

August 2024

Forgotten Victims: Recommendations for Social Care on the Impact on Children of their Parent's Incarceration

Karla Kane Ms

Trinity College Dublin the University of Dublin

Susan Flynn Dr

Trinity College Dublin the University of Dublin

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/jsoc>



Part of the [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kane, Karla Ms and Flynn, Susan Dr (2024) "Forgotten Victims: Recommendations for Social Care on the Impact on Children of their Parent's Incarceration," *Journal of Social Care*: Vol. 4, Article 3.

Available at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/jsoc/vol4/iss1/3>

This Original Research is brought to you for free and open access by the Current Publications at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Social Care by an authorized editor of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie, vera.kilshaw@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License](#).

Forgotten Victims: Recommendations for Social Care on the Impact on Children of their Parent's Incarceration

Cover Page Footnote

The contribution of anonymous peer-reviewers should be acknowledged

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to present findings and key recommendations for social care arising from a study of the impact of a parent's incarceration upon their children. Incarceration is the process of imprisonment of a person, through confining them to prison or secure custody whilst reducing their personal liberty. Incarceration may be used to promote community safety, disincentivise crime and contribute to rehabilitation of prisoners (Irish Prison Service, 2022). The children of prisoners do not forgo punishment insofar as there are diverse determinantal impacts that they may experience, which can include acute relationship deprivation and financial loss (Murray et al., 2012). These children are referred to as hidden victims of incarceration (Children of Prisoners, 2021). It is unjust that their voices and experiences may be left unheard in the context of misrecognition and failed recognition of their loss (Barnardo's, 2022). As children's rights discourses strengthen the position of the child's voice in matters of importance to them, within criminal justice, policy and practice systems, there ought to be better remedies and supports for children serving an unrecognised sentence.

Thankfully, owing to a modest international body of existing literature and research, learning can be extracted towards developing best practice recommendations to help these children in a more meaningful way. The Irish Penal Reform Trust (2021b), for instance, have published a report on recommendations for change. Therein included a call for better recognition of children's rights, better data recording around impacts on the child, the establishment of a national support service, better prison visiting conditions for children, and enshrining more substantially in criminal justice policy and practice, the principle of incarceration as a last resort (Irish Penal Reform Trust, 2021b, 5-8).

The focal study of this article was conducted in Ireland where there is a significant lack of research on the subject matter of parental incarceration (Barnardo's, 2022). A critical literature review with thematic analysis was employed to retrieve and analyse a key sample of international research literature. The study focussed upon producing thematic findings and recommendations that could be used to address impacts of parental incarceration on children in Ireland, but that would also be of benefit and interest to practitioners, researchers and policy makers in other countries.

More broadly, the article's presentation of research is structured in the following way. First, the background to the study will be presented, including key terms and concepts as well as an overview of pertinent literature. Thereafter, the study's method is explained and introduced. Findings are then presented, followed by a critical discussion and conclusion. We ultimately contend that by surpassing a siloed and discrete view of parental incarceration, in which the ripple effects of imprisonment on children and families are unappreciated and overlooked, we can move toward understanding the fullest effects of custodial sentencing (Morris, 1965).

Background

Social care policy and practice oftentimes supports communities that are socio-economically disadvantaged. Within this, a higher rate of parental incarceration features. Imprisonment has been connected to intergenerational social and economic inequalities (Western & Pettit, 2010). Parental incarceration increases the vulnerability of children to

economic, social, educational and psychological risks (Murray et al., 2012). The groundbreaking adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) study, reported by Felitti et al. (1998), established incarceration of a family member within the ten most prominent ACEs linked to poor impacts on a child lasting into their adult years. Children of imprisoned parents may also already be from vulnerable backgrounds, as Wakefield and Uggen (2010, p.393) report that prisons mostly detain people with the “least human capital, financial capital, and social capital.” Due to over-representation of certain social groups in prison populations, incarceration reproduces patterns of inequality that can heavily effect children (Wakefield & Uggen, 2010). Protecting children is a State imperative (Flynn, 2020a; 2020b), and yet protecting them from the harm caused by parental incarceration is forgotten and overlooked.

