

INCARCERATED MOTHERS: FROM THE VIEW OF
CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University-San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of SCIENCE

by

Danielle M. Bridges, B.B.S.

San Marcos, Texas
August 2013

INCARCERATED MOTHERS: FROM THE VIEW OF
CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

Committee Members Approved:

Joycelyn Pollock, Chair

Ollie Seay

Scott Bowman

Approved:

J. Michael Willoughby
Dean of the Graduate College

COPYRIGHT

By

Danielle Marika Bridges

2013

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgment. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of this work I, Danielle Bridges, authorize duplication of this work, in whole or in part, for educational or scholarly purposes only.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I first want to acknowledge Dr. Pollock for her hard work and rigorous editing to making this paper the best that it can be. I am very thankful that she is my thesis chair and I am so grateful that she stood by me to the very end. I also want to acknowledge Dr. Seay and Dr. Bowman who also helped me through this process. I also want to thank you both for being extremely patient with me. I also want to thank all of the correctional officers' and staff members at the Travis County Correctional Facility that assisted me in taking part in my survey and allowing me to use this location for my thesis. I am forever grateful to everyone that took part in making my thesis possible especially Michelle Elliott.

This manuscript was submitted on May 3, 2013.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I. OVERVIEW OF INCARCERATED MOTHERS.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Changes in Sentencing Laws.....	2
Characteristics of Incarcerated Mothers.....	2
Pregnancy & Prison Policies.....	5
Prison Nurseries.....	7
Effects on Children.....	10
Correctional Officers.....	17
Research Question.....	18
II. METHODS.....	19
Participants.....	19
Measures Used.....	21
Results.....	21
III. CONCLUSION.....	35
APPENDIX A: Survey.....	37
REFERENCES.....	41

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1. Demographics	20
2. Length of Employment By Gender.....	20
3. Survey Results	22
4. Correctional Officer Response By Gender By Age. Question: “It important to keep a mother with her children even if she is an offender”	24
5. Correctional Officer Response By Gender By Age. Question: “Non-violent female offenders should not be sent to a correctional facility if she had small children under two”	25
6. Correctional Officer Response By Gender By Age. Question: “Jail or prison parenting programs have a positive impact on children of inmate-mothers”	26
7. Correctional Officer Response By Gender By Age. Question: “Correctional facilities should offer parenting programs to inmate mothers”	27
8. Correctional Officer Response & Gender & Years at Facility. Question: “Inmate mothers can adequately mother their children from inside prison”	28
9. Correctional Officer Response & Gender & Years at Facility. Question: “A bond between mother and child can never be broken”	28
10. Correctional Officer Response & Gender & Years at Facility. Question: “It is acceptable for the state to put an incarcerated mother’s child up for adoption”	29

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF INCARCERATED MOTHERS

Introduction

The number of incarcerated women in the United States has increased dramatically compared to previous years. Oklahoma holds the highest incarceration rate of 130 per 100,000 in 2010 (Sentencing Project, 2010). The prison population of women has increased by 587% between 1980 and 2011; going from 15,118 to 111,387 (Cahalan, 1986; Carson & Sabol, 2012). Over the years the number of women in prison has increased 1.5 times the rate of men from 1980 to 2011 (Sentencing Project, 2012).

According to Carson and Sabol (2012), in 2011, approximately 65 out of every 100,000 women were in prison. The lifetime likelihood of a woman being sent to prison is 1 in 56, but race does play a factor with the rate being: 1 in 19 for African-American women, 1 in 45 for Hispanic women, and 1 in 18 for Caucasian women (Bonczar, 2003). According to Maruschak (2008), 64% of mothers who were sent to a state prison lived with their children before they were sent to prison. It is reported that 1 in 25 women in state prisons and 1 in 33 women in federal prisons enter while they are pregnant (Maruschak, 2008) and continue their pregnancy behind bars with strict prison policies. With the incarceration rates of women increasing, the trend in “mothering behind bars” is also on the rise. It is interesting that prisons in other countries try to encourage the bond between an incarcerated mother and child as to compared practices in the United States (Casey-Acevedo, Baskken, & Karle, 2004; Covington, 2002; Moe & Ferraro, 2006; as cited in Mignon & Ransford, 2012). The purpose of this thesis is to explore the struggles that incarcerated mothers face and the effects on their children. This research

will also address what is missing from previous literature which is how correctional staff views incarcerated mothers. The viewpoint from correctional staff can be beneficial to society and give society a better understanding of this population.

