

'Overwhelmed and powerless': Staff perspectives on mother-infant separations in English prisons.

Journal:	<i>Journal of Criminal Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	JCP-04-2020-0017.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Women, Infants, Prison, Prison staff, Work stress, Qualitative

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

MANUSCRIPT DETAILS

TITLE: "Overwhelmed and powerless": Staff perspectives on mother-infant separations in English prisons.

ABSTRACT:

Imprisoned mothers are at increased risk for poor psychological health and psychological distress when separated from their children, so staff need to be highly skilled to support the women. However, there is a paucity of research focusing on staff experiences around sensitive issues such as mother-child separation. This study aimed to understand the challenges facing staff and how these might be addressed.

This qualitative interview study explored the views and experiences of 24 prison-based staff in England working with female prisoners separated from their infants.

Staff emphasised the challenges of working with separated mothers, specifically the emotional impact of this work, and the impact of the wider criminal justice system on their sense of agency.

CUST_RESEARCH_LIMITATIONS/IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

CUST_PRACTICAL_IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

CUST_SOCIAL_IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

A focus on the experience of separation highlights the broader problem of incarcerating women in general. Reducing the number of mother-child separations would mitigate the impact on both women and staff.

‘Overwhelmed and powerless’: Staff perspectives on mother-infant separations in English prisons.

Introduction

The most recent government workforce statistics show that there are just short of 2,000 staff working across the female prison estate in England (Ministry of Justice, 2020a). This includes officers, administrative and management staff, healthcare, chaplaincy and facilities staff. It does not include staff in private prisons, or additional workers employed by third sector organisations, so the true number is higher. Prisons are challenging places in which to work, and one of these challenges is working with imprisoned mothers separated from their young children.

There were 3,252 women in prison in England on 4th September 2020, with an average sentence length of 10 months (Ministry of Justice, 2020b). Whilst figures are kept on the number of women incarcerated, there are no official, centralised figures for the number of mothers nor are there clear figures on the number of children of female prisoners (Baldwin & Epstein, 2017). Thus in England and Wales (there is no women’s prison in Wales so Welsh women are imprisoned in England; Scotland and Northern Ireland have their own jurisdictions), imprisoned mothers are separated from an estimated average of 17,000 children aged under 18 years old each year (Kincaid, Roberts & Kane, 2019) and approximately one-third of mothers in prison have a child under five years (Prison Reform Trust, 2014).

Currently there is scope for a small number of women to remain in prison with their babies until the child reaches 18 months. (individual prisons have some flexibility up to 24 months). Of the 12 women’s prisons in England, six have Mother and Baby Units (MBUs), a separate wing of the prison with individual rooms for each mother-baby pair and a nursery. There are 64 places for mothers across the six MBUs (Sikand, 2015), and given annual estimates of up to 3,000 babies aged two years and under who have imprisoned mothers (Galloway, Haynes & Cuthbert, 2014), most mothers will not be able to access a place. As highlighted by Sikand (2015), under-occupancy of MBUs has been an issue as a result of a range of factors that prevent women applying. There are stringent criteria (particularly around substance use) for MBU access which

1
2
3 exclude a proportion of the female prison population (Dolan, Birmingham, Mullee &
4 Gregoire, 2013). Once separated, mothers can only see their children if they are
5 brought in by an adult at limited visiting hours, depending on the prison regime and
6 the mother's prisoner status. Visits may not take place at all if the child is taken into
7 care or if the MBU is far from the child's home. The latter is often the case given how
8 few MBUs exist (see Booth, 2020, for further discussion on the impact of distances on
9 family visits).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 A mother can be separated initially at the point of custody, at the birth of her child if
17 she is pregnant in prison (Abbott, 2014; Abbott, Scott, Thomas & Weston, 2020), or
18 following a stay on an MBU if her sentence extends beyond the maximum 18-month
19 MBU stay. The different trajectories to separation highlight the diversity of experiences
20 mothers may have and the potential challenges for staff providing support.
21 Unsurprisingly, separation and loss of children 'were the most commonly cited factors
22 leading to the high risk of suicide and self-harm within prisons' in England and Wales
23 (Independent Advisory Panel on Deaths in Custody, 2017, p.11). This is in addition to
24 maternal suicide as a primary cause of death for all mothers within the first year
25 postnatally, but in particular women at severe disadvantage (Knight et al., 2019); this
26 includes many women in prison. Separation is another traumatic experience for
27 women in prison who are already more likely to be severely disadvantaged (Carlen,
28 2013), and to have survived child sexual abuse and domestic violence (Albertson,
29 O'Keefe, Burke et al., 2012).

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 When staff¹ are faced with imprisoned mothers separated from their children, they will
42 are thus very likely to be working with distressed women. This may manifest itself
43 through an exacerbation of mental health problems (Gregoire, Dolan, Birmingham,
44 Mullee & Coulson, 2010), changes in behaviour as a result of the stress of separation
45 (Raikes, 2009), and/or rule-breaking (Douglas, Plugge & Fitzpatrick, 2009). Prison
46 inspectorate reports suggest that staff lack of understanding about the emotional effect
47 of separation on mothers can result in a 'disciplinary response' (Hardwick, 2012, p.14),
48 which can contribute to a breakdown in the crucial staff-prisoner relationships
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 ¹ For the purposes of this research, 'prison staff' refers to anyone working in a prison, whether they are
59 employed directly by the prison or an external third sector agency.
60

(Liebling, 2011). This is a problem given that positive relationships between mothers, prison and staff can reduce the stress of separation from children (Chambers, 2009). Thus prison work can be emotionally demanding on prison staff (Crawley, 2004), particularly when working with mothers separated from their children (Baldwin, 2015). Research around maternal imprisonment has highlighted the importance of staff support for mothers in custody (O'Malley & Devaney 2015; Baldwin 2017). However there is a paucity of work about the challenges and emotional demands on the staff providing that care. Tait (2011) and Garland (2004), provide insights into prison work related stress, burnout and attitudes towards prisoners. Research specifically exploring the effects of working with separated mothers is limited, although Abbott's (2018) work on the experiences of pregnant women in prison provides insights into staff reactions to mothers separated from their babies at birth. Staff report the emotional impact and their lack of training in relation to providing support.

In general, prison staff themselves are at a higher risk of psychological distress than the general population (Harvey, 2014; Kinman et al., 2017). In terms of protective factors, Harvey (2014) determined that staff accessing support in the prison was helpful. Similarly in relation to emotional support, Kinman et al. (2017) found working relationships and role clarity were protective helpful for staff but managerial support was not (Kinman et al., 2016). Lack of support has been associated with prison officer stress and burnout (Finney et al., 2013; Holmes & MacInnes, 2003). Furthermore, Crewe (2008) suggests that staff working in health or education face additional role strain because of conflicts between their core professional standards, and the restrictions of the prison regime and environment (c.f. Arnold, 2016; Short et al., 2009).

It is evident that prison staff are working in difficult conditions, however the extent and usefulness of support in place for staff appears questionable. Beyond the immediate environment of the prison, the current president of the Prison Governors' Association describes an ever-changing system due to political manoeuvres; these result in overcrowded prisons, low staffing levels and high rates of staff attrition (Albutt, 2017). In this context staff-prisoner relationships (Liebling, 2011) are further put under strain.

