

Rehabilitation, Recidivism, and Reintegration: An Examination of Singapore's Penal System for Drug Offenders

A *Channel NewsAsia* programme in October 2016 highlighted that Singapore has the third highest prisoners-per-population rate among advanced economies. The United States was number one, with a prisoners-per-population rate of 693 per 100,000; Israel followed with 256 per 100,000; Singapore was third with 219 per 100,000.¹ About 70 per cent of Singapore's prison population (12,394) in 2015 were doing time for drug-related offences, a relatively high rate. In Denmark, the rate of imprisonment for drug-related offences was 22.1 per cent; in Portugal it was 20.6 per cent.²

An earlier case study detailed the evolution of Singapore's 'war on drugs'.³ That case study examined Singapore's contemporary penal system through a focus on drug offenders. This emphasis is reflected in the high number of prison inmates currently incarcerated for drug-related offences, and in the capital punishments carried out by the state, in which the majority were for drug-related offences.⁴

The case study begins with a brief statistical overview of Singapore's prison population, with an emphasis on drug offenders. This is followed by an introduction to the Singapore Prison Service (SPS) and its key partners. The 'through-care' framework adopted by the SPS includes three key phases: in-care, halfway care and aftercare. For the in-care phase, this case study examines the rehabilitation framework adopted by the SPS, with an emphasis on the core principles that underpinned programmes and initiatives. The following section includes a discussion on a distinctive feature of halfway care in Singapore: the heavy involvement of religious groups and community organizations. The final section discusses prisoner reentry, where state concern is focused on preventing reoffending and successful 'reintegration', of which a core aspect relates to the employment of ex-offenders.

Drug offenders in prison

Singapore's prison statistics show a strong pattern of predominantly male offenders convicted for drug-related offences (see Table 1). As of December 2016, the total convicted

¹ *Channel NewsAsia*, 'IT Figures: Prison High', CNA Insider, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rT9BtQuOQ8> (accessed 2 February 2018).

² *The Singapore Daily*, 'Singapore Has Third Highest Prisoner-to-Population Ratio in the World', 20 October 2016, <http://singaporedaily.net/2016/10/20/singapore-third-highest-prisoner-population-ratio-world/> (accessed 2 February 2018).

³ Stephanie Chok, 'Singapore's War on Drugs: A Historical Overview', Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, 2018.

⁴ Amnesty International, *Singapore: The Death Penalty—A Hidden Toll of Executions* (Hong Kong: Amnesty International, January 2004), 6, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/ASA36/001/2004/en/> (accessed 13 June 2017); Koh Yi Wen, 'Discourses on Death: How National Identity Discourses Influence Singapore's Capital Punishment Policy for Drug Trafficking' (Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2013/14); Wing-Cheong Chan, 'The Death Penalty in Singapore: In Decline but Still Too Soon for Optimism', *Asian Criminology* 11, no.3 (2016): 179–206.

This case was written by Stephanie Chok under the guidance of Hawyee Auyong, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy (LKY School), National University of Singapore and has been funded by the LKY School. The case does not reflect the views of the sponsoring organisation nor is it intended to suggest correct or incorrect handling of the situation depicted. The case is not intended to serve as a primary source of data and is meant solely for class discussion.

penal population⁵ was 9,502: 8,623 were male and 879 were female. Of the total penal population, 6,666 were convicted for drug offences. There was a Drug Rehabilitation Centre (DRC) housed within Changi Prison Complex, and there were 1,464 DRC inmates in 2016. DRCs are segregated by sex, and female DRC inmates had their own facility within Changi Women’s Prison.

Table 1. Singapore’s Prison Population: 2009–2016⁶

YEAR	Total convicted penal population	Convicted for drug-related offences	DRC inmates	Penal releases
2016	9,502 (8,623 male; 879 female)	6,666	1,464 (1,199 male; 265 female)	10,371 (9,089 male; 1,282 female)
2015	9,602 (8,783 male; 819 female)	6,675	1,419 (1,121 male; 298 female)	10,807 (9,206 male; 1,601 female)
2014	9,754 (8,886 male; 868 female)	6,527	1,400 (1,146 male; 254 female)	11,955 (9,981 male; 1,974 female)
2013	10,042 (9,170 male; 872 female)	6,510	1,617 (1,328 male; 289 female)	12,687 (10,541 male; 2,146 female)
2012	9,901 (9,077 male; 824 female)	6,287	1,503 (1,225 male; 278 female)	12,818 (10,620 male; 2,198 female)
2011	10,028 (9,191 male; 837 female)	6,061	1,280 (1,280 male; 224 female)	13,726 (11,295 male; 2,431 female)
2010	11,154 (10,156 male; 998 female)	6,230	765 (622 male; 143 female)	15,867 (12,828 male; 3,039 female)
2009	11,288 (10,302 male; 986 female)	6,016	613 (501 male; 112 female)	16,601 (13,272 male; 3,329 female)

Young drug users—those under 21 years of age—caught by the authorities had several treatment options: where they were sent depended on a process of ‘risk assessment’, which took into account a range of factors including “social circles, family background and criminal history”.⁷ Those viewed as ‘low risk’ could be placed on the Youth Enhanced Supervision (YES) scheme, where they undergo urine tests and counselling. ‘Moderate risk’ offenders were sent to the Community Rehabilitation Centre (CRC), a residential programme where they were allowed to leave for work or school daily but had to return in the evenings. Drug rehabilitation centres were for ‘high risk’ youth offenders, where they could be placed for up

⁵ The Singapore Prison Service defines its convicted penal population as follows: “Convicted penal inmate population refers to the number of inmates who have already been charged and are within the inmate population as at the end of the respective year.” See SPS, ‘News Release: Enhancing Inmates’ Employability to Prevent Re-Offending’, 2016, 4, [http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-\(news-release\)/sps-annual-stats-release-for-2016-\(14-feb-2017\)_for-upload.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-(news-release)/sps-annual-stats-release-for-2016-(14-feb-2017)_for-upload.pdf?sfvrsn=2) (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁶ Statistics derived from Singapore Prison Service’s annual statistics. See SPS website: <http://www.sps.gov.sg/>.

⁷ Theresa Tan and Tan Tam Mei, ‘Treatment Critical but Challenging, Say Experts’, *Straits Times*, 26 June 2017.

to three years. These youths, under the YES scheme, or sent to CRCs or DRCs, would not have criminal records when released.⁸

Adults who were caught for drug consumption, meanwhile, could be sent to DRCs or prison, depending on how many times they have offended, as well as the amount and type of drugs they are caught with. Since 1998, drug users could only be admitted to DRCs twice; those caught for a third time would be charged in court and sentenced to long-term imprisonment as well as caning.⁹ The Central Narcotics Bureau was the agency tasked with assessing inmates.¹⁰ Those caught for the consumption *and* trafficking of drugs would not be sent to the DRC.¹¹ The list of controlled drugs under the Misuse of Drugs Act and Intoxicating Substances Act has grown over the years, and included cannabis, cocaine, heroin, ketamine, methamphetamine, as well as New Psychoactive Substances (NPS), among others.¹² Punishments have expanded over the years to include long-term imprisonment for not just opiate users, but also those who consume buprenorphine and synthetic drugs.¹³

Recidivism rates

Recidivism rates in Singapore have fluctuated significantly, from 44.4 per cent in 1998¹⁴ to 60–70 percent in the 1990s, dropping to between 20–30 percent in recent years.¹⁵ The Singapore Prison Service defines the recidivism rate as “the percentage of local inmates detained, convicted and imprisoned again for a new offence within two years of their release”.¹⁶ In 2016, SPS data on inmates released in 2014 showed that the overall recidivism rate was 26.5 per cent; comparatively, the recidivism rate for those released in 2013 was 25.9 per cent.¹⁷ Another researcher noted that repeat offenders constitute about 80 per cent of the penal population in Singapore.¹⁸

The recidivism rates for DRC offenders, meanwhile, have been consistently higher than overall recidivism rates (see Table 2). While it has been suggested by state officials that

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Chua Minyi, ‘The Rise of New Penology: Long Term Detention of the Opiate User in Singapore’ (Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2005/06), 7–8.