It must be recognised that there is a “damaging impact of imprisonment on the individual, as well as its ripple effects on families and communities” (Irish Penal Reform Trust, 2019, p.31). The ripple effects create inequalities that are intergenerational, “invisible, cumulative” (Western & Pettit, 2010, p.12). For this reason, governments have committed to trying to ease detrimental impacts on children and families by facilitating a continued relationship between parent and child through access in child-friendly settings and by other means (Department of Children, Equality, Disability, Integration and Youth, 2019). Yet, prison systems vary greatly across nations and jurisdictions, and none are close to perfectly resolving the issue of parental incarceration effects on children. Innovations such as the rehabilitative and restorative approach to criminal justice seek to reduce patterns of reoffending. Yet as the relationship between parental caregiver and child is so influential upon a child’s physical, social and emotional development (Beckett & Taylor, 2019), there is a long way yet to go to redress and prevent damage to the children across criminal justice systems.

Attachment theory is one of the credible and evidence-based ways of understanding the bond between caregiver parent and child (Beckett & Taylor, 2019; Howe, 2011). The theory was founded by John Bowlby (1982) and extended by Mary Ainsworth (1979) and others. It demonstrates that attachments with key caregivers and early pivotal relationships have powerful and lasting effects on a child’s social and emotional development (Bakermans-Kranenburg et al., 2003; Beckett & Taylor, 2019; Howe, 2011). The blunt absence of a caregiver or deficiency in this relationship can hinder the child’s development (Howe, 2011), leading to later behavioural effects on the child (Beckett & Taylor, 2019). Murray and Murray (2010) conclude that forced separation from parental incarceration may negatively disrupt children's attachment bonds (Murray & Murray, 2010). Severed relationships also may not help prisoners stay on the straight and narrow post release. According to the Irish Prison Service (2018), family relationships are recognised to directly link to likelihood of reoffending.

Yet, despite identification of parental incarceration increasing vulnerability of children, a lack of support is provided to these hidden victims (Irish Penal Reform Trust, 2021a). Moreover, it may not be tenable to garner support elsewhere for the child. Doka (1999), for instance, is a key scholar of the concept of disenfranchised grief. This concept designates that some grief, due to the stigmatised nature of its origin, may not be spoken about or openly acknowledged. Arditti (2005) confirms that this concept is widely applicable to children affected by parental imprisonment, due to stigma and shame, as the child may not want to or may have been told not to, tell others that their parent is imprisoned.

Children may be confused and underinformed, with some professionals potentially thinking the child is better off with the parent gone but without the child getting sufficient

support with this. Fortunately, however, scholarship on the effects of parent incarceration is improving the available evidence base on the subject. Morris (1965) was one of the first researchers to investigate the impacts of imprisonment on families. Morris' (1965) hugely influential research prompted better awareness of the harmful effects of imprisonment on families. More recently, O'Malley and Devaney (2016) have emphasised spaces for a social work role in supporting children with parental incarceration. With so much work left to do to accomplish better prospects and conditions for children with incarcerated parents, the study that is outlined in the following method section, was conceived to fill a gap in knowledge by applying a well-rehearsed and authoritative method of documentary analysis. As the specific details of this method remain opaque, we will now turn our attention to elaborating upon the study's method and methodology.

Method

The central research question for the study is, "what are the key considerations regarding the impact of parental incarceration on children?" A qualitative research strategy was selected, which is underpinned by the ontological view that reality is "filtered through the theories, constructs, perceptions, and values of the observer" (Daly, 2003, p.378). Within qualitative inquiry, critical literature review provides a specific creative method "in which the knower is an active participant constructing an interpretation" (Montouri, 2005, p.375). In line with Bowen (2009, p.29), the use of qualitative research demanded that a robust data collection approach with a clearly documented research procedure was employed. Critical literature review is a desk-based method that offers an "effective, analytical, original assessment of previously published information" (Jesson & Lacey, 2006, p.14). It can powerfully generate nuanced interpretations and resolve competing views about topics. Critical skills are needed from the researcher, however, to comprehensively analyse in unity bodies of literature on one topic that maybe at odds (Jesson & Lacey, 2006).

For the study, predetermined inclusion and exclusion criteria were used in selecting sources from authoritative peer-reviewed journals accessed through select databases. A grey literature and e-book search was also undertaken but no relevant sources were retrieved this way. Selected articles were then filtered by publication date to include only the last twelve years (January 2010 to December 2022). Further filtering excluded non-English sources. To then narrow the sample again, sources from global north jurisdictions only were selected, which included Ireland, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, Australia and Sweden. These jurisdictions had been chosen due to having relatable systems.