As part of a larger research project focusing on imprisoned women separated from their infants (see Author, date; Author, date), we investigated the views of prison staff who support mothers separated from their children in prison, because there is such a

1
2
3 significant gap in the literature which translates into a lack of support for staff. Since
4 there is provision for some women to stay in prison with their children aged under 18
5 months, our focus was on staff who had supported mothers separated from children
6 aged under two years as this would include separations following an MBU stay. The
7 research aimed to understand staff experiences and the challenges in their work in
8 order to reflect on how to provide support for staff in this stressful environment.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 17 Methods and analysis

18 19 Design

20
21 This was a qualitative exploratory study carried out from a critical realist perspective
22 (Bhaskar, 1989; Rogers & Pilgrim, 2014). Critical realist research tends to be
23 exploratory and is focused on explanation (Edwards, O'Mahoney & Vincent, 2014),
24 thus it is appropriate given that the focus of this research is understanding the
25 experience and support needs of prison staff. Whilst a critical realist perspective
26 acknowledges multiple perspectives and accounts of reality, as Sims-Schouten and
27 Riley (2014) explain, a critical realist perspective also acknowledges that 'people's
28 actions will be influenced by personal and societal mechanisms that are independent
29 of their thoughts or impressions' (p.47). This is an acceptance of the materiality of lives
30 and this ontological emphasis means that the real impact of social structures, such as
31 prison, on people's lives (both the imprisoned and those who work with them) is
32 acknowledged. As such, critical realism offers scope to make practical practice
33 suggestions (Willig, 1999), and to remain comprehensible to those coming from a
34 more positivist standpoint (i.e. the Prison Service).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Along these critical realist lines, taking into account both the individual's perspective
49 and the broader context, social domain theory (Layder, 1998) was used as a
50 theoretical framework to analyse the findings- both to understand and explain the
51 relationships between the themes. Social domain theory conceptualises social life as
52 layered with multiple contexts that interact, bringing together psychological and
53 sociological dimensions. Social domain theory was chosen due to its previous
54 application in both prison research (Knight & Layder, 2016) and social work (Houston,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2015) and because during data collection and analysis the interweaving by
4 participants of the individual emotions and the wider context was so strong.
5
6
7
8
9

10 11 Settings, participants and recruitment

12
13 Twenty-four prison staff from two women's prisons in England took part. The prisons
14 served different geographical areas (North and South), and each held approximately
15 500 women serving both short and long sentences. They had similar numbers of
16 women with drug and alcohol problems (30-40%) and both prisons had a range of third
17 sector organisations (i.e. organisations that aim to have a social impact rather than
18 being profit-focused; other terms include the voluntary sector or not-for-profits)
19 providing services (e.g. counselling, family visits, housing support), either based inside
20 the prison, or externally with staff visiting to provide support. In order to preserve
21 anonymity, no further details (e.g. whether they had MBUs) can be given.
22
23

24
25 Staff were eligible to take part if they self-identified as having supported women
26 separated from their children under two years of age. The intention was to cover the
27 main staff groups (e.g. prison officers, healthcare, child and family-related services).
28 Sampling was pragmatic and aimed to be as broad as possible; however it was carried
29 out according to prison resources which limited its representativeness because it
30 depended on staff availability when the researcher was at the prison. Following
31 approval of the research by the relevant prison governors, a key contact was
32 nominated to liaise with the researcher. Key contacts provided advice about relevant
33 staff to invite to take part and either actively helped with recruitment or set up an initial
34 meeting with another member of staff who then advised on recruitment. Snowball
35 sampling (Noy, 2008) was used to access staff, and a range of staff from a wide variety
36 of backgrounds and professions were offered the opportunity to take part. Participants
37 who expressed an interest in taking part but were unavailable for interviews were
38 provided with an opportunity to respond electronically.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 57 Instruments

58
59
60

1
2
3 The interview schedule design was influenced by an 'appreciative inquiry' approach
4 (Liebling, Price & Elliott, 1999), which is a strengths-based approach and is a way to
5 build alliances with prison staff who might otherwise experience the interview as critical
6 of their practice. The focus on strengths or best practice does not mean that challenges
7 are avoided; it just provides a different way into difficult conversations and renders
8 visible aspects that might remain hidden (c.f. Robinson et al., 2013).
9

10
11
12
13
14 The interview covered three topics: 1) staff members' experiences of supporting
15 separated mothers; 2) support they had received, and would have liked to receive; 3)
16 broader views about parenting, MBUs and support in prison for mothers. This study
17 will focus on the first two topics, the third will be addressed in future work.
18
19
20

21
22 A demographics questionnaire was designed to capture key information about the
23 participants (e.g. age, sex, nationality and ethnicity), their careers and working
24 histories (e.g. job role, length of time in post, positions in other prisons). Questions
25 were open-ended so that every individual response could be captured, enabling
26 results to be presented with as much detail as possible, whilst still maintaining
27 participant and role anonymity.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Procedure

36
37 Following initial communication with key contacts (either face to face or by email), staff
38 members who agreed to take part met with the lead researcher and were given a
39 participant information sheet and consent form, with the opportunity to ask any
40 questions. The interview either took place there and then in a private room or was
41 arranged for a more convenient time. The face-to-face interviews were audio recorded
42 and lasted from 15 minutes to 73 minutes. If staff were unable to find a time for an
43 interview, information was emailed to them, along with the interview questions for
44 completion in their own time. Most staff took part in face-to-face interviews (n=22), with
45 few (n=2) answering the questions by email.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Ethics

56
57
58
59
60

This study was approved by the XXXX Psychology Department Ethics Committee and the National Offender Management Service National Research Committee. All participants gave written consent to take part. At the end of the interview participants were given a debrief sheet which included details of support available.

Analysis

Interviews were transcribed verbatim and thematically analysed (Braun & Clarke, 2006) by the lead researcher. Ritchie & Lewis (2003)'s framework approach was carried out in NVivo 11 (QSR International) to ensure systematic data organisation before thematic analysis. The strengths of thematic analysis lie in its flexibility and applicability across different paradigms, including critical realism. The analysis involved line-by-line coding and then searching for thematic patterns across the codes (Boyatzis, 1988). Themes were analysed deductively and semantically in order to report the range of perspectives among staff. The analysis was primarily theory-driven (i.e. led by the questions), but some data-driven themes were constructed (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The analytic process was recorded at each stage to ensure transparency (Ritchie et al., 2003), and a quality framework (Spencer et al., 2003) used to ensure credibility.

Findings

See Table I for a summary of demographics. Most participants were White British women, aged over 35 years with more than five years' experience in their current roles. In addition, over a third had worked in other women's prisons. The staff had worked in nine of the 12 women's prisons in England and in eight third sector organisations.