Changes in Sentencing Laws

The reasons for the increase in incarceration rates among women have been attributed to factors. The first contributing factor is the change from indeterminate sentencing to determinate sentencing. Indeterminate sentencing follows the notion of an “offender-based” policy, which allowed court officials to take into consideration the woman’s role in the offense and her criminal record when sentencing. External factors would also come into consideration, including her family role and the welfare of the children in the household while their mother is absent (Zimring, Hawkins, & Kamin, 2001; as cited in Kruttschnitt, 2010). However, with determinate sentencing, the focus is “offense-based.” This means judges are looking more at how often the offender has committed a crime and the severity of the crime, ignoring personal factors, motivations, and participation level.

The second contributing factor as to why more women are being incarcerated is the evolution of gender-neutral sentencing policies, in relation to the war on drugs, including mandatory sentences for certain drug related offenses. Many women who are incarcerated have reported using drugs before they were incarcerated, and also claim that they committed the offense to get money to purchase more drugs (Greenfeld & Snell, 1999; as cited in Zaitzow, 2001). Savelsberg (1992) notes the irony that men and women are now being treated with equality in regards to sentencing laws, but because of that, there is now an inequality for women who are also mothers.

Characteristics of Incarcerated Mothers

Due in large part to the drastic changes in sentencing and drug policies, more women, who are mothers, are being sent to jail and prison. A profile of incarcerated women would include the following: the average age is 34 years old, the majority are

unmarried (80%), undereducated (40%) and underemployed compared to males (Beck & Mumola, 1999; as cited in Zaitzow, 2001). Most likely these statistics have not changed over the years. The prevalence of incarcerated women and their children that they leave behind has been recognized in past years. For example, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, at midyear in 2007, there were approximately 65,600 women incarcerated at the federal and state level, and within this group of women it was reported that they were the mothers of 147,400 minor children.

When a mother is incarcerated, she is viewed as a bad mother and a bad woman (Allen, Flaherty & Ely, 2010). Mothers who enter the system often do not fit the idealized portrayal or role of motherhood, and as a result their needs as mothers are forgotten about. According to Berry and Smith-Mahdi (2006) “womanhood and motherhood are strongly linked and prescriptive role expectations for women do not include incarcerated women” (p.103). Incarcerated mothers undoubtedly feel that they are invisible to society, and in a way are “throwaway moms” (Allen, Flaherty & Ely, 2010). The Women in Prison Project (2006) reported and emphasized the lack of services available to incarcerated mothers—such as visitation with their children, parenting, and proximity of a mother’s location to that of her child. This population is unique in the sense that although these women do hold the status of being a mother, they are unable to fulfill their role as a mother in a traditional way (Berry & Smith-Mahdi, 2006). An incarcerated mother’s life without her children is just one of many obstacles she has to face. Incarcerated mothers also have other worries to overcome such as if their children are receiving the best care, if they will ever be a family again, and if after they are released they should tell their children why they had to go away and leave them behind (Houck & Loper, 2002). It is interesting that even though incarcerated mothers are viewed as different from non-incarcerated mothers, studies have shown that they are not significantly different (Radosh, 2004; LeFlore & Holston, 1989; as cited in Berry & Smith-Mahdi, 2006). Both groups of mothers strongly believe that it is important for

them to love and support their children, and do their best to guide them in appropriate behaviors and attitudes.

In a study conducted by Berry and Smith-Mahdi (2006), incarcerated mothers were interviewed and asked how they defined the word mother and how they fulfilled their roles as mothers from prison. The results from the study fit into traditional views of motherhood as well as not-so-traditional views of motherhood. Traditional definitions of the word “mother” emerged such as: friend/confidant (13%), loves their children (74%), someone who cares for their children (52%), and teaches them/disciplines them (22%), just to name a few (p.111). The non-traditional responses to the definition of the word “mother” were very unusual. A few examples are as follows: “a mother is a hand of God,” “a mother is a woman who doesn’t go to prison,” and 3% of these women stated that “a mother was merely someone who gives birth” (p.112).