Prior to searching for sources, a subject librarian was consulted on database selection. Seven databases were searched and of these seven, three databases were used. These were Academic Search Complete, ProQuest Social Science Premium Collection and Scopus. A PICO (person, intervention, comparison, outcome) method associated with Sackett et al.'s (1997) work was used to identify strong and relevant search terms. The Boolean operator "OR" was used to build search strings and improve access to relevant literature. Alternatively, the Boolean operator "AND" reduced and refined the search. Table 1 outlines search terms used.

Table 1: PCO Method of Search Terms

Person:	Children or child or young person or youth or teenager or adolescent or boy or girl
Comparison:	Parent or parents or guardian or caregiver or mother or father or mam or dad
Outcome:	Prison or imprisonment or jail or incarceration or detention centre or confinement

This table has been adapted from Haynes et al. (1997).

In total, 252 results were retrieved from the database searches. Then title and abstract searching based on the research question, as well as inclusion and exclusion criteria, and a quality assurance system using a quality appraisal tool, refined the sample down further. The final sample for thematic analysis was 20 peer-reviewed articles.

Qualitative data analysis was undertaken through thematic analysis using Braun and Clarke's (2006) approach. This permits themes and patterns to be extracted across articles as a way to interpret the qualitative data. It also includes coding to identify patterns of issues and phenomena arising within the articles that can be later clustered to create themes (Bowen, 2009). Specifically, Braun and Clarke (2006, p.87) outline a six-step data analysis method that was followed. This required familiarising with the articles, then creating initial codes, generating initial themes from codes, reviewing and developing themes, defining and naming the themes, followed by write up. At the end of this analysis process, rich and informative findings were produced that illuminate key dimensions of the impact of parental incarceration on children. It is to these findings that we now turn our attention, so that from them, recommendations to improve policy and practice can be discussed and considered.

Findings

Three main areas of findings were identified in the reviewed literature which pertain to resources, relationships, and policy. Within these main findings, sub-themes arose which depicted key commonalities and continuities arising across articles. In this context, disenfranchised grief presented an overarching theme which describes the grief that cannot be openly communicated because of prejudicial opinions held in society towards incarceration (Doka, 1999).

Findings Theme 1: Resources

Children of prisoners can often have unequal access to resources (Leeson & Morgan, 2022; Morgan-Mullane, 2018; Saunders & McArthur, 2020; Sheehan, 2010; Smith & Young, 2017; Vernon Kautz, 2017; Zhang & Flynn, 2020). Within this, a key sub-theme arising is the issue of financial resources. It has been suggested that financial instability can often be experienced by families before a parent is in prison (Morgan-Mullane, 2018). Children of prisoners are more likely to experience financial difficulty, when compared to their peers, as removing a parent is reducing a family's income (Morgan-Mullane, 2018; Roberts & Loucks, 2015; Zhang & Flynn, 2020). This impacts children as this financial deficit makes children

more susceptible to poor physical and mental health outcomes (Smith & Young, 2017). A qualitative study undertaken by Kremer and colleagues (2021) highlights that some children whose parents are in prison, come from middle class families. In this study, the authors highlight that the financial impact could be more significant as the stigma of incarceration can be exemplified in this class.

Social opportunities represent another sub-theme within the area of resources. It is clear that social opportunities can help to mitigate harm (Zhang & Flynn, 2020). In a study by Zhang and Flynn (2020), the authors interviewed children of prisoners, and found that that social opportunities distracted children from their chaotic realities and helped keep them busy. However, literature also suggests that children whose parents are in prison can feel vulnerable in social situations and in school as they can feel judged, stigmatised, and misunderstood by friends, peers, teachers, or subsequent caregivers (Leeson & Morgan, 2022; Vernon-Kautz, 2017; Zhang & Flynn, 2020). Roberts and Loucks (2015, p.130) state that: "This can be psychologically damaging for children, turning what is already a difficult situation into something that they feel must not be talked about – a 'forced silencing' of children – or worse, that they are somehow guilty by association."