Table I – Staff demographics

Staff interviewed held a range of job positions (prison officer/offender supervisor/probation officer (n=7), health-related (n=7), children and family-related (n=10) at both front-line and managerial levels, see Table II for details. Staff described a range of roles in supporting women before, during and after separation from their infants. Roles included practical support, such as writing birth plans and liaising with

1
2
3 social services, in addition to providing emotional support and counselling after
4 separations.
5

6 7 **Table II – Staff roles** 8

9
10 Staff quotations are reported according to whether they were prison employed (e.g.
11 prison officer, health-related, family services) or third sector employed (health-related,
12 counselling, family services) in order to highlight differences between these two types
13 of employers and, most importantly, to preserve anonymity as the findings were
14 reported back to the prisons. All staff who took part identified themselves as supporting
15 separated mothers in some way so the focus was on this, rather than their role,
16 because the numbers were so small.
17
18
19
20
21

22 The types of work role related to the support that staff received in relation to
23 separations, and these have been categorised as low and high support. See Table III.
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Table III – Support received by staff according to job sector** 30 31

32
33 Staff discussed the main challenges in their work, and two key themes were identified.
34 The first theme was 'Overwhelmed', describing an individual response in the face of
35 their own and the mothers' emotions. This was mapped to Layder's (1998) social
36 domains of 'psychobiography' and 'situated activity' because staff were discussing
37 their individual emotional responses in response to the mothers they worked with. Staff
38 emotions were intensified when they shared the experience of parenthood, a specific
39 aspect of their biography. and one shared by most of the participants. The strength of
40 their own and the mothers' emotions left some staff feeling unable to support mothers
41 – they were worried they might make things worse or that they just did not know what
42 to do. Furthermore, some staff felt unsupported by their managers to cope with the
43 level of distress in mothers.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The second theme was 'Powerless'; this was due to staff feeling unable to do anything
54 as a result of the broader context, both in the prison itself and in co-ordination between
55 services. This theme was mapped on to two social domains – 'social setting' and
56 'contextual resources' – because staff described their powerlessness both in terms of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 their immediate institutional context and the wider context of the criminal justice
4 system. See Table [IV](#). The themes will be discussed with an examination of the
5 differences between staff receiving low and high support, as well as their relevant
6 training suggestions.
7
8
9

10 **Table [IV](#) – Key themes mapped on to social domains**

11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Key theme 1: ‘Overwhelmed’**

19

20 Throughout the interviews staff discussed the emotional impact of working with
21 separated mothers. The theme encompassed the psychological experience of
22 supporting mothers and was related to personal history, hence the association with
23 the domain of psychobiography. Separation was seen as something that one cannot
24 be fully prepared for because each separation is different, as one third sector staff
25 member described:
26
27
28
29

30
31 *Yeah, nothing...I might cry actually, nothing can prepare you for the*
32 *difficulty of working with women who've had their children removed....*
33 *There's actually nothing like it. And I know that now I've done lots of other*
34 *roles. And talk about going in at the deep end is what I think now.... The*
35 *level of pain, I mean... I've done bits of work with torture victims and quite*
36 *a lot of work with people who've been sexually abused. Just the level of*
37 *pain is so incredibly profound. It's... really like nothing else. (Participant*
38 *14)*
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 This challenge and dealing with intense emotions, both their own and others', seemed
47 to be epitomised in the final contact visits which were facilitated by some of the staff
48 interviewed. The hardest part was 'watching somebody else break down' (Participant
49 7) whilst managing one's own emotions. This need to 'manage emotions' ([c.f. Crawley,](#)
50 [2009](#)) was repeated through the interviews, particularly when some staff
51 acknowledged the guilt they felt at being part of the separation process. One prison-
52 employed staff member pointed out:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *You're actually involved in the process that is... detrimental to them in one*
4 *way or another. It doesn't matter which, how you look at it. And, what you're*
5 *trying to do is manage that on a daily basis until we get to the end of the*
6 *process. (Participant 12)*
7
8
9

10 One staff member described the challenge of building trusting relationships with
11 mothers, then sitting on separation boards and sometimes deciding that separation
12 was the best course of action. Even when mothers had understood the process and
13 felt fairly treated, there was still a sense of personal guilt from being part of the process.
14
15

16
17
18 The process of separating mothers in prison from their children was related to personal
19 biographical experiences. Staff felt they could relate if they were parents too (c.f.
20 Baldwin, 2015), which appeared to make them more empathetic but meant the
21 emotional impact was greater. Staff who worked with children described 'getting
22 attached' and struggling with their own feelings of loss, particularly when children went
23 into care. Staff described how loss tapped into their own past experiences, which if
24 unsupported could have a negative impact. A third sector staff member reflected:
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 *It's a hard one separation, you know, because you've got your bereavement*
32 *and loss...and you know the implications of that. I think what comes up for*
33 *you as an individual is it taps into your own stuff. And when you haven't got*
34 *anything in place... it can make you quite ill, really. (Participant 18)*
35
36
37

38 Staff who provided counselling found a loss and bereavement framework useful for
39 making sense of their feelings and were aware that for separated mothers loss was
40 present all the time.
41
42

43
44 Whilst guilt and loss were two specific feelings that were discussed in the interviews,
45 even when participants did not name how they felt they did say that they had to
46 'manage emotions'. Staff acknowledged the range of emotions they experienced and
47 discussed how this worked in their interactions with mothers. This seemed to involve
48 remaining empathetic but having enough distance to not become overwhelmed. As
49 one prison-employed staff member put forward:
50
51
52
53

54
55 *So, it is hard to take that step back and because you can't be emotionally*
56 *involved but actually to do this job you have to be a little bit because you*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *are, you know, I just think you need to show the women that you have got*
4 *some empathy. (Participant 4)*
5
6

7 This description of balancing empathy and distance mirrors some staff concerns about
8 wanting to support women but understanding their limits, both for themselves and the
9 women. One manager pointed out the potential for abuse of power when staff believe
10 they can rescue women. Other balancing acts included how not to be overwhelmed
11 by colleagues' emotions and leaving their work-related emotions at work (Crawley,
12 2004) so home life was not affected. The sense of being overwhelmed by their own
13 and mothers' emotions was apparent across all staff. However, it was those staff with
14 low support (i.e. prison-employed and some third sector) who felt under-skilled for
15 such emotional work with female prisoners.
16
17

18 Several participants pointed out that there was no training specifically for dealing with
19 issues arising from separation, its effects on women and how to manage this, and that
20 they wanted this to feel more confident. What was particularly highlighted as a skill
21 lacking in everyone who was not a counsellor was being able to adequately provide
22 psychological support. All staff acknowledged that this was part of their role, but many
23 lacked the confidence and skills to be able to do it 'properly'. There was a general
24 sense of anxiety that they might make things worse for separated women and that
25 they needed to refer on to professionals when women were distressed. One prison-
26 employed participant vividly described the fear:
27
28

29 *We know that there is the possibility that we're...going to open a can of*
30 *worms that we're not going to be able to shut. (Participant 12)*
31
32

