Correction to Doyle et al. (2021)

In the article *The Importance of Incorporating Lived Experience in Efforts to Reduce Australian Reincarceration Rates* by Caroline Doyle, Karen Gardner and Karen Wells (*The International Journal of Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*. Advance online publication. [https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.1666](https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.1666) published on February 17, 2021, some text in the literature review was unintentionally missing attribution. This corrected version of the article can be found at [https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.1942](https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.1942)

The following corrections have been made:

*Page 1:*
The abstract is updated, and the following sentence deleted: In Australia, the value of drawing on lived experiences in the development and delivery of services has recently been noted in health areas, such as disability and mental health.

*Page 2, paragraph 3:*
The sentence:

> It is widely acknowledged that ‘good policy’ should be informed by the individuals it most directly affects (Arnstein 1969; De’Ath 2018; Holmes 2011; Lancaster et al. 2013; Lenihan and Briggs 2011; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 2001; Torres 2007).

Replaced with:

> De’Ath 2018 is added to the citations.

The sentence:

> Recently, in Australia the value of drawing on lived experiences in the development and delivery of services has been noted in areas such as disability and mental health (Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care 2017).

Replaced with:

> In recent years, we have seen examples of drawing from lived experience in developing health (Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care 2016; De’Ath et al. 2018; Gardner et al. 2016; Salisbury et al. 2010; Wong and Haggerty 2013) and disability services (De’Ath et al 2018); however, drawing on the lived experience of people who have spent time in prison has received little attention (De’Ath et al. 2018).

*Page 3, paragraph 3:*

Added the following citations to the sentence:

> Participation in policy development is regarded as a principle of good governance Arnstein 1969; Blomkamp 2018; De’Ath et al. 2018.

The sentence:

> Over 40 years ago, Arnstein (1969) argued for the importance of engaging marginalised people in the development of policies that directly affect them.

Replaced with:

> De’Ath (2018) noted that it is now over 40 years since Arnstein (1969: 216) argued the importance of engaging marginalised populations in the development of policies that directly affect them (Arnstein 1969; De’Ath et al. 2018: 77).
Page 3, paragraph 3:
The sentences:
They concluded that lived experience approaches are important because they provide insights into the shared typical experience. Within the social policy context, lived experience has been used in a range of research contexts to emphasise the worth of subjective experiences to empirical studies and the importance of identifying individual agency (Garthwaite 2015; Miller et al. 2018; Neale 2016, 2018; Neale et al. 2015; Patrick 2014; Wright 2016).

Replaced with:
They concluded that lived experience approaches are important because they provide insights into the 'shared typical' experience (McIntosh and Wright 2019: 463). Within social policy, lived experience has been used in a range of research contexts to emphasise the value of understanding, and appreciating, individual experiences (Garthwaite 2015; Neale 2015; Neale et al. 2015; McIntosh and Wright 2019; Miller et al. 2018; Patrick 2014; Wright 2016).

Page 4, paragraph 2:
The sentences:
In the social/public health sector, most of the development incorporating the lived experiences of individuals have been implemented in the health, disability and mental health sectors. For example, in Australia, the National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards provides guidance for involving people in the design and implementation of evidence-based services, which requires the participation (not just consultation) of relevant stakeholders in the design, evaluation and governance of health services (Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care 2017).

Replaced with:
As shown by De’Ath et al. (2018: 78), the most significant developments in incorporating the lived experience of individuals in Australia have been in the health, disability and mental health sectors. They discussed the significance of the 2017 National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards which provide guidance on ‘person-centred healthcare systems’ (Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care 2016: 33) and the need to involve (not just consult with) consumers and patients and members of the community in the ‘design, evaluation and governance’ of healthcare services (De’Ath et al. 2018: 78; Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care 2016: 33).

Page 4, paragraph 4
The following sentence deleted:
There have also been similar developments in the last 10 years in the disability sector. During 2011, the National Disability Strategy noted the importance of ‘equal and active participation of all people with a disability’ (Council of Australian Governments 2011: 3).

Page 5, paragraph 2:
The paragraph has been re-written and is now two paragraphs:
As acknowledged by De’Ath et al. (2018: 77), despite considerable developments in the social and health sector, opportunities for Australian individuals with lived experience in the criminal justice sector, (including people currently serving and who have spent time in prison, their families and victims of crime) to influence policy in the criminal justice system have been negligible (De’Ath et al. 2018: 77). An important review of previous research on insights of the lived experiences of people in the criminal justice system, conducted by De’Ath et al. (2018) drew from previous studies in the UK which argued there needs to be a shift from viewing people in prison as ‘passive recipients of punishment’ (Weaver 2011: 1052) to being ‘active participants’ (Weaver 2011: 1052) who should have a voice in their own rehabilitation and even punishment (Weaver 2011). However, the authors also note a number of challenges including that members of the wider community can have negative perceptions of people in prison and/or those who have served time in prison. Members of the community can see people in prison as ‘perpetrators’ who have made ‘bad choices’, rather than seeing them as people who might need access to therapeutic programs to address their
reasons for offending in the first place (De’Ath et al. 2018: 78; Weaver, 2011; Weaver and Weaver, 2016). By drawing from Weaver (2011), De’Ath et al. (2018: 78) argued that it is these negative perceptions which can present challenges in accepting the participation of people with lived experience in the criminal justice system.

De’Ath et al. (2018: 81) points to one of the few studies incorporating lived experience in policy, LeBel et al. (2015) who found that people who have spent time in prison who are employed in mentoring roles post-release are supportive of helping others upon release and also of advocacy work, such as changing how people in prison are perceived by the wider community (LeBel et al. 2015: 116). A more recent study by Heidemann et al. (2016) found that a peer support program for women who had spent time in US prisons benefited both ‘mentees’ and ‘mentors’ as it provided opportunities to ‘give back’ and help others navigate the post-release experience (Heidemann et al. 2016: 19).
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