

Original Article | **Open Access**

## Advancing Social Inclusion in Criminal Justice Policy and Research: Elevating Marginalized Voices for Equitable Outcomes

Donna F. Ossorio, PhD<sup>1</sup> and Jennifer L. Knudsen, PhD<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Delta State University, Cleveland, Mississippi 38733, United States of America.

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Delta State University, Cleveland, Mississippi 38733, United States of America.

**ORCID iD:**

<sup>1</sup> 0009-0005-5222-7949

<sup>2</sup> 0009-0007-6499-9107

**Copyright and Permission:**

© 2025. The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits sharing, adapting, and building upon this work, provided appropriate credit is given to the original author(s). For full license details, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

**Address for Correspondence:**

Dr. Donna F. Ossorio, Assistant Professor, Delta State University, Cleveland, Mississippi 38733, United States of America. (Email: [dossorio@deltastate.edu](mailto:dossorio@deltastate.edu))

**Article History:**

Received: 21 March 2025; Accepted: 2 May 2025; Published: 18 May 2025

**Abstract** Criminal justice systems globally have long reflected dominant sociopolitical perspectives, often excluding the needs and voices of marginalized communities, Indigenous populations, and women. This paper explores the necessity of incorporating diverse, underrepresented perspectives in criminal justice policymaking and research. Through an intersectional lens, it investigates how race, gender, and socioeconomic status shape justice experiences and outcomes. Drawing on case studies and recent reforms, the study reveals how inclusive practices lead to improved community safety, reduced recidivism, and enhanced legitimacy. Despite documented benefits, systemic bias, leadership underrepresentation, and access limitations continue to hinder full inclusion. The authors advocate for participatory policy development, culturally responsive frameworks, and expanded representation within criminological research. Advancing social inclusion is presented as both an ethical mandate and a practical strategy to ensure equitable justice.

**Keywords** social inclusion, marginalized communities, criminal justice policy, intersectionality, equitable outcomes

**Volume 15, 2025**

**Publisher:** The Brooklyn Research and Publishing Institute, 442 Lorimer St, Brooklyn, NY 11206, United States.

**DOI:** 10.1080/ijhss.vol15p13

**Reviewers**

Benjamin A. Neil, Retired Professor, Towson University, 8000 York Rd, Towson, MD 21252, United States; Email: [bnellaw@gmail.com](mailto:bnellaw@gmail.com); Phone: +1 410-342-4400.

Laura Zavatta, Department of Law, Economics, Management and Quantitative Methods (DEMM), Università Degli Studi Del Sannio, Italy; Email: [lzavatta@unisannio.it](mailto:lzavatta@unisannio.it); Phone: +39 0824 355199.

**Citation:** Ossorio, D. F., & Knudsen, J. L. (2025). Advancing Social Inclusion in Criminal Justice Policy and Research: Elevating Marginalized Voices for Equitable Outcomes. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 15, 149-154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijhss.vol15p13>

## 1. Introduction

Efforts to address disparities in criminal justice must begin with acknowledging the historical and structural roots of exclusion. Theories such as social disorganization (Shaw & McKay, 1942) and strain theory (Merton, 1938) have long emphasized the environmental and systemic factors that contribute to criminal behavior. These theories highlight how marginalized communities are disproportionately exposed to conditions—such as poverty, unemployment, and limited educational opportunities—that increase their likelihood of justice system involvement. Without intentional policy efforts to address these underlying conditions, reforms risk overlooking the broader social forces driving inequality.

Intersectionality serves as a crucial analytical lens for understanding how these structural barriers affect individuals with overlapping marginalized identities. Crenshaw's (1989) work on intersectionality has provided a foundational framework for examining the compounded effects of race, gender, and class within legal and policy institutions. When criminal justice policies are developed without accounting for these intersecting identities, they often fail to protect or serve the populations most at risk. For instance, Potter (2013) argues that conventional criminological models often marginalize the experiences of women of color, thereby perpetuating gaps in both policy response and scholarly attention.

Furthermore, systemic exclusion extends into research and data collection, where the underrepresentation of marginalized populations leads to biased outcomes and incomplete narratives. As Fridell (2017) notes, even well-meaning reforms can fall short when they are not grounded in evidence that accurately reflects community experiences. Addressing these research gaps requires a commitment to inclusive methodologies and diverse research teams. Only through inclusive representation at all levels—policy, practice, and research—can criminal justice systems begin to shift toward equitable and community-centered approaches (Varghese et al., 2019).