33 Yet, these were all front-line staff working regularly with separated women. The extent
34 and intensity of mothers' emotions were vividly described by staff as a major challenge
35 in their work with separated women. The emotional impact of separation was
36 particularly profound shortly after the separation and at the beginning of the
37 counselling process – this is when prison staff felt most concerned about risk. Mothers
38 were described as having 'ups and downs' of guilt, anger and shame which became
39 an 'incredibly toxic burden' (Participant 20). Staff identified that these feelings
40 increased mothers' aggression, self-harm, suicide attempts and drug-taking following
41 separation. Separation was seen as having an impact on drug and alcohol recovery in
42 the long term. A third sector staff member explained the relationship with addiction:
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *I think it [separation] hinders their recovery.... If the children have been*
4 *removed permanently then some women feel like there's no reason for*
5 *them to become drug free. Their motivation has gone so I think we see*
6 *increased drug use or steady drug use in custody. So, there's no real end*
7 *point for them. (Participant 16)*
8
9
10
11

12 This lack of motivation for change could result in women becoming stuck in addiction
13 and grief. Staff reflected that this made supporting mothers even more challenging.
14 Several participants highlighted how there is a particular trauma around children going
15 into care. The children are 'gone but they're not dead' (Participant 20) (c.f. [Boss &](#)
16 [Greenberg, 1984](#)) The impact of loss was seen to be part of an ongoing cycle of trauma
17 and hopelessness for women, including domestic violence and abuse, from which it
18 becomes increasingly difficult for them to escape. Whilst staff acknowledged the
19 consequences of women's past and present situations, in some ways this awareness
20 led to increasing feelings of not being capable or skilled enough to provide support.
21 However, the staff interviewed made a range of suggestions for what might help with
22 being emotionally overwhelmed, and these ideas came from both those who felt skilled
23 and competent and those who did not.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 In terms of training related to the 'psychobiographical' domain there were two
34 suggestions: 1) training specific to separation including the emotional impact of
35 separation on women and how to support them; however, it would include relevant
36 information on policies and processes in prison; 2) general awareness-raising for
37 prison officers in particular about the emotional impact of separation and possible
38 ensuing depression for women, as one third sector staff member explained:
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *There are some really brilliant prison officers who get all of this stuff. But I feel*
46 *like the education piece around the impact of this [separation] in staff training,*
47 *for kind of uniformed staff and others, like non-psychotherapy staff is really,*
48 *really important. And that would support the women in turn. Because who's*
49 *there at two in the morning? Certainly not the non-uniformed civilians. It's ...the*
50 *prison officers. (Participant 14)*
51
52
53
54
55

56 In terms of training related to prison--staff--situated activities, i.e. interacting with
57 mothers, staff requested knowledge and skills relevant to separation, incorporating:
58 counselling skills, mental health awareness, domestic violence awareness, knowledge
59
60

1
2
3 of social work and legal structures and processes, and child development. Having this
4 knowledge was seen as key to reducing the anxiety of working with very distressed
5 mothers.
6
7

8 9 **Key theme 2: Powerless**

10
11 Part of the challenge that staff identified when supporting mothers separated from their
12 young children was feeling powerless as a result of both the prison and the wider
13 context. Given the clear links with both the institution and the wider environment, this
14 theme was mapped on to the domains of social setting and contextual resources.
15
16

17
18
19 Key practical issues that had a direct impact on how well staff felt able to support
20 women were around staffing levels and information collection. Staff called attention to
21 the constant staff changes and understaffing, resulting in women not having continuity
22 of care or feeling able to talk to officers. A prison-employed staff member recalled:
23
24

25
26
27 *When I first came here the prison service, you used to have an officer on*
28 *every single house...The officer knew all the women on that house... So,*
29 *they got to know the women, they got to know whether they was acting a*
30 *bit different - they were able to pick that up. All that's gone now... The*
31 *feedback from the women is they haven't got anyone there to listen to them.*
32
33 *Nobody's got any time. It's so busy, it's so understaffed. (Participant 18)*
34
35
36

37
38 This opportunity to form trusting relationships was seen as particularly important for
39 women separated from their children. Closely allied to this is the lack of centralised
40 and systematic information collection about which women have children. Staff from
41 the two prisons described different approaches, however staff in both prisons
42 discussed women who were not supported as a result of a lack of information sharing.
43
44

45
46 Staff described 'patchy' good practice (Participant 14), where women would often lack
47 support immediately following separation, particularly if they arrived in prison
48 separated or following giving birth in prison (c.f. [Abbott, 2020](#)). For mothers separated
49 after time on an MBU, the follow-up care was described as thorough, but staff voiced
50 repeated concerns about the lack of continuity of care when mothers returned to the
51 main prison following separation. A prison-employed staff member explained:
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *With the shifts...you're not always there for the difficult times. As much as*
4 *you can, you want to be there for them but sometimes it's out of your control*
5 *about having that continuity of care. (Participant 10)*
6
7
8

9 Separations at birth were seen as often more challenging than separations on MBUs
10 because there could be less planning involved, and these relied on the involvement of
11 social services as well as co-ordinating prison staff. One third sector organisation
12 worker highlighted concerns about the lack of support for officers following separations
13 and reported that they were often left to offer this support:
14
15
16

17
18 *I guess we've also really noticed how officers can be left feeling after being*
19 *in a situation where a woman is separated from her baby.... And sometimes*
20 *officers have told us... how...terrible they've been left feeling. And we have*
21 *actually been in a situation where we've actually stayed and debriefed with*
22 *them a bit...Talked them through what's happened...because I think it's not*
23 *fair in the same way for them not to have emotional support or perhaps*
24 *recognition of how emotionally challenging some of those situations are.*
25 *(Participant 21)*
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 In general, it was frequently repeated that the wider prison staff had little or no
34 understanding of the impact of separation on women.
35

36 This lack of understanding was related to a general lack of awareness of mental health
37 and acknowledgement of separations as traumatic. This was seen as a lack both of
38 knowledge and skills from training, and of suitable spaces and privacy for counselling,
39 as described by one third sector participant:
40
41
42
43

44 *It's always a problem because...I barely get through a session without*
45 *somebody bursting into the room.... And they're glass partitioned so... to*
46 *try and get the client to sit with her back to the door because you think if*
47 *she's going to bawl her head off she doesn't want to see everyone, to see*
48 *her doing that....But it is tricky and it's deeply less than ideal. (Participant*
49 *20)*
50
51
52
53
54

55 The problems of lack of space for and awareness of what is needed for counselling
56 were seen in the context of prisons being a 'completely disempowering environment'
57 (Participant 17, third sector) (c.f. De Viggiani, 2007), and the challenge this poses
58
59
60

1
2
3 when trying to support women through separation. One third sector staff member
4 detailed:

5
6
7 *But the main thing... is just there is such an uneven power dynamic in our*
8 *prisons... That has obviously been exacerbated for women who've had their*
9 *child temporarily or permanently removed... I think it's really difficult as*
10 *professionals and working with women, how do you empower, how do you*
11 *disrupt power dynamics? (Participant 14)*
12
13
14
15

16 There seemed to be an underlying question about the extent to which staff really can
17 provide emotional support in contexts of incarceration; a question primarily asked by
18 staff from the third sector in this study.
19
20
21

22 The sense of powerlessness in the prison context was further intensified by the
23 challenges of services co-ordinating their work in a prison. Social services were a
24 target of frustration amongst many of those working with separation. Staff explained
25 that services within the prison were often not joined up, particularly mental health and
26 substance misuse services, and work could often be duplicated, for example, in
27 gathering information about a woman's family network.
28
29
30
31
32