¹⁰ Shaffiq Alkhatib, ‘Life at Drug Rehab Centre’, *Straits Times*, 16 April 2017.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Central Narcotics Bureau, ‘Drugs and Inhalants: Controlled Substances in Singapore’, last updated 16 September 2016, <https://www.cnb.gov.sg/drugs/bannedsubstance.aspx> (accessed 26 June 2017).

¹³ Singapore Prison Service, ‘Treatment and Rehabilitation Regime and Long-Term Imprisonment for Abusers of Cannabis and Cocaine’, last updated 9 November 2016, <http://www.sps.gov.sg/news-about-us/in-the-news/treatment-and-rehabilitation-regime-and-long-term-imprisonment-for-abusers-of-cannabis-and-cocaine> (accessed 1 June 2017).

¹⁴ Singapore Prison Service, ‘Positive Recidivism Rate a Result of Close Collaboration Between Prisons and Its Key Partners’, 25 January 2011, [http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-\(news-release\)/4-press-release---prisons-2010-statistics-25-jan2011.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-(news-release)/4-press-release---prisons-2010-statistics-25-jan2011.pdf?sfvrsn=2) (accessed 2 February 2018).

¹⁵ Ministry of Home Affairs, ‘Written Reply to Parliamentary Question on Recidivism Rate for Long Term Imprisonment 1 and Drug Rehabilitation Centre Inmates from 2010 to 2013 by Mr K Shanmugam, Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for Law’, 7 November 2016, <https://www.mha.gov.sg/Newsroom/in-parliament/written-replies-to-pqs/Pages/Written-Reply-to-Parliamentary-Question-on-Recidivism-Rate.aspx> (accessed 2 February 2018).

¹⁶ Singapore Prison Service, ‘News Release: Enhancing Inmates’ Employability to Prevent Reoffending’, 2016, [http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-\(news-release\)/sps-annual-stats-release-for-2016-\(14-feb-2017\)_for-upload.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-(news-release)/sps-annual-stats-release-for-2016-(14-feb-2017)_for-upload.pdf?sfvrsn=2) (accessed 16 December 2017).

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Charmian Goh, ‘Neoliberal Penalty: Prisoner Reintegration Organisations in Singapore’ (Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2014/2015), 3.

Singapore’s recidivism rates are low by international standards,¹⁹ between-country comparisons on recidivism rates are highly problematic due to a lack of standardization regarding definitions, criterion measured (for example types of offences included/excluded) as well as follow-up times (which could range from six months to five years).²⁰ Differences in such criteria can significantly impact the reported rate of recidivism.²¹

Table 2: Recidivism Rates (2007–2014)

Year of release	Overall recidivism rates	Recidivism rate for DRC offenders
2014 release cohort	26.5%	30.1%
2013 release cohort	25.9%	31.9%
2012 release cohort	27.6%	28.3%
2011 release cohort	27.4%	31.1%
2010 release cohort	23.6%	27.5%
2009 release cohort	26.7%	27.1%
2008 release cohort	27.3%	30.5%
2007 release cohort	26.5%	20.4%

The Singapore Prison Service: the shift towards rehabilitation

The Singapore Prison Service (SPS) was a department within the Ministry of Home Affairs. It was part of the HOME Team of agencies related to “crime control, security and civil defence”.²² Other agencies in the HOME Team included:

- Singapore Police Force (SPF)
- Singapore Civil Defence Force (SCDF)
- Central Narcotics Bureau (CNB)
- Immigration and Checkpoints Authority (ICA)
- Casino Regulatory Authority (CRA)
- Home Team Academy
- Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises (SCORE)

Collectively, these government agencies were tasked with “safeguarding the safety and internal security of Singapore”.²³ The Singapore Prison Service was in charge of both penal

¹⁹ *AsiaOne*, ‘Less Prisoners Re-offending’, 23 November 2010, <http://www.asiaone.com/News/AsiaOne%2BNews/Singapore/Story/A1Story20101123-248798.html> (accessed 2 February 2018).

²⁰ Seena Fazel and Achim Wolf, ‘A Systematic Review of Criminal Recidivism Rates Worldwide: Current Difficulties and Recommendations for Best Practice’, *PLoS One* 10, no.6 (June 2015): 1-8; Peter B Hoffman and Barbara Stone-Meierhoefer, ‘Reporting Recidivism Rates: The Criterion and Follow-Up Issues’, *Journal of Criminal Justice* 8, no.1 (1980): 57.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Lohman Yew, ‘Effective Treatment Measures for Prisoners and Drug Addicts to Facilitate Their Reintegration into Society’, *Resource Material Series No.54* (Tokyo, Japan: UNAFEI, September 1999): 303, http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/RS_No54/No54_23VE_Yew.pdf (accessed 26 June 2017).

²³ Peter Joo Hee Ng, ‘Offender Rehabilitation, Community Engagement, and Preventing Re-Offending in Singapore’, *Resource Material Series No.80* (Tokyo, Japan: UNAFEI, March 2010): 18, http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/RS_No80/No80_06VE_Ng.pdf (accessed 2 February 2018).

and drug inmates,²⁴ and oversaw 14 institutions, of which 13 were male prisons and one was a female prison.²⁵ According to Peter Ng, a former Director of Prisons, the SPS ascribed four basic purposes to imprisonment, the first of which was ‘punishment’. Prisons in Singapore are therefore ‘spartan’, with the incarceration regime ‘strict’.²⁶ As Lohman Yew, another former Deputy Director of Prisons emphasized, Singapore’s prisons and DRCs are “not holiday resorts”.²⁷ The second purpose is ‘incapacitation’, in which the “hard-core and long-termed imprisoned”, in particular, are denied opportunities to re-offend. Achieving the third purpose, ‘deterrence’, means “[l]ife in prison must never be better than life outside”.²⁸ Prison life had to be sufficiently harsh so persons both in and outside of prison would be deterred from entering or reentering the system. The final purpose, ‘reformation’, is for those assessed as “willing and able to turn their backs on a criminal career”. For these individuals, there are rehabilitative programmes and aftercare support to assist them with reintegration and lead “crime-free lives”.²⁹

The primary emphasis on punishment reflected a tough stance on crime. Nevertheless, the prison service has, over the years, established frameworks to improve prisoner welfare and rehabilitation, from the colonial period to the present day. Quek, for example, detailed shifts in Singapore’s penal philosophy, from the treatment of our convict population during the colonial period, through to the 1980s.³⁰ While a greater range of structural facilities as well as activities for prisoners have been introduced, including rehabilitation programmes, disciplining remained a core function of the prison system. Classification systems were also an important element, in which ‘hardened’ inmates were viewed as requiring different forms of treatment and segregation from others.³¹ This distinction, that rehabilitation was for those “genuinely desirous of changing”,³² has been a consistent emphasis, and continued to underpin the allocation of resources and programmes (see later section on risk and rehabilitation).