## 2. The Importance of Intersectionality in Criminal Justice

Intersectionality also offers a vital corrective to traditional criminological theories that often fail to account for the complex and overlapping forms of marginalization experienced by certain populations. For instance, Potter (2013) critiques mainstream criminology for focusing too narrowly on race or gender in isolation, rather than exploring how these identities intersect to create compounded disadvantages. Women of color, particularly Black and Latina women, may face both racial profiling and gender-based discrimination in their interactions with the justice system, yet these dual burdens are rarely addressed simultaneously in policy reforms. Intersectionality urges scholars and practitioners to move beyond single-axis analyses and adopt multidimensional approaches that more accurately reflect lived realities.

Intersectionality is crucial in analyzing how systemic structures such as policing, incarceration, and legal representation disproportionately disadvantage specific populations. David (2013) discusses how internalized oppression and societal marginalization affect psychological functioning, decision-making, and overall engagement with legal processes. Individuals who belong to multiple marginalized categories often experience a sense of invisibility or hyper-surveillance within the justice system, further exacerbating their exclusion. For example, LGBTQ+ youth of color may be over-policed and under-protected due to biases that combine homophobia, racism, and classism, yet such patterns remain inadequately addressed in conventional justice models (Crenshaw, 1989; Potter, 2013).

Intersectionality is also essential for developing policies that are both equitable and effective. Without this framework, interventions risk being one-size-fits-all, often privileging dominant identities while neglecting the unique needs of marginalized groups. Varghese et al. (2019) argue that justice system reforms must be informed by intersectional data to identify hidden disparities and prioritize the voices of those most affected. For instance, trauma-informed care for justice-involved women must consider racial and cultural factors to be effective (DeHart & Lynch, 2021). Intersectionality not only enriches our understanding of injustice but also equips policymakers and practitioners with tools to dismantle structural inequities and promote transformative change.

## 3. Systemic Exclusion in Criminal Justice Processes

Systemic exclusion within the criminal justice system is reflected in racially biased policing strategies, inequitable sentencing practices, and institutional policies that disproportionately target marginalized communities. Beckett, Nyrop, and Pfingst (2006) highlight how law enforcement practices in drug-related arrests often concentrate on

communities of color, despite comparable rates of drug use across racial groups. These patterns of racial targeting are exacerbated by law enforcement structures that prioritize surveillance and punishment in minority neighborhoods, reinforcing cycles of criminalization and marginalization (Fridell, 2017). Such disparities are not incidental—they are embedded in the organizational and funding priorities that define law enforcement agencies.

A significant component of systemic exclusion is found in school-based policing, which has evolved under the guise of public safety but often leads to the criminalization of youth, particularly those from Black and Hispanic backgrounds. Weisburst (2018) found that increases in school police presence are associated with higher rates of disciplinary action against students of color, contributing to the school-to-prison pipeline. Rios (2011) similarly documents how Latino and Black boys are subjected to punitive surveillance both in educational institutions and public spaces, where they are treated as threats rather than students or children. This form of over-policing extends beyond schools, affecting how these youth interact with all public systems designed to support development and safety.

Policing strategies such as zero-tolerance and broken windows policing further entrench systemic exclusion. Barrett and Welsh (2018) examine how community members in high-crime neighborhoods perceive low-level enforcement as harassment rather than protection. These approaches often emphasize order maintenance through aggressive policing of minor infractions, creating a sense of hostility between law enforcement and the communities they serve. Ranasinghe (2011) critiques these strategies through the lens of Jane Jacobs' theory of urban disorder, noting that community cohesion—not punitive enforcement—is the foundation for public safety. As a result, the over-policing of minor offenses and simultaneous neglect of more serious community concerns erodes trust in law enforcement and widens the gap between justice institutions and the communities they are meant to serve.

#### 4. Impact of Social Inclusion on Criminal Justice Outcomes

Inclusive practices in criminal justice not only improve fairness but also directly enhance outcomes for individuals and communities. Varghese et al. (2019) emphasize that when policies reflect the voices of those most affected by the justice system—such as racial minorities, low-income individuals, and women—recidivism rates decline, and public trust in legal institutions increases. Inclusive decision-making fosters transparency, encourages participation, and leads to more equitable policy development. This collaborative approach allows for the creation of services that are tailored to the needs of specific populations, making interventions more effective and sustainable.

Incorporating trauma-informed care is a particularly powerful example of inclusive justice reform. DeHart and Lynch (2021) argue that recognizing and addressing the trauma histories of justice-involved women—many of whom have experienced abuse, poverty, or addiction—can lead to better rehabilitation and reintegration outcomes. Traditional correctional systems often fail to consider the underlying factors that contribute to criminal behavior, especially among women. By contrast, trauma-informed approaches focus on healing and empowerment, reducing the likelihood of reoffending and improving overall well-being. These models demonstrate the importance of shifting from punitive responses to more compassionate, person-centered care.