33 There were challenges emphasised in terms of co-ordination between prison and third
34 sector organisations – both inside and outside the prison. The main difficulties
35 included: unclear lines of responsibility in terms of management and supervision,
36 particularly of new staff; third sector staff felt their work was limited, for example by
37 making access to women difficult; and a general difference of priorities between
38 officers and third sector staff when it came to providing support.
39
40
41
42
43

44 Related to this, continuity of staff, as mentioned above, is often lacking when mothers
45 return to the main prison from an MBU, or when they are released. Staff were
46 immensely frustrated that mothers could be separated following release because of a
47 lack of community support. One third sector participant recalled:
48
49
50

51
52 *Women being separated can happen a few months after leaving here, even*
53 *though they've done fantastically, because there is no support outside...
54 and that can be because there's no mother and baby places outside or no*
55 *supported living or not that kind of thing. So...they can go out... but it can*
56 *be like shared parental responsibility with the local authority because...of*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *the risk. They might be going back to the same man they were with before.*
4 *Or the same family, or the same area where the, all the associates are the*
5 *same... We do feel that, that, the support ends and then there's nothing*
6
7 *else. (Participant 17)*
8
9

10 Within the prison it was noticed that there were difficulties co-ordinating services, such
11 as drug and alcohol rehabilitation for women on MBUs.
12
13

14 Finally, some third sector staff considered the obstacle to different services and
15 prisons working more effectively together stemmed from different underlying ways of
16 working. One organisation with an explicit trauma-informed approach felt that their
17 ethos was not understood by either the prison or social services and this resulted in
18 mothers not being treated with respect:
19
20
21
22

23
24 *I: What are the...-challenges of being trauma-informed and then working*
25 *with other agencies and organisations that aren't trauma-informed?*
26
27

28 *P: Yeah, it's just not understanding that somebody can be so overwhelmed*
29 *by an experience and that they can be, um, I suppose in these situations it*
30 *would normally be social services that we were talking to and they are*
31 *completely coming from a child perspective with a lot of sort of other*
32 *judgements there about the mother. (Participant 3)*
33
34
35
36

37 The last set of challenges identified how staff feel powerless about the wider system,
38 which incorporates both the prison context and co-ordination with services, in
39 particular social services and the wider legal system. Staff gave examples of
40 inconsistent practice around which mothers retained custody of their children and
41 those who did not. One third sector participant explained:
42
43
44
45

46 *I find some of the laws just ridiculous that, that a father can come and take*
47 *a child...and not let them have contact with the mother they've lived with. I*
48 *find that it's bizarre. And how a woman can lose her children when she's*
49 *only been put on remand...and that her crime was nothing to do with*
50 *children...So, I find that very hard to understand sometimes. (Participant 6)*
51
52
53
54
55

56 Even staff who had worked with separated mothers for a long time felt they were
57 observing repeated inconsistent practice by social services and sentencers. This
58 inconsistency continues in prison as some mothers are entitled to 'release on
59
60

1
2
3 temporary licence' (ROTL), and others are not, despite staff seeing the benefit for all
4 mothers. One prison-employed participant described that:

5
6
7 *Specific groups can have specific things. So, if you're a sole carer, you'll*
8 *get all these ROTLs, you'll get everything, if you're behaving and engaging.*
9 *People who've lost their children don't get an extra ROTL or extra visits from*
10 *family to support them through the loss of their child. And if you've got a*
11 *partner you don't get them either. So, this is where unless you fit into one*
12 *pot, you're not entitled. (Participant 15)*
13
14
15
16
17

18
19 Several staff (both third sector and prison-employed) expressed their anger at the
20 impact of short prison sentences resulting in permanent child loss (c.f. Baldwin &
21 Epstein, 2017; Masson, 2019). Community-based staff pointed out how mothers were
22 often left in an impossible situation on release – housed far away from their children
23 and then penalised for not maintaining contact. Stigma was highlighted both in the
24 general population and in other agencies. The staff interviewed felt that women are
25 being judged and badly treated as a result of general perceptions about the rights of
26 women with a conviction. The perceptions of inconsistency and injustice were further
27 aspects of the situation for separated mothers that front-line staff were unable to
28 address. One third sector participant explained:

29
30
31 *One woman that I was with...was told that she would actually meet the*
32 *foster parents and they'd come and meet her, and she'd say goodbye to*
33 *the baby in hospital. But... that arrangement broke down...In the end, she*
34 *had to be taken back to prison and say goodbye to her baby and just leave*
35 *the baby in the neonatal unit at the hospital. Not being able to hand the*
36 *baby over to someone, which she'd been told would be what happened...*
37 *That was really devastating to her. (Participant 21).*
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 This theme has provided an overview of the multiple ways in which staff, whether they
50 received high or low levels of support, felt the prison context and wider social context
51 constrain the provision of support for imprisoned mothers separated from their infants.
52 Prisons do not exist in isolation and staff explained how the interrelationships with
53 external agencies and services appeared to function in a way that prevented
54 compassionate, continuous support for mothers. In general, the key to overcoming
55 powerlessness was seen to be knowledge, rather than support. Whilst there were a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 couple of members of staff who felt that no training could help them in their work as
4 every separation scenario is different, many staff felt that training would enable them
5 to manage the challenges of mother-infant separations more effectively. Staff
6 proposed training related to wider services and suggestions included both training
7 about and training with these services. There was a focus on joint working, particularly
8 with social services and including all relevant in-prison services, in order to share
9 knowledge from expert teams and clarify referral pathways. Training was viewed as a
10 way to encourage cross-team working and thus perhaps reduce the sense of
11 powerlessness. These suggestions were very much in line with the recommendations
12 made in Baldwin's (2015) important collection for those working with mothers in the
13 criminal justice system, in particular those addressing partnership working with social
14 services and third sector agencies.

25 26 27 Discussion

28
29 Separation from children is one of the 'gendered pains of imprisonment' for women
30 (Crewe et al., 2017), and this study has shown the impact on the staff who work with
31 them (c.f. Abbott, 2018). Staff openly discussed the challenges they faced in
32 supporting separated mothers, and these included both the emotional impact and the
33 impact of the wider system on their capacities to support mothers in prison.

34
35
36
37
38 Focusing on the experience of separation has highlighted the broader problems of
39 incarcerating women in general. Staff offered critiques of: short sentences; the use of
40 prison for remand; challenges for women on release; and the stigma towards mothers
41 in prison. These critiques have been addressed extensively in the wider literature for
42 years, and of course are key to the Corston (2007) report. Through the theme of
43 'powerlessness', this study shows how these systemic issues directly affect staff and
44 their sense of agency in their work.