Perhaps unsurprisingly, a third sub-theme to arise under resources was housing. Unstable housing was identified as a direct impact of parental incarceration before and during imprisonment across much of the literature (Morgan-Mullan, 2018; Saunders & McArthur, 2020; Sheehan, 2010; Smith & Young, 2017). Some of the literature suggested that after a parent went to prison, this left children in vulnerable and precarious living situations, where they ended up in homeless accommodation or unsafe neighbourhoods (Morgan-Mullane, 2018; Smith & Young, 2017). Here, Morgan-Mullane (2018) highlights that living in an unsecure housing situation is a structural trauma. In their study, Smith and Young (2017) note that children who experience trauma from conditions of poverty and unsecure housing can exhibit externalising behaviours into their adulthood such as substance misuse and violence. Therefore, children who have experienced parental incarceration and precarious housing conditions may be at a higher risk of having poorer outcomes in their future.

Findings Theme 2: Relationships

The second major theme to arise from findings pertains to relationships. Relationships are vital for children as they can impact positively and negatively on a child's future development, emotional regulation, and coping strategies (Smith & Young, 2017). In many studies, it was highlighted that positive relationships can help a child to process their emotions and help foster resilience (McLeod et al., 2021; Smith & Young, 2017; Vernon-Kautz, 2017; Zhang & Flynn, 2020). Relationships, however, can also contribute to additional stigmatisation of children of incarcerated parents.

Within the theme of relationships, the first sub-theme to be explored pertains to child and parent relationships. Parental incarceration can negatively impact children as this may disrupt the attachment between a child and their parent, inhibiting a child's emotional development (Skinner-Osei & Levenson, 2018). If a parent is removed from a child's life this can incur "anxiety, depression, bedwetting, sleep disturbances, attention difficulties, physical aggression, and family conflict" (Smith & Young, 2017, p.477). In a mixed-method study undertaken by Nylander, Källström and Hellfeldt (2018), the authors found that there were disparities between children whose parents were in prison and children whose parents were

not. This study highlighted that parental incarceration impacted poorly on attachment and in turn a child's feeling of being loved. However, not all children experience positive relationships with their parents. Having a parent go to prison may have a positive impact on a child. Some studies highlight that having a parent go to prison may ease tension in the child's life, making them feel safer (DeHart & Altshuler, 2009; McCrudden et al., 2014; Smith & Young, 2017). This emphasises the complexity of families, as it shows that not all children of prisoners have the same experience.

The next sub-theme to consider refers to the child and subsequent caregiver relationship. Positive connections with subsequent caregivers can help children to mitigate the impact of stigma and isolation (Vernon-Kautz, 2017; Zhang & Flynn, 2020). Zhang and Flynn (2020) found that subsequent caregivers have a vital role in linking children to external protective activities that can help to mitigate adversities, such as sports and camps. In contrast, some studies have suggested that subsequent caregivers can hinder children in this context (Kremer et al., 2021; Saunders, 2017). Subsequent caregivers may try to hide the incarceration because of shame and fear (Skinner-Osei & Levenson, 2018). After a parent has been imprisoned, children may also feel shame, and this may be reinforced unintentionally by subsequent caregivers (Saunders, 2017). If caregivers are dishonest about the incarceration, this can lead to confusion and isolation for children (Saunders, 2017). Moreover, if there is a conflict between the parent in prison and the subsequent caregiver, the subsequent caregiver can become a "gatekeeper" (Saunders, 2017, p.64). Saunders (2017) points out that limited contact with parents, compounded with a lack of understanding of their incarceration, can be both upsetting and confusing for children. Roberts and Loucks (2015) consider that this may lead to disenfranchised grief, as a lack of understanding, stigma and shame may inhibit a child's capacity to process grief.

Finally, the third sub-theme under the area of relationships, refers to the child and school relationship. The relationship between a child and their school emerged as highly relevant across the literature. A qualitative study undertaken by Laasko and Nygaard (2012) looked at mentoring programmes for children whose parents are in prison. The results of this study indicated a positive correlation between mentoring and school attainment, performance, and self-confidence. Elsewhere, it has been documented that school systems and teachers may increase shame and stigma (Saunders & McArthur, 2020; Skinner-Osei & Levenson, 2018; Smith & Young, 2017). Skinner-Osei and Levenson (2018) consider that children may display externalising behaviours because of the trauma they have experienced at home, and oftentimes, these behaviours are met with punishment rather than trauma-informed approaches. Subsequently, an increase of shame and stigma may be compounded by schools due to misunderstanding and a lack of training.