Public health frameworks also play a vital role in enhancing justice outcomes through inclusion. Dumont et al. (2013) advocate for integrating health services, such as mental health and substance use treatment, into correctional settings. They argue that justice-involved individuals often have limited access to basic health care, contributing to poor outcomes both during incarceration and post-release. By addressing these health disparities, correctional systems can support individuals in managing chronic conditions, overcoming addiction, and stabilizing their lives. These inclusive, health-oriented reforms promote both individual recovery and broader community safety by reducing preventable recidivism and supporting long-term social reintegration.

#### 5. Barriers to Inclusion in Criminal Justice Settings

One of the most significant barriers to inclusion within the criminal justice system is the continued presence of structural racism. Fridell (2017) identifies how implicit bias among law enforcement officers and judicial personnel results in unequal treatment of individuals based on race and ethnicity. This bias often manifests in discretionary decisions, such as stops, searches, sentencing, and parole recommendations, disproportionately affecting Black and Latino communities. Furthermore, systemic inequities in arrest rates and sentencing outcomes reflect deeper institutional practices that prioritize punitive measures over restorative or rehabilitative approaches. These patterns are difficult to dismantle without explicit anti-racist training and accountability mechanisms embedded into all levels of the justice system.

Leadership representation is another critical obstacle that hinders inclusive justice reform. Despite increasing public discourse around equity and diversity, individuals from marginalized backgrounds remain vastly underrepresented in positions of influence within the legal, law enforcement, and policy-making sectors (Hinton, 2016). This lack of representation contributes to blind spots in policy development and research, where the unique needs and perspectives of underserved communities are frequently overlooked or misunderstood. Without diverse leadership, justice institutions risk reinforcing the very disparities they are meant to address, as policies continue to be shaped by those who are detached from the lived realities of system-impacted populations.

Legal and procedural barriers also limit access to justice for many individuals, particularly those from low-income or marginalized communities. Hinton (2016) highlights how discriminatory court practices—such as cash bail, limited access to quality defense counsel, and unequal sentencing—create a two-tiered justice system. These obstacles prevent many from fully participating in or benefiting from legal protections and reforms. For example, defendants without adequate legal representation are more likely to accept plea deals regardless of guilt, reinforcing the cycle of incarceration and disenfranchisement. To truly advance inclusion, justice reform must address these procedural inequities by ensuring universal access to competent legal services and eliminating policies that disproportionately penalize the poor and marginalized.

## 6. Policy Recommendations

Advancing social inclusion in the criminal justice system begins with meaningful community engagement in the policymaking process. Participatory policymaking involves incorporating the voices of individuals and communities directly affected by justice policies, particularly those who have historically been marginalized or excluded. When communities are involved in designing policies that impact their lives, the outcomes are more equitable, legitimate, and effective. This approach builds public trust and accountability, empowering communities to advocate for reforms that align with their lived experiences and needs.

Incorporating culturally responsive frameworks is another essential strategy for promoting social inclusion. David (2013) emphasizes the importance of integrating gender-sensitive and trauma-informed practices, especially when addressing the needs of justice-involved individuals who have experienced systemic oppression and personal adversity. A culturally responsive justice system acknowledges the diverse social, cultural, and psychological realities of those it serves, thereby fostering a more humane and rehabilitative environment. These frameworks are particularly critical for addressing disparities among women, LGBTQ+ individuals, and communities of color, who are often disproportionately impacted by rigid, one-size-fits-all justice policies.

To support lasting reform, inclusive research practices and bias-free policing must also be prioritized. Varghese et al. (2019) advocate for diversifying research teams and ensuring that data collection methods capture the full range of community experiences. When marginalized populations are accurately represented in research, the resulting policies and interventions are more likely to address their specific needs. Simultaneously, law enforcement agencies must invest in training programs aimed at reducing implicit bias and fostering positive community engagement. As Fridell (2017) notes, bias-free policing grounded in scientific principles is essential for creating safer, fairer interactions between officers and the communities they serve. Together, these strategies create a comprehensive foundation for building a more inclusive and equitable justice system.

## 7. Conclusion

Inclusion within the criminal justice system necessitates a comprehensive understanding of intersectionality, a framework that illuminates how overlapping social identities—such as race, gender, and class—create compounded disadvantages. As Crenshaw (1989) originally theorized, recognizing these interconnections is crucial for exposing the multi-layered nature of systemic injustice, which in turn allows for more nuanced and effective policy interventions. David (2013) further emphasizes that addressing internalized oppression is essential for the development of strategies that not only mitigate discrimination but also empower marginalized groups to reclaim agency within the legal framework.