In the contemporary period, prison reform has been frequently credited to the leadership of Chua Kin Kiat, a former Director of Prisons who helmed the Singapore Prison Service from 1999 to 2007.³³ In his book, *The Making of Captains for Lives*, Chua detailed how the SPS, when he became Director, was overpopulated (there were 16,000 inmates and rising), and suffered from high staff turnover.³⁴ The situation was sufficiently dire for the SPS to request that law enforcement agencies “slow down” as the prisons could not cope with the

²⁴ Yew, ‘Effective Treatment Measures for Prisoners and Drug Addicts’, 303.

²⁵ Stanley Tang, ‘Effective Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offenders’, *Resource Material Series No.82* (Tokyo, Japan: UNAFEI, December 2010): 41, http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/RS_No82/No82_07VE_Tang.pdf (accessed 2 February 2018).

²⁶ Ng, ‘Offender Rehabilitation’, 19.

²⁷ Yew, ‘Effective Treatment Measures for Prisoners and Drug Addicts’, 303.

²⁸ Ng, ‘Offender Rehabilitation’, 19.

²⁹ Ng, ‘Offender Rehabilitation’, 19.

³⁰ Quek Shi Lei, ‘Prisons in Singapore—Changing Philosophies and Methods of Treatment’, in *Return to Society: Key Issues in the Rehabilitation of the Ex-Prisoner*, ed. Francis HM Heng (Singapore: SACA, 1984), 6–14.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 9–11.

³² Yew, ‘Effective Treatment Measures for Prisoners and Drug Addicts’, 303.

³³ Lena Leong, ‘The Story of Singapore Prison Service: From Custodians of Prisoners to Captains of Life’, Centre for Governance and Leadership, Civil Service College, 2012, 1–14, <http://www.pgionline.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/The-Story-of-the-Singapore-Prison-Service.pdf> (accessed 2 February 2018).

³⁴ The prison population hit an all-time high of 18,000 in 2002, before this trend was reversed through reform. See Chua Chin Kiat, *The Making of Captains for Lives, Prison Reform in Singapore 1999 to 2007* (World Scientific: Singapore, 2012), 2.

prevailing rate of admission.³⁵ The burgeoning prison population was due to the high number of arrests for drug offences (amendments to the Misuse of Drug Act had worsened the crunch), and relapse rates that were double those of today. There was also a lack of structured rehabilitation programmes for drug users.³⁶

Chua instituted a comprehensive and painstaking process of revision, research, and engagement with SPS staff and the Ministry of Home Affairs to transform the organization and adopt a more inmate-centric system, with greater emphasis on rehabilitation. The MHA had previously rejected an SPS proposal of setting up a Rehabilitation Division, with the Ministry unconvinced that “the huge amount of resources requested for would produce any results”.³⁷ There were thus some tensions between the recommendations that emerged from Chua’s consultations and the MHA, in which the MHA was adamant that secure custody had to be seen as the primary focus of the SPS and that efforts at rehabilitation should not give the impression the prison system had ‘gone soft’.³⁸ Nonetheless, Chua persisted, and compromises were brokered; the prison service was gradually steered towards an emphasis not just on security and safety, but also on the rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders into society. During Chua’s term, the prison population steadily declined. Other noteworthy initiatives that took place under Chua’s directorship included the opening of the Kaki Bukit Prison School in 2000, the establishment of the CARE Network (a co-ordinating body of aftercare agencies in Singapore), and the launch of the Yellow Ribbon Project, described as “the only national ‘second chance’ campaign” to increase awareness, acceptance, and public action to support ex-offenders in their reintegration into society.³⁹

‘Serving time should never be a waste of time’: risk and rehabilitation

In the 1990s, a shift in prison management occurred in which discourses of ‘risk and probability’ were adopted. This new rationality relied on the adoption of managerial processes and statistical techniques to “[assess] risk and [predict] dangerousness”.⁴⁰ Risk assessment strategies were deployed as a means of generating efficiencies in the prison system and this relied on a system of differentiation based on predicted risk of recidivism, in which the allocation of security as well as welfare-oriented resources were dependent on how an inmate was assessed. ‘Hardcore’ drug users, who were viewed as difficult to change, were ‘risky’, and a strong scarcity mentality justified decisions to exclude such inmates from certain programmes. As stated in the SPS Annual in 1998: “To be realistic, not every offender will change. In the face of limited resources, rehabilitation cannot be [the goal] for every offender.”⁴¹

The Rehabilitation Framework was first adopted by the SPS in 2000 and assessed inmates based their security risk as well as rehabilitative potential. Four security levels could be assigned, with one being the highest and four being the lowest. Rehabilitation potential,

³⁵ The response was that “law enforcement must be dictated by law and order considerations, not by prison capacity”. See Chua, *The Making of Captains for Lives*, 3.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 3–4.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 28.

³⁹ Tang, ‘Effective Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offenders’, 49.

⁴⁰ Malcolm M. Feeley and Jonathan Simon, ‘The New Penology: Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and Its Implications’, *Criminology* 30, no.4 (1992): 457.

⁴¹ Minyi, ‘The Rise of New Penology’, 35.

meanwhile, was determined with a predictive actuarial assessment tool termed Level of Service Inventory—Revised (LSI-R).⁴² Under the LSI-R framework, inmates could be categorized Class A, B, C or D:

- Class A was for “offenders who will change regardless whether rehabilitation treatment is given”;⁴³ they were considered inmates of “low risk and needs” that were “unlikely to reoffend”;⁴⁴
- Class B was for inmates who “will likely change if appropriate treatment or rehabilitation is given”;⁴⁵ they were inmates with “moderate risk and needs”, who were “less likely to reoffend if rehabilitation is given”;⁴⁶
- Class C was for “high risk and needs” inmates;⁴⁷ in 1999, they were viewed as those “not likely to change regardless whether rehabilitation or treatment is given”;⁴⁸ in 2010, such prisoners were determined “likely to reoffend unless intensive rehabilitation is given”;⁴⁹
- Class D was for “foreigners and the mentally ill whose ‘rehabilitation was not a concern’”.⁵⁰

Under this framework, prison resources were targeted at Class B and ‘motivated’ Class C inmates; it was believed such inmates would give the SPS “the best returns with the resources invested”.⁵¹ This classification system shaped each inmate’s Personal Route Map (PRM), which planned and guided each inmate’s passage through prison;⁵² an assigned prison officer would review the PRM of the inmate under his/her charge throughout the inmate’s incarceration. This mode of assessment adopted by the SPS was a “composite of actuarial tools and officer mediation”, and thus served as an “ideological hybrid between the world of welfare needs and the world of risk and correction”.⁵³ The Personal Route Map, meanwhile, influenced the rehabilitation and treatment programmes an inmate would be assigned, as well as programmes or even job placement interviews they could be selected for or excluded from.⁵⁴

Economic rationalism as a governing principle in Singapore’s prison system thus relegated rehabilitation into a “secondary concept”, a means to “the ‘end’ of risk reduction for *some* offenders” (emphasis in original).⁵⁵ The mix of actuarial science and officer discretion also resulted in rehabilitation being framed as a privilege for those viewed by officers as ‘unproblematic’ and ‘motivated’; those who were not offered such opportunities were expected to understand this decision as one resulting from optimizing efficiencies in

⁴² Ibid. 35.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Tang, ‘Effective Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offenders’, 44.