Finding Theme 3: Policy

The final theme to be presented is with respect to policy. Across the literature it has been documented that children of prisoners are impacted by policy yet are often also excluded from policy. Interestingly, Saunders and McArthur (2022) note that in policy, children of prisoners are not given a voice, but instead are constructed as a vulnerable population. It is perhaps unsurprisingly that the first sub-theme in this area pertains to prison policy. The impact of the physical separation between parent and child during incarceration was a key highlighted theme (Kremer et al., 2021; Saunders, 2017; Vernon Kautz, 2017; Zhang & Flynn,

2020). Saunders (2017) considers the impact of prison visiting policies on the child-parent relationship, and cleverly cites the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 9, which sets out children's right to have contact with their parent. Sheehan (2010) states that there is no formal process for prisons to facilitate visits for children and parents.

In a qualitative study, McLeod and colleagues (2021) researched how effective it is for parents in prison to send videos to their children. Remarkably, this study found that this intervention improved the child-parent attachment and increased child stability. In contrast, contact between a child and their parent in prison may be further traumatising and harmful (Kremer et al., 2021). Oftentimes, literature which promotes contact between parents and children, is based on attachment theory, rather than children's lived experience (Saunders, 2017). Alternatives to prison such as community-based sanctions can offer children and parents an opportunity to maintain their relationship (Kremer et al., 2021; O'Malley & Devaney, 2016).

Next among the arising sub-themes is education policy. Education warrants specific policy attention for children of prisoners (Nylander et al., 2018). Schools are in a unique position to positively impact the possible future outcomes of children who have experienced parental incarceration (Leeson & Morgan, 2022; McLeod et al., 2021; Nylander, Källström & Hellfeldt, 2018; Roberts & Loucks, 2015; Sheehan, 2010; Zhang & Flynn, 2020). In a study undertaken by Leeson and Morgan (2022), the researchers engaged in semi-structured interviews with the professionals who link in with children of prisoners. The researchers found that teachers lack training and guidance and may reprimand children's behavioural or academic issues stemming from trauma, as they are not trained otherwise. In this context, Skinner-Osei and Levenson (2018) suggest that using a trauma-informed approach can reduce stigma and isolation. School counsellors, according to Roberts and Loucks (2015), should be available for children to talk to. The authors also recommend adding the topic of parental incarceration into the school curriculum to inform children and reduce stigma. This may encourage children to speak and process their experience. The vital role that schools play in referring children for appropriate therapeutic supports, such as speech and language therapy and counselling, ought also to be appreciated (Sheehan, 2010).

After the sub-theme of education policy, is the final sub-theme of social work which encompasses social care. The need for social work intervention was highlighted across the literature (Laasko & Nygaard, 2012; O'Malley & Devaney, 2016; Sheehan, 2010; Skinner-Osei & Levenson, 2018; Vernon Kautz, 2017). Sheehan (2010, p.175) states: "the lack of formal planning for children affected by parental offending and imprisonment creates fragmented living circumstances for these children, and impacts on their psychological, social, and cognitive development." Social workers and social care workers are trained in trauma, grief, loss and relationship-based practice, and may be best placed to support families and children to process their grief (Smith & Young, 2017). Zhang and Flynn (2020) make an interesting and valid point that social workers can focus on the negatives, and this can indirectly reinforce stigma for children of prisoners. McCrudden and colleagues (2014) similarly note that not all children have the same experience and therefore experiences oftentimes can't be generalised. Finally, Akesson et al. (2012) add that children who experience hardship have usually experienced this prior to a parent being incarcerated.

Discussion

It is now timely and fitting to critically consider findings, with respect to their wider meaning and implications, for social care practitioners, policy makers, families and the children who ultimately bear the burden of hidden victimhood. Discussion will be structured around five key recommendations that are intended to lessen the impact of parental incarceration.

The first recommendation for this study is that children of prisoners should be recognised in social care as a group with their own specific needs which are then outlined and addressed in policy. Economic, social, and psychological inequality for children is strongly correlated with parental incarceration (Murray et al., 2012). The experience of having a parent in prison is also highlighted as an ACE (adverse childhood experience) (Felitti et al., 1998). In an Irish study undertaken by Parkes and Donson (2018), the authors note that prison policy and prison authorities fail to see children and instead focus on the parents. Therefore, giving children a voice as a cohort in their own right paves the way for their voice to be heard.