45
46
47
48
49
50
51 In terms of the emotional impact, conveyed through the theme of feeling
52 'overwhelmed', what stood out is the extent to which staff emotions reflect those of the
53 mothers in prison: in particular around guilt and loss (c.f. Baldwin, 2015; Baldwin,
54 2017; Morriss, 2018). Staff were sensitive to the specificity of the loss (whether
55 temporary or permanent as a result of adoption) of a child through imprisonment. This
56 is not the same as a bereavement and has been termed an 'ambiguous loss' (Boss &
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Greenberg, 1984) because of the psychological presence of imprisoned mothers'
4 children, despite their physical absence (c.f. Arditti, 2012). This causes emotional pain
5 because of the lack of clarity about the future. It appears that empathy with the
6 mothers' ambiguous loss causes prison staff to feel overwhelmed and guilty about
7 being part of a harmful process.
8
9

10
11
12 This guilt as a result of the ambiguous loss experienced by the mothers appears to
13 lead to 'moral distress' for staff. Epstein and Delgado (2010) describe this as when a
14 professional knows what is ethically appropriate, but feels powerless to take action as
15 a result of their work environment or the broader context. This resonates with the staff
16 descriptions of powerlessness given the constraints of the prison, service co-
17 ordination and problems with the justice system.
18
19
20
21

22
23 Staff concerns around supporting distressed women prisoners are highlighted in the
24 literature, particularly in relation to self-harm (Walsh & Freshwater, 2009; Short et al.,
25 2009; Walker et al., 2017), but more recently in the context of motherhood and the
26 criminal justice system (Baldwin, 2015). This study showed that the staff who felt more
27 confident about working with mothers when they were distressed by separation were
28 those from third sector organisations with an explicit gender- and trauma-informed
29 approach. This was the case even when they were directly involved in the separation
30 process. Given the recent roll-out of trauma-informed training in the women's estate
31 (Covington, 2018), which has built on the aims and ethos of the Corston (2007) report,
32 this is worth noting.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 However it is important to highlight the growing critiques of trauma-informed practice:
42 the core ideas are potentially impossible in prison contexts (Kilty, 2012); being trauma-
43 informed (i.e. knowledge or awareness) does not always translate into the relevant
44 work skills (Tseris, 2013; Berliner & Kolko, 2016); when embedded in unsuitable
45 environments, trauma-informed practice makes no difference (Jewkes et al., 2019);
46 and finally, a change in work practice is not sufficient – what is needed is a paradigm
47 shift across the entire organisation (Sweeney et al., 2016).
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 These critiques highlight the challenges of embedding individual or team-work
55 practices within a challenging environment and echo the frustrations that third sector
56 staff in particular expressed. Thus, what needs to be asked is whether the harms
57 caused to imprisoned mothers and children (Chambers, 2009; Fawcett Commission,
58
59
60

2009; Author, date; Dallaire, Zeman & Thrash, 2015; Scharff Smith, 2014; Women's Breakout, 2016) and the related stress on staff as a result of separations can really be justified.

Limitations

This study is not without limitations. Whilst the strength of qualitative research is in its detail and nuance, the limitation is its generalisability beyond the context in which it was carried out. The research took place in two prisons (and between them staff had worked in nine different women's prisons) however, it would have been preferable to have interviewed staff from more prisons. Whilst the main staff groups were represented at different levels of seniority, certain groups of healthcare staff (e.g. nursing) and prison officers (e.g. those without a particular interest or role associated with mothers and children) were under-represented. The lead researcher's role with two voluntary sector organisations and regular presence in one of the prisons meant some staff were perhaps more open and willing to talk to her. A researcher based in the prison or a former officer or healthcare staff might have been able to access these groups more effectively. A team of researchers (rather than a single PhD researcher) with more time and resources would be able to reach a more representative group of staff.

The findings are affected by those staff who did take part and, given that most staff interviewed were experienced and worked directly with or had an interest in supporting separated mothers, perhaps some of the more punitive views were not reflected (c.f. Kelly, 2014). Nevertheless, there does not appear to be any other research that addresses the concerns of staff supporting imprisoned mothers separated from their children. Finally, the small-scale nature of this study means that further research is needed to capture any gender differences in attitudes towards separation and to explore in more detail the variations in experience by staff group.

Conclusion

It is clear that the trauma of separation from children affects both imprisoned mothers and the staff who work with them. Focusing on the specific experience of maternal separation has emphasised the impact of the wider context of the criminal justice system on staff experiences. Whilst staff suggestions for training and support could be useful if implemented, they are unlikely to resolve the moral distress engendered

through this work. Ultimately, staff as well as imprisoned mothers would be best served if Corston's (2007) ever-relevant recommendations were implemented. If solely women with serious and violent offences were imprisoned, this would automatically reduce the number of mother-child separations- and mitigate the impact on staff.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With grateful thanks to the prison staff who took part.

REFERENCES

Author (date)

Author (date)

Author (date)

Abbott, L. (2018). *The Incarcerated Pregnancy: an Ethnographic Study of Perinatal Women in English Prisons*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Hertfordshire. Retrieved from: <https://uhra.herts.ac.uk/handle/2299/20283>

Abbott, L (2014). 'The pregnant woman in prison'. Howard League for Penal Reform ECAN bulletin, 23.

Abbott, L., Scott, T., Thomas, H., & Weston, K. (2020). Pregnancy and childbirth in English prisons: institutional ignominy and the pains of imprisonment. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 42(3), 660-675.

Albertson, K., O'Keeffe, C., Lessing-Turner, G., Burke, C., & Renfrew, M.J. (2012). *Tackling health inequalities through developing evidence-based policy and practice with childbearing women in prison: A consultation. Project Report*. Sheffield Hallam University.

Albutt, A. (2017, October 3). Speech made at the Criminal Justice Alliance Members Meeting. Retrieved from: <http://www.criminaljusticealliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Andrea-Albutts-speech-031017.pdf>

Arditti, J. A. (2012). *Parental incarceration and the family: Psychological and social effects of imprisonment on children, parents, and caregivers*. New York: NYU Press.

Arnold, H. (2016). 'The Prison Officer' in Y.Jewkes, B.Crewe, J.Bennett (Eds) Handbook on Prison. London: Routledge.

Baldwin, L. (2015). *Mothering Justice. Working with mothers in criminal and social justice settings*. East Sussex: Waterside Press.

Baldwin, L. (2017). Tainted Love: The Impact of Prison on Mothering Identity Explored via Mothers' Post Prison Reflections. *Prison Service Journal*, (233), 28-33.