⁴⁵ Chua, ‘The Rise of New Penology’, 35.

⁴⁶ Tang, ‘Effective Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offenders’, 44.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Chua, ‘The Rise of New Penology’, 35.

⁴⁹ Tang, ‘Effective Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offenders’, 44.

⁵⁰ Chua, ‘The Rise of New Penology’, 35.

⁵¹ Tang, ‘Effective Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offenders’, 44.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Hazel Kemshall, *Understanding Risk in Criminal Justice* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2003): 100.

⁵⁴ Chua, ‘The Rise of New Penology’, 36.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

resource allocation.⁵⁶ Joo Hee, another former SPS Director, noted in a 2010 statement that time spent in prison offers a “golden opportunity for rehabilitation”:

*For the deserving and suitably well-motivated, the time spent in detention can be profitably deployed into unlearning previously destructive behaviours, learning a trade or skill, or resuming formal education. Indeed, serving time should never be a waste of time.*⁵⁷

‘Many helping hands’: faith-based, community-driven approaches

The Singapore Prison Service’s efforts to reduce reoffending included the development of its ‘throughcare system’,⁵⁸ which had three distinct phases: In-Care, Halfway Care and Aftercare.⁵⁹ The In-Care phase included, as discussed earlier, a personal assessment and the development of a PRM.⁶⁰ This determined an inmate’s involvement in various prison programmes, including Specialized Treatment Programmes to manage ‘criminogenic risks’ (for example, substance abuse or violent behaviour).⁶¹ Vocational training and employment services were facilitated by the Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises, a statutory board established under the Ministry of Home Affairs. SCORE managed industrial workshops in prison and DRCs. These courses included training in landscaping, culinary skills, food preparation, logistics and multi-media skills.⁶² Meanwhile, the Prison School, currently housed in Tanah Merah Prison, offered formal education opportunities for inmates who qualified and wished to take their N, O or A-Levels. 239 inmates sat for these examinations in 2015.⁶³

Before inmates were released, they would be assessed for suitability for community-based rehabilitation: this assessment was based on “needs and risks”, with criteria including “the nature of their offences, their conduct in prison and the presence of family support”.⁶⁴ Those viewed as low risk (in terms of re-offending) and deemed to have strong family support could be allowed to serve part of their remaining sentence at home. Under this Home Detention Scheme, inmates could be monitored by electronic ankle tags and had to abide by curfew hours. Those assessed as requiring more structured programmes or who did not have adequate family support could be sent to halfway houses.

When it came to halfway care and aftercare, the SPS relied on community-based rehabilitation to ease the transition of offenders from the institutional setting of a prison to ‘regular life’. Such programmes “place the responsibility for integration squarely on the offender”, while at the same time leveraged community resources to achieve rehabilitation

⁵⁶ Ibid., 38.

⁵⁷ Ng, ‘Offender Rehabilitation’, 19.

⁵⁸ Timothy Hee Sun Leo, ‘Using Evidence-Based Knowledge to Create an Offender Throughcare System’, *Resource Material Series No.88* (Tokyo, Japan: UNAFEI, December 2012): 96–104.

http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/RS_No88/No88_15VE_Leo_Using.pdf (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁵⁹ Tang, ‘Effective Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offenders’, 43; Ng, ‘Offender Rehabilitation’, 21–24.

⁶⁰ Ng, ‘Offender Rehabilitation’, 22.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² SCORE, ‘Training and Employment Assistance’, last updated 23 January 2018, http://www.score.gov.sg/vocational_training.html (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁶³ Faris Mokhtar, ‘Awakening Hope: How Singapore’s Only Prison School Helps Rebuild Inmates’ Lives’, *Channel NewsAsia*, 31 March 2016, <http://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/awakening-hope-how-singapore-s-only-prison-school-helps-rebuild--8150128> (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁶⁴ Ng Huiwen, ‘More Ex-Offenders Staying Out of Jail’, *Straits Times*, 18 February 2016.

for the ‘reforming prisoner’.⁶⁵ This cohered with Singapore’s ‘Many Helping Hands’ approach in dealing with social problems, where the emphasis was on developing “self-reliance in a society that is robust, yet compassionate and caring”, through partnerships with a wide range of non-state actors that included “concerned citizens, corporations, community organisations, religious groups and family members”.⁶⁶ This ethos of ‘shared responsibility’ was especially pronounced with programmes and initiatives dealing with the rehabilitation and reintegration of drug offenders.

In 2000, the CARE Network was established to support the effective rehabilitation of ex-offenders in Singapore.⁶⁷ There were nine core member agencies—including the government’s HOME team—and a network of over 100 community partners that included voluntary welfare organisations (VWOs), religious groups, corporations, and grassroots organisations. In 2010, the Singapore Prison Service, the Singapore After-Care Association (SACA) and the Singapore Anti-Narcotics Association (SANA) established the Community Outreach Project, in which over 200 volunteers registered with grassroots organisations assisted more than 200 families of inmates.⁶⁸ This emphasis on supporting inmates’ families was a core focus, with Family Resource Centres (FRCs) set up in 2006. Structurally, the work of the FRCs was outsourced to community welfare organisations (CWOs), who were tasked with supporting families during the inmates’ incarceration; assistance was also provided to released inmates who did not have family support. These CWOs in turn provided information and referred inmates and their families to targeted voluntary welfare organizations to receive further help.⁶⁹ A key objective of the FRC and its affiliated programmes was to prevent “the inter-generational offending cycle”.⁷⁰

In Singapore, the heavy involvement of religious groups in rehabilitation efforts in prison and post-release from prison was deliberate, due to official views that religion could be a powerful and effective means of changing inmates’ thinking and, therefore, behaviour. The association of prisoner rehabilitation with religious activities was made as early as 1948 and 1951, when the Singapore Prison Enquiry Commissions were released.⁷¹ In 1977, the President of SANA,⁷² Baey Lian Peck, met with religious leaders with the aim of getting religious groups more involved in providing spiritual counselling and religious instruction, both within DRCs as well as for those released under supervision.⁷³ It was believed that religion, with its “purifying values, sustaining powers and energy” could “motivate and

⁶⁵ Ng, ‘Offender Rehabilitation’, 23.

⁶⁶ Janice Tai, ‘All Hands on Deck Needed for Social Good’, *Straits Times*, 11 April 2016.

⁶⁷ CARE Network website, ‘What We Do’, <http://www.carenetwork.org.sg/whatWeDo.aspx#mls> (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁶⁸ Singapore Prison Service, ‘Stronger Community and Family Support Help Keep Recidivism Rates Low as SPS Maintains Focus on Its “Through-Care” Philosophy’, 1 February 2012, [http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-\(news-release\)/3-2012-prisons-annual-statistics-release-1-feb-2012_0.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-(news-release)/3-2012-prisons-annual-statistics-release-1-feb-2012_0.pdf?sfvrsn=2) (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁶⁹ Fei Yue Family Resource Centre, <http://www.fycs.org/index.cfm?GPID=121> (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁷⁰ Tang, ‘Effective Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offenders’, 45.