The practical benefits of embracing inclusive policies have been well documented. Research indicates that integrating trauma-informed practices and culturally responsive approaches can lead to significant improvements in community trust and reductions in recidivism (Fridell, 2017; DeHart & Lynch, 2021). These findings suggest that when policies are designed to reflect the lived experiences of all community members, especially those historically marginalized, there is a higher likelihood of fostering safer communities and more rehabilitative outcomes. Varghese et al. (2019)

also note that inclusive practices contribute to more accurate and effective data collection, ultimately guiding policymakers toward interventions that are both evidence-based and equitable.

Sustaining momentum in the pursuit of justice requires ongoing collaborative efforts among policymakers, researchers, and community stakeholders. Engaging in participatory decision-making processes ensures that the perspectives of underrepresented populations are not only heard but are instrumental in shaping reform efforts (Hinton, 2016). Future research must continue to explore innovative methods for embedding social inclusion in every facet of criminal justice policy, thereby transforming the system from one of exclusion to one that genuinely promotes equity for all.

**Conflict of Interest:** No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

**Ethical Approval:** Not applicable.

**Funding:** None.

## References

- Barrett, C. J., & Welsh, M. (2018). Petty crimes and harassment: How community residents understand low-level enforcement in three high-crime neighborhoods in New York City. *Qualitative Sociology, 41*(1), 73–197. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-017-9376-0>
- Beckett, K., Nyrop, K., & Pfingst, L. (2006). Race, drugs, and policing: Understanding disparities in drug delivery arrests. *Criminology, 44*(1), 105–137. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2006.00045.x>
- Council on Criminal Justice. (2024). *The footprint: Tracking the size of America's criminal justice system*. <https://counciloncj.foleon.com/the-footprint>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139–167.
- David, E. J. R. (2013). *Internalized oppression: The psychology of marginalized groups*. Springer.
- DeHart, D., & Lynch, S. (2021). Trauma-informed services for justice-involved women. *Violence Against Women, 27*(5), 551–572. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801220935191>
- Dumont, D., Brockmann, B., Dickman, S., Alexander, N., & Rich, J. (2013). Public health and the epidemic of incarceration. *Annual Review of Public Health, 34*, 65–83. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031912-114927>
- Fridell, L. (2017). *Producing bias-free policing: A science-based approach*. Springer.
- Hinton, E. (2016). *From the war on poverty to the war on crime: The making of mass incarceration in America*. Harvard University Press.
- Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review, 3*(5), 672–682. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2084686>
- Potter, H. (2013). *Intersectionality and criminology: Disrupting and revolutionizing studies of crime*. Routledge.
- Ranasinghe, P. (2011). Jane Jacobs' framing of public disorder and its relation to the 'broken windows' theory. *Theoretical Criminology, 16*(1), 63–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480611416846>
- Rios, V. (2006). The hyper-criminalization of Black and Latino male youth in the era of mass incarceration. *Souls, 8*(2), 40–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999940600680457>
- Rios, V. (2011). *Punished: Policing the lives of Black and Latino boys*. New York University Press.
- Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas*. University of Chicago Press.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2024). *Quick Facts: United States*. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045224>
- Varghese, F. P., Israel, T., Seymour, G., Becker Herbst, R., Suarez, L. G., & Hargons, C. (2019). Injustice in the justice system: Reforming inequities for true “justice for all.” *The Counseling Psychologist, 47*(5), 682–740. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019861791>

Weisburst, E. (2018). Patrolling public schools: The impact of school police on student discipline. *Journal of Public Economics*, 165, 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2018.06.007>

### **Author Biography**

#### **Dr. Donna F. Ossorio**

Dr. Donna Ossorio is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice and Graduate Coordinator at Delta State University. She holds a Ph.D. in Juvenile Justice, and her academic and research interests focus on promoting equity and inclusion within the criminal justice system. Dr. Ossorio specializes in youth justice, reentry, and restorative practices, and has guided numerous graduate students in developing research that addresses systemic disparities. She actively participates in interdisciplinary and community-based initiatives that support social justice and amplify the voices of marginalized populations. Her recent scholarship explores the intersections of race, mental health, and policy reform in correctional systems. Through her teaching and research, Dr. Ossorio is committed to fostering inclusive, evidence-based approaches that promote fairness, accountability, and long-term reform in criminal justice policy and practice. Her work contributes to a growing body of literature aimed at transforming the justice system to better serve all communities.

ORCID ID# 0009-0005-5222-7949

#### **Dr. Jennifer Knudsen**

Dr. Jennifer Knudsen is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Delta State University. She received her PhD from the University of North Texas. Her research primarily focuses on stratification processes through the lens of Education and Race.

ORCID ID# 0009-0007-6499-9107

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The views, opinions, and data presented in all publications are exclusively those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and do not necessarily reflect the position of BRPI or its editorial team. BRPI and the editorial team disclaim any liability for any harm to individuals or property arising from the use of any ideas, methods, instructions, or products mentioned in the content.