Baldwin, L. & Epstein, R. (2017). *Short But Not Sweet: A study of the impact of short*

- 1
2
3 *custodial sentences on mothers & their children*. De Montfort University.
4 Bennett, J., Crewe, B., & Wahidin, A. (2008). *Understanding Prison Staff*. Devon:
5 Willan Publishing.
6
7 Birmingham, L., Coulson, D., Mullee, M., Kamal, M., & Gregoire, A. (2006). The
8 Mental health of women in prison mother and baby units. *Journal of Forensic*
9 *Psychiatry and Psychology*, 17, 393–404.
10
11 Booth, N. (2020). *Maternal Imprisonment and Family Life. From the Caregiver's*
12 *Perspective*. Bristol: Policy Press.
13 Boss, P., & Greenberg, J. (1984). Family boundary ambiguity: A new variable in
14 family stress theory. *Family Process*, 23(4), 535-546.
15 Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and*
16 *code development*. London: Sage Publications.
17 Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative*
18 *Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101.
19 Brough, P., & Biggs, A. (2010). Occupational stress in police and prison staff. In J.M.
20 Brown & E.A. Campbell (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Forensic Psychology*
21 (pp.707-717). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
22 Carlen, P. (2013). Against rehabilitation: for reparative justice. *Criminal Justice*
23 *Matters*, 91(1), 32-33.
24
25 Chambers, A.N. (2009). *Impact of forced separation policy on incarcerated*
26 *postpartum mothers. Policy, Politics and Nursing Practice*, 10, 207-11.
27 Cohen, S. (2001). *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering*.
28 Cambridge: Polity Press.
29 Corston, B.J. (2007). *The Corston Report: The need for a distinct, radically different,*
30 *visibly-led, strategic, proportionate, holistic, woman-centred, integrated*
31 *approach*. London: Home Office.
32
33 Crawley, E. (2004). *Doing Prison Work: The Public and Private Lives of Prison*
34 *Officers*. Cullompton, Willan.
35
36 Crawley, E. (2009). *Emotion and performance. Punishment & Society*, 6(4), 411-427.
37
38 Crewe, B. (2008). Concluding comments on the social world of prison staff. In J.
39 Bennett, B. Crewe and A. Wahidin (Eds.), *Understanding Prison Staff*
40 (pp.421-432). Devon: Willan Publishing.
41
42 Dallaire, D.H., Zeman, J.L., & Thrash, T.M. (2015). *Children's Experiences of*
43 *Maternal Incarceration – Specific Risks: Predictions to Psychological*
44 *Maladaptation. Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 44(1), 109-
45 *122.*
46
47 De Viggiani, N. (2007). *Unhealthy prisons: exploring structural determinants of prison*
48 *health. Sociology of health & illness*, 29(1), 115-135.
49 Dolan, R.M., Birmingham, L., Mullee, M., & Gregoire, A. (2013). The mental health of
50 imprisoned mothers of young children: A follow-up study. *Journal of Forensic*
51 *Psychiatry and Psychology*, 24, 421-439.
52
53 Douglas, N., Plugge, E., & Fitzpatrick, R. (2009). *The impact of imprisonment on*
54 *health: What do women prisoners say? Journal of Epidemiology and*
55 *Community Health*, 63, 749-754.
56
57 Edwards, P.K., O'Mahoney, J., & Vincent, S. (Eds.). (2014). *Studying organizations*
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 using critical realism: A practical guide (First edition). Oxford, United Kingdom:
4 Oxford University Press.
- 5
6 Epstein, E.G., & Delgado, S. (2010) "Understanding and Addressing Moral Distress"
7 *OJIN: The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing* Vol. 15, No. 3, Manuscript 1.
- 8 Fawcett Commission. (2009). *Engendering justice – from policy to practice: Final*
9 *report of the Commission on Women and the Criminal Justice System.*
10 London: Fawcett Society.
- 11
12 Finney, C., Stergiopoulos, E., Hensel, J., Bonato, S., & Dewa, C.-S. (2013).
13 Organizational stressors associated with job stress and burnout in correctional
14 officers: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 13(1), 82.
- 15 Galloway, S., Haynes, A., & Cuthbert, C. (2014). *An unfair sentence. All babies*
16 *count: Spotlight on the criminal justice system.* London: NSPCC and
17 Barnardos.
- 18
19 Garland, B. (2004). The impact of administrative support on prison treatment staff
20 burnout: An exploratory study. *The Prison Journal*, 84(4), 452-471.
- 21
22 Gregoire, A., Dolan, R., Birmingham, L., Mullee, M., & Coulson, D. (2010). The
23 mental health and treatment needs of imprisoned mothers of young children.
24 *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 21, 378–392.
- 25 Hardwick, N. (2012). *Women in prison: Corston five years on.* Justice Inspectorate.
- 26
27 Harvey, J. (2014). Perceived physical health, psychological distress, and social
28 support among prison officers. *The Prison Journal*, 94(2), 242–259.
- 29
30 Holmes, S., & MacInnes, D. (2003). Contributors to stress among Prison Service
31 staff. *The British Journal of Forensic Practice*, 5(2), 16–24.
- 32 Houston, S. (2015). *Enabling others in Social Work: Reflexivity and the theory of*
33 *social domains. Critical and Radical Social Work*, 3(2): 245-260.
- 34
35 Independent Advisory Panel on Deaths in Custody [IAP] (2017). *Preventing the*
36 *Deaths of Women in Prison – initial results of a rapid information gathering*
37 *exercise by the Independent Advisory Panel on Deaths in Custody.*
38 Department of Health & Home Office & Ministry of Justice.
- 39
40 Kelly, D. (2014). Punish or Reform? Predicting Prison Staff Punitiveness. *The*
41 *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 53(1), 49–68.
- 42 Kincaid, S., Roberts, M., & Kane, E. (2019). *Children of prisoners: Fixing a broken*
43 *system.* London: Crest.
- 44
45 Kinman, G., James Clements, A., & Hart, J. (2016). Work-related wellbeing in UK
46 prison officers: A benchmarking approach. *International Journal of Workplace*
47 *Health Management*, 9(3), 290–307.
- 48
49 Kinman, G., Clements, A. J., & Hart, J. (2017). Job demands, resources and mental
50 health in UK prison officers. *Occupational Medicine*, 67(6), 456–460.
- 51 Knight, M., Bunch, K., Tuffnell, D., Shakespeare, J., Kotnis, R., Jenyon, S., &
52 Kurinczuk, J.J. (Eds.) on behalf of MBRRACE-UK. (2019). *Saving Lives,*
53 *Improving Mothers' Care – Lessons learned to inform maternity care from the*
54 *UK and Ireland Confidential Enquiries into Maternal Deaths and Morbidity*
55 *2015-17.* Oxford: National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit, University of Oxford.
- 56
57 Knight, V., & Layder, D. (2016). *Concept-Formation, Complexity and Social*
58 *Domains: Investigating Emotion (S) in a Prison Setting. Sociological Research*
59 *Online*, 21(4), 107-120.
- 60