⁷¹ Olivia Siong, ‘Faith-Based Offender Rehabilitation in Singapore: Deconstructing State Discourse’ (Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2010/2011), 2.

⁷² The Singapore Anti-Narcotics Association (SANA) is a voluntary welfare organisation registered under The Societies Act on 19 August 1972. It was approved as a charity under The Charities Act on 19 August 1972. SANA is affiliated to the National Council of Social Service. It was first established to assist in the rehabilitation of drug addicts and provide assistance and support wherever necessary. See Singapore Anti-Narcotics Association (SANA), <http://eresources.nlb.gov.sg/webarchives/details/www.sana.org.sg.html> (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁷³ KV Veloo, ‘The Singapore Drug Scene, 1973–1980’, in *The Uphill Task of Rehabilitating Drug Addicts—1973–1980*, part of series *Rehabilitation of Offenders in Singapore: Vol 4* (Singapore: Dept. of Social Work and Psychology, National University of Singapore, June 2004), 42.

inspire drug users to recover their balance, social purpose, worth and dignity”.⁷⁴ Religious groups responded enthusiastically, and a SANA Religious Aftercare (Counselling) Service was developed.⁷⁵ Chua, in his book, also expressed the belief that involving religious groups could reap “handsome rewards” in terms of improving rehabilitation efforts.⁷⁶

At present, all halfway houses in Singapore have adopted a “faith-based approach”, with religion was a key part of rehabilitative programmes.⁷⁷ The Prisons Halfway House Scheme, founded in 1995, was a live-in programme that allowed ‘amenable offenders’ (those deemed low to medium risk) from DRCs and prisons who did not have adequate family support to spend the last stages of their detention at halfway houses. There were eight halfway houses that worked with the Singapore Prisons Service that collectively could house 450 offenders.⁷⁸ These halfway houses were carved along ethnic/religious lines, with one catering specifically to women: as listed on SCORE’s website, there were two “Malay Halfway Houses”, one “Indian Halfway House”, one “Buddhist Halfway House”, three “Christian Halfway Houses” (including one for teenagers called Teen Challenge), and one “Female Halfway House”.⁷⁹ These categories were reflective of the government’s tendency to refer to race and religion interchangeably,⁸⁰ in which particular ethnic groups were assumed to follow specific religions (i.e. Malays were presumed to be Muslim, Indians Hindu, and Chinese Buddhist or Christian).⁸¹ In practical terms, this conflation could mean that Chinese ex-offenders had greater access to resources, despite the reality that the penal population included a disproportionate numbers ethnic minorities.⁸² Additionally, halfway houses that were not linked to the SPS were all Chinese/Christian-based.⁸³

The transformative goal of prisons made religious groups attractive partners in the rehabilitation process. At the same time, as Siong has pointed out, faith-based rehabilitation tended to have a depoliticising effect through the focus on internalising criminal behaviour. Religion was promoted as a means to overcome personal weakness (a ‘lack of willpower’, for example) and achieve inner transformation. This positivist and individualising tendency has been said to obscure the “structural issues and material conditions in which crime and recidivism may take place”.⁸⁴

Societal inequalities were often reproduced within the prison system. The different resources—including not just financial but also social capital—available to different religious groups operating within the prison created competition whereby particular religious groups were perceived as more attractive (or more successful) than others. These inequalities in

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Chua, *The Making of Captains for Lives*, 99.

⁷⁷ Siong, ‘Faith-Based Offender Rehabilitation’, 2.

⁷⁸ TODAY, ‘New Govt-Run Halfway House for Ex-Offenders to be Ready by 2018’, 18 January 2014, <http://www.todayonline.com/singapore/new-govt-run-halfway-house-ex-offenders-be-ready-2018> (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁷⁹ SCORE, ‘Community Partnerships & Aftercare: Halfway Houses’, last updated 23 January 2018, http://www.score.gov.sg/halfway_houses.html (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁸⁰ Siong, ‘Faith-Based Offender Rehabilitation’, 5.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Marlia Mohamed, ‘The Invisible Visible: Plight of Homeless Ex-Prisoners in Singapore’ (Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2010), 44; Ganapathy Narayanan and Lian Kwen Fee, ‘Race, Reintegration, and Social Capital in Singapore’, *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* 40, no.1 (2016): 1–23.

⁸³ Narayanan and Fee, ‘Race, Reintegration, and Social Capital in Singapore’, 8–9.

⁸⁴ Siong, ‘Faith-Based Offender Rehabilitation’, 4.

resources, networks and thereby opportunities, were inextricably tied to broader socio-economic phenomena in which race and class intersected in Singapore, and had direct, material consequences for prisoners.⁸⁵

Critical examinations of faith/ethnic-based rehabilitative and reintegration programmes have raised questions about the structural disadvantages faced by ethnic minority offenders (who relied on less well-endowed and less well-connected service providers) vis-à-vis the financial privileges and ethnic/social capital of the Christian/Chinese community and the inmates they supported.⁸⁶ Narayanan and Fee argued that such entrenched “racial structuration”, in which there was an “unequal exercise of interpersonal influence in a hierarchy of networks” not only influenced wellbeing and opportunities during the in-care and halfway care phases, but resulted in unequal outcomes for different categories of prisoners when they were released to mainstream society.⁸⁷

Examining aftercare: ‘reentry’ and ‘reintegration’

Every year, about 11,000 inmates were released and faced the daunting prospect of adjusting to life outside prison.⁸⁸ The problems faced by ex-offenders post-release included enduring stigmatization (that is, they continue to suffer the criminogenic impacts of incarceration), difficulties with finding and keeping jobs, and various forms of family strife, with these problems often deeply intertwined.

Adopting the perspective of a “carceral continuum”⁸⁹ allows an acknowledgement that the punitive effects of prison continued even after someone has served his/her sentence. This was especially evident in one key area of policy concern: the employment/unemployment of ex-offenders. Peck and Theodore, who conducted research among communities of colour in Chicago, spoke of an “ex-offender employability crisis”,⁹⁰ in which former inmates experienced ‘churning’ within the low-wage labour market, thus further exacerbating their segregation and eroding long-term employment prospects. The authors determined that for inmates of colour, “social stigma, institutional marginalisation and economic disenfranchisement assume the status of an extended form of incarceration”.⁹¹

Sustained employment was perceived as a critical aspect in the effective reintegration of ex-offenders. Harrison and Schehr, for example, argue that “sustainable employment is critical to the success of a supervision program, and an ex-offender’s avoidance of recidivism”; they believed that vocational guidance and programmes that included financial assistance as well as follow-up support were “more effective than incarceration for some offenders in deterring perpetual recidivism”.⁹² The employment and employability of ex-offenders was

⁸⁵ Siong, ‘Faith-Based Offender Rehabilitation’; Narayanan and Fee, ‘Race, Reintegration, and Social Capital in Singapore’; Yeo Zhi Qi, ‘The Coloured Ribbon: Race, Recidivism and Reintegration’ (Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2009/10).

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Narayanan and Fee, ‘Race, Reintegration, and Social Capital in Singapore’, 18.

⁸⁸ Narayanan and Fee, ‘Race, Reintegration, and Social Capital in Singapore’, 1.

⁸⁹ Goh, ‘Neoliberal Penalty’, 9.

⁹⁰ Jamie Peck and Nik Theodore, ‘Carceral Chicago: Making the Ex-Offender Employability Crisis’, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32, 2 (June 2008): 251.