The second key recommendation arising from this research is that the Department of Education include the subject of parental incarceration in the Irish curriculum starting at the primary school level. It is advised, within this, that teachers receive pertinent trauma-informed training on how to assist students in these situations in schools, much as teachers receive training on bereavement and other topics that affect students. Study findings suggest that schools and teachers may lack knowledge and guidance on how to support children of prisoners, and they may harbor prejudice, therefore stigmatising their students (Saunders & McArthur, 2020; Skinner-Osei & Levenson, 2018; Smith & Young, 2017). Teachers may respond to externalising trauma behaviors with punitive measures, which can further isolate children (Skinner-Osei & Levenson, 2018). Barnardo's recognise that children should not be penalised by their parents' actions (Barnardo's, 2022). To lessen any harm, isolation, and shame, Barnardo's offers specialised training to professionals in the United Kingdom, including prison workers and teachers (Barnardo's, 2022). It is possible to apply the lessons learned from Barnardo's in Ireland.

Thirdly, this research recommends that the Irish Prison Service implements child-friendly visiting arrangements to support the child-parent relationship. Findings in this article highlighted how prison systems impact children visiting their parents which interrupts the child-parent relationship. This impacts on children's attachment, development, and physical and mental wellbeing. In the Better Outcomes, Brighter Futures policy issued by the Irish Government, it states that the government will implement child-friendly prison visitations to facilitate the child-parent relationship (Department of Children, Equality, Disability, Integration and Youth, 2019, p.82). However, the Irish Citizens Information website notes that the monitoring procedures followed by Irish prisons can make visiting a parent in prison very stressful for a child (Citizensinformation.ie).

Fourthly, this study recommends that the use of non-custodial sentences is favored to reduce the harm caused to children. According to the Irish Penal Reform Trust (2021a, p.4), incarceration should only be used as a 'last resort' to protect children from the damages associated with a parent's incarceration. Accordingly, the results showed that children's access to services and other social opportunities, as well as their capacity to make ends meet, are all negatively impacted by parental incarceration (Saunders, 2017). Children are not the ones who require incarceration; rather, they are the ones who are indirectly punished for crimes that they did not commit. The Irish Penal Reform Trust (2021a) noted in the most recent PIPS report

that there has not been much progress made regarding the shortening of sentences and use of community punishments.

Fifth and finally, this study recommends that the Irish Government create a dedicated position for a social care worker or social worker to lessen the harm caused by parental incarceration, and this role should be mandated and should focus on early intervention. Study findings indicate that those who are close to a child may silence them because they could feel embarrassed or afraid to talk about their parent's incarceration. This can lead children to experience disenfranchised grief (Doka, 1999). According to Doka (1999), professionals are in the best position to comprehend disenfranchised grief and provide help for persons who experience bereavement. Here O'Malley and Devaney (2016) highlight that there is a lack of a social work role in the Irish context, whilst Phillips and O'Brien (2012) note that early intervention of social work may help respond to children's social, developmental, and emotional needs.

Limitations and Ethics

As this research is a desk-based study, there were limited ethical considerations. Empathy, sensitivity, and regard for people's actual experiences were considered at every stage of the research process. Another ethical factor considered was the researcher's biases. It is important as a researcher to be aware of your personal values, prejudices, and ideological beliefs (O'Leary, 2004). Jesson and Lacey (2006) point out that using a collection of selected literature reduces the likelihood of biases as this allows for more perspectives on the topic.

Conclusion

This study has critically examined, with a view to informing social care, key international texts on children and parental incarceration. By applying a thematic analysis, this study found that when a parent is imprisoned, their children can subsequently be negatively impacted in many ways. Oftentimes, these children are invisible to social care professionals, services, and policymakers. This study has suggested five key recommendations for Ireland, which may reduce the harm caused to children who experience a parent going to prison. The complexity of the inequity that these children experience is shown by this research, which also gives social care professionals the opportunity to investigate and promote practices and policies that would benefit these children. Recommendations of this study include policy improvements for children's rights, education policy and prison policy. Other key recommendations include a role for social care work and the use of non-custodial sentences.