- 1
2
3 Layder, D. (1998). *Sociological Practice. Linking Theory and Social Research*.
4 London: Sage Publications.
- 5
6 Liebling, A. (2011). Distinctions and distinctiveness in the work of prison officers:
7 Legitimacy and authority revisited. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(6),
8 484-499.
- 9
10 Liebling, A., Price, D., & Elliott, C. (1999). Appreciative inquiry and relationships in
11 prison. *Punishment & Society*, 1(1), 71-98.
- 12 Masson, I. (2019). *Incarcerating Motherhood: The Enduring Harms of First Short*
13 *Periods of Imprisonment on Mothers*. Oxford: Routledge.
- 14
15 Meziane, D., Ramirez-Garcia, M. P., & Fortin, M.-L. (2018). A reflective practice
16 intervention to act on the moral distress of nurses providing end-of-life care on
17 acute care units. *International Journal of Palliative Nursing*, 24(9), 444-451.
- 18
19 Ministry of Justice. (2020a). *Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service workforce*
20 *quarterly: June 2020*. Accessed 5th September:
21 [https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-offender-management-](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-offender-management-service-workforce-statistics)
22 [service-workforce-statistics](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/national-offender-management-service-workforce-statistics)
- 23
24 Ministry of Justice. (2020b). *Population bulletin: weekly 4 September 2020*.
25 Accessed 5th September: [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/prison-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/prison-population-figures-2020)
26 [population-figures-2020](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/prison-population-figures-2020)
- 27
28 Morriss, L. (2018). Haunted futures: The stigma of being a mother living apart from
29 her child(ren) as a result of state-ordered court removal. *The Sociological*
30 *Review*, 66(4):816 -831.
- 31
32 Noy, C. (2008). Sampling Knowledge: The Hermeneutics of Snowball Sampling in
33 Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*,
34 11(4):327-344.
- 35
36 O'Malley, S. & Devaney, C. (2016). Supporting incarcerated mothers in Ireland with
37 their familial relationships: A case for the revival of the social work role.
38 *Probation Journal*, 63(3), 293-309.
- 39
40 Prison Reform Trust. (2014). *Bromley briefing, Autumn 2014*.
- 41
42 Raikes, B. (2009). Imprisoned mothers: 'out of sight, out of mind'. A missed
43 opportunity for rebuilding mother-child relationships. In *Navigating risks and*
44 *building resilience in small states* (Unpublished). Cavehill campus, Barbados.
- 45
46 Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social*
47 *science students and researchers*. London; ~~Thousand Oaks, Calif~~: Sage
48 Publications.
- 49
50 Ritchie, J., Spencer, L., & O'Connor, W. (2003). Carrying out Qualitative Analysis. In
51 J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice. A Guide for Social*
52 *Science Students and Researchers* (pp.219-262). London: Sage Publications.
- 53
54 Robinson, G., Priede, C., Farrall, S., Shapland, J., & McNeill, F. (2013). Doing
55 'strengths-based' research: Appreciative Inquiry in a probation setting.
56 *Criminology & criminal justice*, 13(1), 3-20.
- 57
58 Rogers, A., & Pilgrim, D. (2014). *A Sociology of Mental Health and Illness*. Slough:
59 McGraw-Hill Education.
- 60
61 Ruck, S., Bowes, N., & Tehrani, N. (2013). Evaluating trauma debriefing within the
62 UK prison service. *Journal of Forensic Practice*, 15(4), 281-290.
- 63
64 Scharff Smith, P. (2014). *When the Innocent are Punished*. London: Palgrave

Macmillan UK.

- Scott, D. (2008). Creating ghosts in the penal machine: prison officer occupational morality and the techniques of denial. *Understanding Prison Staff*, 168-86.
- Short, V., Cooper, J., Shaw, J., Kenning, C., Abel, K., & Chew-Graham, C. (2009). Custody vs care: attitudes of prison staff to self-harm in women prisoners—a qualitative study. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 20(3), 408–426.
- Sikand, M. (2015). *Lost Spaces: Is the current procedure for women prisoners to gain a place in a prison Mother and Baby Unit fair and accessible? The Griffins Society.*
- Sims-Schouten, W., & Riley, S. (2014). Employing a form of critical realist discourse analysis for identity research: an example from women’s talk of motherhood, childcare and employment. In P. Edwards, J. O’Mahoney, & S. Vincent (Eds.), *Studying organizations Using Critical Realism: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sims-Schouten, W., Riley, S. C., & Willig, C. (2007). Critical Realism in Discourse Analysis A Presentation of a Systematic Method of Analysis Using Women’s Talk of Motherhood, Childcare and Female Employment as an Example. *Theory & Psychology*, 17(1), 101-124.
- Spencer, L., Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., & Dillon, L. (2003). Quality in qualitative evaluation: a framework for assessing research evidence. Retrieved from <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/21069/2/a-quality-framework-tcm6-38740.pdf>
- Tait, S. (2011). A typology of prison officer approaches to care. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(6), 440–454.
- Walker, T., Shaw, J., Hamilton, L., Turpin, C., Reid, C., & Abel, K. (2017). “Coping with the job”: prison staff responding to self-harm in three English female prisons: a qualitative study. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*, 1–14.
- Walsh, E., & Freshwater, D. (2009). Developing the Mental Health Awareness of Prison Staff in England and Wales. *Journal of Correctional Health Care*, 15(4), 302–309.
- Walsh, E., Freshwater, D., & Fisher, P. (2012) Caring for prisoners: towards mindful practice. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 18(2), 158-168.
- Willig, C. (1999). Beyond appearances: a critical realist approach to social constructionist work. In D.J. Nightingale and J. Cromby (edsEds.) *Social Constructionist Psychology. A Critical Analysis of Theory and Practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Women’s Breakout. (2016). *Children on the Edge. Children affected by maternal imprisonment.* Kent: Women’s Breakout.

Table I – Staff demographics

Demographics	Number of participants (N=24)
Sex	
Female	n=23
Male	n=1
Ethnicity (participant-defined responses)	
White British	n=20
White Other	n=3
Black British	n=1
Age	
Under 35 years	n=5
Over 35 years	n=19
Experience in this prison	
Under 3 years experience	n=6 (<i>of whom n=4 had previously worked in another prison for between 3-12 years</i>)
3 to 5 years experience	n=4
5 to 10 years experience	n=7
Over 10 years experience	n=7
Have children (including biological, step, adopted, fostered etc.)	
Yes	n=16
No	n=5
Not asked (due to to time constraints)	n=3

Table

Staff category	Specific area of work	Seniority	Employer	Total (N=24)
Prison	Prison officer, offender supervisor, probation officer	Administrator, Senior officer, Manager	Prison Agency	n=7
Children & Families	Pregnancy, young children, families	Senior practitioner, Manager	Prison 3 rd Sector	n=10
Health	Counselling, drugs and alcohol, holistic support	Senior practitioner, Manager	3 rd Sector	n=7

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table III – Support received by staff according to job sector

Low support received	High support received
<p>1) Prison-employed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No formal support specifically around separation, mainly colleagues • Management support varied from informal to strong support • Not everyone appeared to know what was available • Some knowledge of broader support available but not how to access. 	<p>3) Third sector – high support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systematic support structures to discuss separation: team meetings, individual, group and line manager supervision • Managers consistently available • Some gaps in provision for managers • Not always enough support from the prison
<p>2) Third sector – low support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly other colleagues in their own or other organisations • Managers infrequently available • Occasional psychological support 	<p>4) Counselling/trauma-informed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structured and systemic support systems • Regular individual and group supervision for front-line and management staff • Supportive colleagues and structured support e.g. peer supervision • Some organisations received additional support from the prison (e.g. psychology team) • Reported supporting staff in other organisations

Table IV – Key themes mapped on to social domains

Social domains	As applied to staff in prisons	Key theme
Psychobiography	Experience of previous losses Experience of motherhood	Overwhelmed
Situated activity	Interactions with separated mothers Interactions with managers	
Social setting	Women's prison	Powerless
Contextual resources	Education and professional training e.g. counselling Criminal Justice system Family Justice system (including Social Services)	

Journal of Criminal Psychology

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60