⁹¹ Peck and Theodore, ‘Carceral Chicago’, 251.

⁹² Byron Harrison and Robert Carl Schehr, ‘Offenders and Post-Release Jobs’, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 39, no.3 (2004): 35–68.

therefore a major concern for state as well as non-state actors involved in the aftercare phase.

The Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises continued to try and engage employers from industries such as food and beverage, hospitality, logistics, and manufacturing, and encourage them to hire ex-offenders. It was reported in February 2017 that 2,061 inmates were referred to SCORE, and 96 per cent of them secured jobs while still serving their sentences. In 2016, 2,932 'eligible inmates' qualified for daily work programmes while in prison.⁹³ These numbers indicated that around one-fifth of inmates were able to avail themselves of SCORE's assistance.

It is unclear how 'employability' was assessed and which inmates were selected; demographic breakdowns (in terms of gender, age, race, type of offences) were also unavailable. This precluded sustained examination of which subgroups within the prison population might be excluded from training opportunities and employment assistance. While job retention rates for those placed by SCORE were tracked, this was only done up to the six month mark; in the 2012 to 2016 statistics, there were noticeable drops in retention rates after three months.⁹⁴ It was therefore difficult to assess the stability of job tenure in the longer-term as well as other dimensions of employment, such as wage rates and terms of employment.

The vocational training opportunities offered to inmates and the industries in which job opportunities were clustered for them indicated that most would be engaged in lower-wage work, and in sectors that were known for less favourable working conditions (for example, long hours and shift work). Data on wages in industries such as cleaning, food and beverage, landscaping and maintenance work indicated chronic wage depression and stagnation,⁹⁵ with basic monthly salaries in 2015 ranging from S\$1,000 to S\$1,200; such wages would have been less than half the median gross monthly income in 2015, which was S\$3,949.⁹⁶

In Singapore, there were additional regulatory barriers to overcome for ex-offenders searching for a job. Those with criminal records were not able to work in the insurance or real estate industries, among others.⁹⁷ Those charged with certain crimes were barred from becoming commercial taxi drivers or could be banned for a number of years.⁹⁸ The proliferation of private car hire companies initially offered an additional employment opportunity for ex-offenders, but regulations have since been tightened. In June 2017, an article revealed that one ex-offender, who was jailed for drug consumption three times, was no longer eligible to continue as a Grab and Uber driver (from which he was earning an

⁹³ Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises, *Annual Report 2016* (Singapore: SCORE, 2016): 30, http://www.score.gov.sg/doc/annual_reports/SCORE-Annual-Report-2016.pdf (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 31.

⁹⁵ Chew Hui Min, 'Singapore Budget 2015: Median Wages Increased Six Times Since 1965', *Straits Times*, 23 February 2015.

⁹⁶ Ministry of Manpower, 'Summary Table: Income', <http://stats.mom.gov.sg/Pages/Income-Summary-Table.aspx> (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁹⁷ Council for Estate Agencies, 'Apply for Estate Agent Licence', last updated 25 August 2017, <https://www.cea.gov.sg/professionals/estate-agents-licensing-matters/apply-for-estate-agent-licence> (accessed 2 February 2018); General Insurance Association of Singapore, 'Fit and Proper Criteria', http://www.gia.org.sg/pdfs/GIARR/AMF_FitAndProperCriteria.pdf (accessed 2 February 2018).

⁹⁸ Singapore Parliament Report (1 September 2017), Vol 94, 'Taxi Driver's Vocational License (TDVL) Re-Application Criteria', <https://tinyurl.com/TaxiLicenceCriteria> (accessed 2 February 2018).

income of around S\$4,000) a month.⁹⁹ A criminal record also prevented one from becoming an auxiliary police officer, a teacher, or a Member of Parliament. Ex-offenders could also have difficulties getting jobs—such as in the security industry—in which one had to be assessed to be “fit and proper” and of “good character”.¹⁰⁰ There were also disruptions such as mandatory, regular urine tests for former drug-users that could jeopardize their employment.¹⁰¹

The discourse surrounding ‘reentry’ and ‘reintegration’ have been critiqued for several reasons: 1) the transitory journey tended to be individualised, thus obscuring structural barriers; 2) it assumed inmates were ‘integrated’ before incarceration; 3) it falsely delineated the various dimensions of an ex-offender’s lived realities (for e.g. in prison versus outside prison).¹⁰² These tendencies were strongly evident in the Singapore context as well, and were exacerbated for those who suffered from ‘double’ marginalization.

In fact, in Mohamed’s work on homeless ex-offenders in Singapore, she pointed out how homeless, ethnic minority ex-offenders suffered from additional strains and structural impediments and faced ‘triple marginalization’.¹⁰³ Yet the pervasiveness of individualisation discourses—which inmates often internalise—effectively depoliticised and made invisible the structural barriers and racialized experiences they faced.¹⁰⁴ Reintegration, as emphasized by Narayanan and Fee, needs to be recognized as a “structural issue that is located at the intersection of race and social class”.¹⁰⁵

There are other groups within the inmate community that remained understudied and under-represented within mainstream discourse. These included female inmates, for whom there were gendered difficulties (often related to care responsibilities) to contend with¹⁰⁶ Meanwhile, it was recently revealed that the number of elderly prisoners has almost doubled in the past five years (from 359 in 2012 to 651 inmates above 60 years old in 2017),¹⁰⁷ prompting discussion on rehabilitation options for those above 60.¹⁰⁸ For some, repeated and long-term incarceration meant they had diminished financial resources and extremely strained family relations; this while they were also facing added challenges due to shifts in their physical, cognitive and social functioning.¹⁰⁹ There was also little detailed information publicly available on the population of foreigners in Singapore’s prisons, as well as the treatment of inmates who were mentally and physically challenged. Just Detention International, which is based in the United States, has deemed that Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual

⁹⁹ Isabel Liew, ‘LTA: Murderers, Rapists Barred from PDVL for Life’, *The New Paper*, 30 June 2017, <http://www.tnp.sg/news/singapore/Ita-murderers-rapists-barred-pdvl-life> (accessed 2 February 2018).

¹⁰⁰ Singapore Statutes Online, Private Security Industry Act, Part III, Section 17.

¹⁰¹ Lim Yan Liang, ‘Hair Testing for Ex-Drug Offenders Begins’, *Straits Times*, 7 November 2013; Central Narcotics Bureau, *A Handbook for Current Drug Supervisees* (Singapore: CNB, January 2011).

¹⁰² Goh, ‘Neoliberal Penalty’, 42.

¹⁰³ Mohamed, ‘The Invisible Visible’, 45

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 48.

¹⁰⁵ Narayanan and Fee, ‘Race, Reintegration, and Social Capital in Singapore’, 19.

¹⁰⁶ Lim Yun Xin, “‘People Like Us’: A Sociological Account of Women Drug Users in Singapore’ (Honours thesis, National University, 2000); Minyi, ‘The Rise of New Penology’, 22; Goh Chin Mien, ‘Treatment of Female Offenders in Singapore’, *Annual Report for 2012 and Resource Material Series No.90* (Tokyo, Japan: UNAFEI, August 2013): 163–171, http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/RS_No90/No90_23PA_Mien.pdf (accessed 13 June 2017).

¹⁰⁷ Theresa Tan, ‘Grab Bars, Handrails in Some Cells as Number of Elderly Prisoners Rises’, *Straits Times*, 13 March 2017.