References

- Ainsworth, M.S. (1979). Infant–mother attachment. *American Psychologist*, 34(10): 932-937.
- Akesson, B., McGregor Smyth, J., Mandell, D.J., Doan, T., Donina, K., & Hoven, C.W. (2012). Parental involvement with the criminal justice system and the effects on their children: A collaborative model for researching vulnerable families. *Social Work in Public Health*, 27(1-2):148-64. doi: 10.1080/19371918.2012.629898
- Arditti, J.A. (2005). Families and incarceration: An ecological approach. *Families in Society*, 86(2): 251-260. <https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.2460>
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M.J., Van Ijzendoorn, M.H., & Fennie, J. (2003). Less is more: Meta-analyses of sensitivity and attachment interventions in early childhood. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(2): 195-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.2.195>
- Barnardo's. 2022. *Children with a parent in prison*. <https://www.barnardos.org.uk/what-we-do/helping-families/children-with-a-parent-in-prison>
- Beckett, C., & Taylor, H. (2019). *Human growth and development*, 4th edn. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Bowen, G.A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2): 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment*, 2nd edition. New York, USA: Basic Books.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2): 77-101. Doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Citizensinformation.ie. (2022). *Visiting someone in prison*. Citizensinformation.ie. https://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/justice/prison_system/visiting_someone_in_prison.html
- Daly, J.S. (2003). A qualitative analysis of the supervisory working alliance as perceived by the supervisee. PhD diss., Alliant International University, San Diego ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- DeHart, D.D., & Altshuler, S.J. (2009). Violence exposure among children of incarcerated mothers. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 26(5): 467-479. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-009-0184-y>
- Department of Children, Equality, Disability, Integration and Youth. (2019). *Better outcomes brighter futures. The national policy framework for children & young people 2014 - 2020*. <<https://assets.gov.ie/23796/961bbf5d975f4c88adc01a6fc5b4a7c4.pdf>>
- Doka, K.J. (1999). Disenfranchised grief. *Bereavement Care*, 18(3): 37-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02682629908657467>
- Felitti, V.J., Anda, R.F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D.F., Spitz, A.M., Edwards, V., Koss, M.P., & Marks, J.S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 14(4): 245-258. Doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797\(98\)00017-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(98)00017-8)
- Flynn, S. (2020a). Convergent spaces: Intersectional analysis of ethnic minority status and childhood disability in Irish safeguarding work. *Child & Family Social Work*, 25(3): 648-656. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12739>
- Flynn, S. (2020b). Theorizing disability in child protection: Applying critical disability studies to the elevated risk of abuse for disabled children. *Disability & Society*, 35(6): 949-971. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1669433>
- Sackett, D.L., Scott, R.W., Rosenberg, W., & Haynes, B.R. (1997). Evidence-based medicine: How to practice & teach EBM. *Canadian Medical Association*, 157(6): 788. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.313.7069.1410>

- Howe, D. (2011). *Attachment across the lifecourse: A brief introduction*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Irish Penal Reform Trust. (2021b). *Piecing it together: Supporting children and families with a family member in prison in Ireland*. Dublin: Irish Penal Reform Trust.
- Irish Penal Reform Trust. (2019). *Progress in the penal system (PIPS): A framework for penal reform*. <https://pips.iprt.ie/site/assets/files/Progress-in-the-Penal-System-2019.pdf>
- Irish Penal Reform Trust. (2021a). *Progress in the penal system (PIPS): The need for transparency*. Dublin: Irish Penal Reform Trust.
- Irish Prison Service. (2018). *Irish prison service & probation service strategic plan 2018-2020*. https://www.irishprisons.ie/wp-content/uploads/documents_pdf/IPS-PS-Strategic-Plan-2018-2020.pdf
- Irish Prison Service. (2022). *Mission and values*. <https://www.irishprisons.ie/about-us/mission-and-values/>
- Jesson, J.K., & Lacey, F. (2006). How to do (or not to do) a critical literature review. *Pharmacy Education*, 6(2): 139-148. Doi: 10.1080/15602210600616218
- Kremer, K.P., Christensen, K.M., Stump, K.N., Stelter, R.L., Kupersmidt, J.B., & Rhodes, J.E. (2022). The role of visits and parent-child relationship quality in promoting positive outcomes for children of incarcerated parents. *Child & Family Social Work*, 27(2): 206-216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12872>
- Laakso, J., & Nygaard, J. (2012). Children of incarcerated parents: How a mentoring program can make a difference. *Soc Work Public Health*, 27(1-2):12-28. Doi: 10.1080/19371918.2012.629892
- Leeson, C., & Morgan, J. (2022). Children with a parent in prison in England and Wales: A hidden population of young carers. *Child Care in Practice*, 28(2): 196-209. Doi: 10.1080/13575279.2019.1680531
- McCrudden, E., Braiden, H.J., Sloan, D., McCormack, P., & Treacy, A. (2014). Stealing the smile from my child's face: A preliminary evaluation of the "being a dad" programme in a Northern Ireland prison. *Child Care in Practice*, 20(3): 301-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13575279.2013.865592>
- McLeod, D.A., Pharris, A.B., Marcus-Mendoza, S., Winkles, R.A.M., Chapman, R., & Fuller, C. (2021). Reducing trauma from behind bars: Enhancing parent-child attachment through a digitally distributed reading program. *The Prison Journal*, 101(5): 575-590. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00328855211048181>
- Morgan-Mullane, A. (2018). Trauma focused cognitive behavioural therapy with children of incarcerated parents. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 46(3): 200-209. Doi: 10.1007/s10615-017-0642-5
- Morris, P. (1965). *Prisoners and their families*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Murray, J., & Murray, L. (2010). Parental incarceration, attachment and child psychopathology. *Attachment & Human Development*, 12(4): 289-309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14751790903416889>
- Murray, J., Farrington, D.P., & Sekol, I. (2012). Children's antisocial behavior, mental health, drug use, and educational performance after parental incarceration. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(2): 175-210. doi: 10.1037/a0026407
- Nylander, P-A., Källström, A., & Hellfeldt, K. (2018). After a childhood with a parent in prison—relationships and well-being as a child and young adult. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, 14(1): 34-45. doi: 10.1108/ijph-12-2016-0074
- O'Leary, Z. (2004). *The essential guide to doing research*. London: Sage publications.

- O'Malley, S., & Devaney, C. (2016). Supporting incarcerated mothers in Ireland with their familial relationships; A case for the revival of the social work role. *Probation Journal*, 63(3): 293-309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550516648393>
- Aisling, P., & Donson, F. (2018). Developing a child's right to effective contact with a father in prison—an Irish perspective. *Child Care in Practice*, 24(2): 148-163. Doi: 10.1080/13575279.2017.1420039
- Phillips, S.D., & O'Brien, P. (2012). Learning from the ground up: Responding to children affected by parental incarceration. *Soc Work Public Health*, 27(1-2): 29-44. doi: 10.1080/19371918.2012.629914.
- Roberts, S., & Loucks, N. 2015. The role of schools in supporting families affected by imprisonment. *Law in Context*, 32(Jan 2015): 126-146.
- Saunders, V. (2017). Children of prisoners—children's decision making about contact. *Child & Family Social Work*, 22(52): 63-72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12281>
- Saunders, V., & McArthur, M. (2020). Representing children of prisoners in the public domain: Comparing children's views and policy documents. *Australian Social Work*, 73(1): 118-130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2018.1492623>
- Sheehan, R. (2010). Parental imprisonment and child protection: A study of children presented to the Melbourne children's court. *Australian Social Work*, 63(2): 164-178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03124070903265708>
- Skinner-Osei, P., & Levenson, J.S. (2018). Trauma-informed services for children with incarcerated parents. *Journal of Family Social Work*, 21(4-5): 421-437. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10522158.2018.1499064>
- Smith, C.J., & Young, D.S. (2017). A retrospective look at the experience of parental incarceration and family reentry during adolescence. *Social Work in Public Health*, 32(8): 475-488. Doi: 10.1080/19371918.2017.1360819
- Vernon-Kautz, S. (2017). Adolescent adaptation to parental incarceration. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 34(6): 557-572. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-017-0493-5>
- Wakefield, S., & Uggen, C. (2010). Incarceration and stratification. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36(1): 387-406. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102551>
- Western, B., & Pettit, B. (2010). Incarceration & social inequality. *Daedalus*, 139(3): 8-19.
- Zhang, J., & Flynn, C. (2020). University students/graduates who have experienced parental incarceration: A qualitative exploratory study of protective processes. *Qualitative Social Work*, 19(5-6): 882-900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1473325019888007>