¹⁰⁸ Seow Bei Yi, ‘Different Rehab Approach for Elderly Inmates Mooted’, *Straits Times*, 28 July 2017.

¹⁰⁹ Dorothy Tan Zhi Ling, ‘The Forgotten Generation: Incarceration and Reintegration Experiences of Older (Ex)Offenders in Singapore’, (Honours thesis, National University, 2014/2015).

and Transgender (LGBT) prisoners face additional challenges in prison and were at extreme risk of abuse and harassment.¹¹⁰ In Thailand, sexual minorities are separated within the prison system and it was reported the country was considering a separate facility for LGBT prisoners to prevent violence.¹¹¹ There did not seem to be any specific literature on this community in relation to Singapore's prison system.

Conclusion

The penal system in Singapore has undergone key shifts through the decades, and was positioned as one that was both focused on secure custody yet also concerned with the effective rehabilitation of inmates. Resources continued to be directed towards the development of programmes and the strengthening of networks to 'rehabilitate' individuals and support their families to prevent re-offending. Reintegration efforts were strongly couched as a 'shared responsibility' that required the participation of a wide range of non-state actors. Community groups and faith-based organisations play a significant role in these efforts.

Economic rationalism, however, strongly underpinned many of these efforts. In fact, Singapore has been deemed to approximate a "neoliberal criminal justice system", characterised by a "residual welfare state, extreme income inequality, and limited social rights".¹¹² A strong ethos of individual responsibility dominated official and mainstream discourse on the rehabilitation and reintegration of ex-offenders, while access to programmes and initiatives invariably relied on a combination of 'risk assessment' tools and the discretionary power of various gatekeepers. While the employment of ex-offenders remained a major policy concern, the qualitative dimensions of available employment opportunities tended to be overlooked. While there was a notable lack of disaggregated data, the general perception was that ex-offenders tend to be clustered in the low-wage labour market and suffered from multiple forms of precarity, which could result in some invariably being drawn back into the illegitimate economy.¹¹³

Official and mainstream discourse in Singapore tended towards extremes: from the adoption of 'race- and class blind' perspectives that obscured how racialized experiences differentially impacted the lives of various ethnic and socio-economic groups in Singapore, to initiatives that continually emphasized the 'unique' cultural attributes of particular ethnic groups and the entrenchment of "ethnicized welfare"¹¹⁴ as the most effective means to deal with problems within different ethnic groups. This tendency was especially evident in state discourse on the rehabilitation and reintegration of ex-offenders, and belied the 'intertwining nature of 'race', 'religion' and 'social capital' in everyday life in the Singapore context".¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰ Just Detention International, 'In Danger: Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Survivors Behind Bars', 29 October 2014, https://justdetention.org/webinar_category/lgbt/ (accessed 2 February 2018).

¹¹¹ Dake Kang, 'Thailand Separates LGBT Inmates, Considers Segregated Prison', *Associated Press*, 29 January 2017, <https://sg.news.yahoo.com/thailand-separates-lgbt-inmates-considers-segregated-prison-030227179.html> (accessed 2 February 2018).

¹¹² Charmian Goh, 'Neoliberal Penalty', 11.

¹¹³ Narayanan and Fee, 'Race, Reintegration, and Social Capital in Singapore'; Ganapathy Narayanan, "'Us" and "Them": Ethnic Minority Gangs in Singapore Prisons', *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 32, no.3 (2016): 264–284.

¹¹⁴ Narayanan and Fee, 'Race, Reintegration, and Social Capital in Singapore', 6.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 19.

References

- Alkhatib, Shaffiq. 'Life at Drug Rehab Centre.' *Straits Times*, 16 April 2017.
- Amnesty International. *Singapore: The Death Penalty—A Hidden Toll of Executions*. Hong Kong: Amnesty International, January 2004.
<https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/ASA36/001/2004/en/> (accessed 13 June 2017).
- AsiaOne*. 'Less Prisoners Re-offending.' 23 November 2010.
<http://www.asiaone.com/News/AsiaOne%2BNews/Singapore/Story/A1Story20101123-248798.html> (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Central Narcotics Bureau. *A Handbook for Current Drug Supervisees* (Singapore: CNB, January 2011).
- Channel NewsAsia*. 'IT Figures: Prison High.' CNA Insider.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rT9BtnQuOQ8> (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Chan, Wing-Cheong. 'The Death Penalty in Singapore: In Decline but Still Too Soon for Optimism.' *Asian Criminology* 11, no.3 (2016): 179–206.
- Chew, Hui Min. 'Singapore Budget 2015: Median Wages Increased Six Times Since 1965.' *Straits Times*, 23 February 2015.
- Chok, Stephanie. 'Singapore's War on Drugs: A Historical Overview', Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, 2018.
- Chua, Chin Kiat. *The Making of Captains of Lives—Prison Reform in Singapore: 1999 to 2007*. Singapore: World Scientific, 2012.
- Chua, Minyi. 'The Rise of New Penology: Long Term Detention of the Opiate User in Singapore.' Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2005/06.
- Fazel, Seena and Wolf, Achim. 'A Systematic Review of Criminal Recidivism Rates Worldwide: Current Difficulties and Recommendations for Best Practice.' *PLoS One* 10, no.6 (June 2015): 1-8.
- Feeley, Malcolm M. and Simon, Jonathan. 'The New Penology: Notes on the Emerging Strategy of Corrections and Its Implications.' *Criminology* 30, no.4 (1992): 449–474.
- Goh, Charmian. 'Neoliberal Penalty: Prisoner Reintegration Organisations in Singapore.' Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2014/2015.
- Goh, Chin Mien. 'Treatment of Female Offenders in Singapore.' *Annual Report for 2012 and Resource Material Series No.90*. Tokyo, Japan: UNAFEI, August 2013, 163–171.
http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/RS_No90/No90_23PA_Mien.pdf (accessed 13 June 2017).

- Harrison, Byron and Schehr, Robert Carl. 'Offenders and Post-Release Jobs.' *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 39, no.3 (2004): 35–68.
- Hoffman, Peter B and Stone-Meierhoefer, Barbara. 'Reporting Recidivism Rates: The Criterion and Follow-Up Issues.' *Journal of Criminal Justice* 8, no.1 (1980): 53–60.
- Just Detention International. 'In Danger: Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Survivors Behind Bars.' 29 October 2014, https://justdetention.org/webinar_category/lgbt/ (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Kang, Dake. 'Thailand Separates LGBT Inmates, Considers Segregated Prison.' *Associated Press*, 29 January 2017. <https://sg.news.yahoo.com/thailand-separates-lgbt-inmates-considers-segregated-prison-030227179.html> (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Kemshall, Hazel. *Understanding Risk in Criminal Justice* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2003).
- Koh, Yi Wen. 'Discourses on Death: How National Identity Discourses Influence Singapore's Capital Punishment Policy for Drug Trafficking.' Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2013/14.
- Leo, Hee Sun Timothy. 'Using Evidence-Based Knowledge to Create an Offender Throughcare System.' *Resource Material Series No.88* (Tokyo, Japan: UNAFEI, December 2012): 96–104. http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/RS_No88/No88_15VE_Leo_Using.pdf (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Leong, Lena. 'The Story of Singapore Prison Service: From Custodians of Prisoners to Captains of Life.' Centre for Governance and Leadership, Civil Service College, 2012, 1–14. <http://www.pgionline.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/The-Story-of-the-Singapore-Prison-Service.pdf> (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Liew, Isabel. 'LTA: Murderers, Rapists Barred from PDVL for Life.' *The New Paper*, 30 June 2017. <http://www.tnp.sg/news/singapore/lta-murderers-rapists-barred-pdvl-life> (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Lim, Yan Liang. 'Hair Testing for Ex-Drug Offenders Begins.' *Straits Times*, 7 November 2013.
- Lim, Yun Xin. "'People Like Us...: A Sociological Account of Women Drug Users in Singapore.' Honours thesis, National University, 2000.
- Ministry of Home Affairs. 'Written Reply to Parliamentary Question on Recidivism Rate for Long Term Imprisonment 1 and Drug Rehabilitation Centre Inmates from 2010 to 2013 by Mr K Shanmugam, Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for Law.' 7 November 2016. <https://www.mha.gov.sg/Newsroom/in-parliament/written-replies-to-pqs/Pages/Written-Reply-to-Parliamentary-Question-on-Recidivism-Rate.aspx> (accessed 2 February 2018).

- Mohamed, Marlia. 'The Invisible Visible: Plight of Homeless Ex-Prisoners in Singapore.' Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2010.
- Mokhtar, Faris. 'Awakening Hope: How Singapore's Only Prison School Helps Rebuild Inmates' Lives.' *Channel NewsAsia*, 31 March 2016.
<http://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/singapore/awakening-hope-how-singapore-only-prison-school-helps-rebuild--8150128> (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Narayanan, Ganapathy. "'Us" and "Them": Ethnic Minority Gangs in Singapore Prisons.' *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 32, no.3 (2016): 264–284.
- Narayanan, Ganapathy and Lian, Kwen Fee. 'Race, Reintegration, and Social Capital in Singapore.' *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* 40, no.1 (2016): 1–23.
- Ng, Huiwen. 'More Ex-Offenders Staying Out of Jail.' *Straits Times*, 18 February 2016.
- Ng, Joo Hee Peter. 'Offender Rehabilitation, Community Engagement, and Preventing Re-Offending in Singapore.' *Resource Material Series No.80* (Tokyo, Japan: UNAFEI, March 2010): 17–27.
http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/RS_No80/No80_06VE_Ng.pdf (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Peck, Jamie and Theodore, Nik. 'Carceral Chicago: Making the Ex-Offender Employability Crisis.' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32, no.2 (June 2008): 251–281.
- Quek, Shi Lei. 'Prisons in Singapore—Changing Philosophies and Methods of Treatment.' In *Return to Society: Key Issues in the Rehabilitation of the Ex-Prisoner*, ed. Francis HM Heng. Singapore: SACA, 1984, 6–14.
- Seow, Bei Yi. 'Different Rehab Approach for Elderly Inmates Mooted.' *Straits Times*, 28 July 2017.
- Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises. *Annual Report 2016* (Singapore: SCORE, 2016). http://www.score.gov.sg/doc/annual_reports/SCORE-Annual-Report-2016.pdf (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Singapore Prison Service. 'News Release: Enhancing Inmates' Employability to Prevent Re-Offending.' 2016. [http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-\(news-release\)/sps-annual-stats-release-for-2016-\(14-feb-2017\)_for-upload.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-(news-release)/sps-annual-stats-release-for-2016-(14-feb-2017)_for-upload.pdf?sfvrsn=2) (accessed 2 February 2018).
- . 'News Release: Enhancing Inmates' Employability to Prevent Reoffending.' 2016. [http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-\(news-release\)/sps-annual-stats-release-for-2016-\(14-feb-2017\)_for-upload.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-(news-release)/sps-annual-stats-release-for-2016-(14-feb-2017)_for-upload.pdf?sfvrsn=2) (accessed 16 December 2017).
- . 'Treatment and Rehabilitation Regime and Long-Term Imprisonment for Abusers of Cannabis and Cocaine.' Last updated 9 November 2016.

- <http://www.sps.gov.sg/news-about-us/in-the-news/treatment-and-rehabilitation-regime-and-long-term-imprisonment-for-abusers-of-cannabis-and-cocaine> (accessed 13 June 2017).
- — —. 'Stronger Community and Family Support Help Keep Recidivism Rates Low as SPS Maintains Focus on Its "Through-Care" Philosophy.' 1 February 2012. [http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-\(news-release\)/3-2012-prisons-annual-statistics-release-1-feb-2012_0.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-(news-release)/3-2012-prisons-annual-statistics-release-1-feb-2012_0.pdf?sfvrsn=2) (accessed 2 February 2018).
- — —. 'Positive Recidivism Rate a Result of Close Collaboration Between Prisons and Its Key Partners.' 25 January 2011. [http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-\(news-release\)/4-press-release---prisons-2010-statistics-25-jan2011.pdf?sfvrsn=2](http://www.sps.gov.sg/docs/default-source/in-the-news-(news-release)/4-press-release---prisons-2010-statistics-25-jan2011.pdf?sfvrsn=2) (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Siong, Olivia. 'Faith-Based Offender Rehabilitation in Singapore: Deconstructing State Discourse.' Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2010/2011.
- Tai, Janice. 'All Hands on Deck Needed for Social Good.' *Straits Times*, 11 April 2016.
- Tan, Theresa. 'Grab Bars, Handrails in Some Cells as Number of Elderly Prisoners Rises.' *Straits Times*, 13 March 2017.
- Tan, Theresa and Tan, Tam Mei. 'Treatment Critical but Challenging, Say Experts.' *Straits Times*, 26 June 2017.
- Tan, Zhi Ling Dorothy. 'The Forgotten Generation: Incarceration and Reintegration Experiences of Older (Ex)Offenders in Singapore.' Honours thesis, National University, 2014/2015.
- Tang, Stanley. 'Effective Rehabilitation and Reintegration of Offenders.' *Resource Material Series No.82* (Tokyo, Japan: UNAFEI, December 2010): 41–51. http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/RS_No82/No82_07VE_Tang.pdf (accessed 2 February 2018).
- The Singapore Daily*. 'Singapore Has Third Highest Prisoner-to-Population Ratio in the World.' 20 October 2016. <http://singaporedaily.net/2016/10/20/singapore-third-highest-prisoner-population-ratio-world/> (accessed 2 February 2018).
- TODAY*. 'New Govt-Run Halfway House for Ex-Offenders to be Ready by 2018.' 18 January 2014. <http://www.todayonline.com/singapore/new-govt-run-halfway-house-ex-offenders-be-ready-2018> (accessed 2 February 2018).
- Veloo, KV. 'The Singapore Drug Scene, 1973–1980.' In *The Uphill Task of Rehabilitating Drug Addicts—1973–1980*, part of series *Rehabilitation of Offenders in Singapore: Vol 4*, 11–29. Singapore: Dept. of Social Work and Psychology, National University of Singapore, June 2004.
- Yeo, Zhi Qi. 'The Coloured Ribbon: Race, Recidivism and Reintegration.' Honours thesis, National University of Singapore, 2009/10.

Yew, Lohman. 'Effective Treatment Measures for Prisoners and Drug Addicts to Facilitate Their Reintegration into Society.' *Resource Material Series No.54* (Tokyo, Japan: UNAFEI, September 1999): 301–314.
http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/RS_No54/No54_23VE_Yew.pdf (accessed 26 June 2017).