In response to how these mothers fulfill their role as a mother while incarcerated, some identities/ unique behaviors emerged. Examples identified by Berry and Smith-Mahdi (2006) include, “self-improving incarcerated mother,” “the traditional incarcerated mother,” and “the optimistic incarcerated mother.” The self-improving mother used her time in prison to improve herself and read self-help books on how to become a better mother to help her once she is released from prison. This identity/behavior is different from the traditional incarcerated mother who continues to counsel with, listen to, disciplines, and expresses her love for her children from prison and doesn’t necessarily believe she needs that much improvement. The optimistic, incarcerated mother is closely related to the traditional incarcerated mother but kept a more positive mindset, and generally used her time drawing pictures, writing poetry, and continually speaking with her children and expressing her love for them. The results of this study showed that incarcerated mothers are not that different from non-incarcerated mothers and both groups generally define motherhood as caring and showing love toward their children.

The study conducted by Berry and Smith-Mahdi (2006) provides new insight to the struggles that incarcerated mothers face on a daily basis. These struggles include having their motherhood put into question and their struggle with being basically invisible to society. The children that are left behind need to have continuous contact with their mother in order to sustain some kind of stability within the family. They concluded that more awareness and knowledge of incarcerated mothers' family relations need to be incorporated into institutional practices to maintain supportive relationships among family members (Enroos, 2011).

Pregnancy & Prison Policies

Since there is an increase in the number of women who are mothers being incarcerated, it should be no surprise that there is an increase in women who are giving birth while serving time. It is estimated that about 9% of incarcerated women give birth while they are incarcerated (Knight & Plugge, 2005a, 2005b; Nelson, 2006; as cited in Chambers, 2009). Since the majority of prisons are located in remote areas, it is often difficult for a pregnant inmate-patient to seek the appropriate medical attention that she needs due to transportation issues from the prison. Because prison policies are extremely punitive, mothers and their babies are forcibly separated from one another immediately after birth. As a result, for approximately 50% of all incarcerated mothers, this forced separation becomes permanent (Chambers, 2009).

Some prisons still shackle pregnant inmates during transport to the hospital and immediately before and after birth. Vainik (2008) suggests that the use of shackling for a pregnant woman should only be used if, "a woman has a history of violent behavior and has made attempts to escape from prison" (p.686). However, even in those cases using shackles is unsafe, and if restraints are needed, they should be soft restraints. Under no circumstances should an inmate be shackled especially during labor or delivery (Vainik, 2008). In a typical prison hospital there are approximately 15 beds, and in some units the

women are not shackled to the beds but they are locked in the room with guards patrolling the halls (Chambers, 2009).

Most inmates give birth in an outside hospital. Under prison policies, there is little time for mother and infant to bond and form an attachment. After a mother has given birth, she is quickly transported back to a secure prison facility while her newborn is taken to a hospital nursery. The mothers of these newborns do not get to see them until 2 to 3 days later when they have to say goodbye (Chambers, 2009). These newborns are then sent out to family members, fathers, adoption agencies, or foster care to be taken care of. The psychological impact that forced separation has on the mother has been ignored. It is expected that the majority of these mothers feel grief, pain, loss and anxiety.

Chambers (2009) conducted a study concluding that women feel/deal with the forced separation in different ways. A few examples of how these women cope/feel are as follows: “everything was great until I birthed,” “feeling empty and missing a part of me,” and “I don’t try to think too far in advance” (Chambers, 2009, p.207). From the themes that emerged from this study, it is clear that these women undergo a great deal of pain and struggle with the forced separation. These women are in need of counseling that specifically addresses the psychological problems that they face during pregnancy and after the separation of their newborn (Kubiak, Kasiborski, & Schmittl, 2010; Ferszt & Erickson-Owens, 2008; Wooldredge & Masters, 1993).

It has been speculated that some prison policies violate an inmate’s rights. The two main rights that are viewed as violated for incarcerated mothers would be the Fourteenth Amendment due to the separation of mother and child, and the Eighth Amendment due to the lack of prenatal care (Vainik, 2008). Prenatal medical care is crucial and needed in order to monitor the pregnancy for any complications that would put a mother and her baby at “high risk.” According to Vainik (2008), there are two main reasons why prenatal care is so critical. First, most of these women who enter prison are prior drug users who need medical care to ensure that she and the baby are healthy and no

complications have surfaced. Second, there are certain things a pregnant woman needs to have in order to have a comfortable pregnancy such as: clothes that fit, the right types of food, an accessible bathroom, and, especially, sleep (p.685). Unfortunately, due to the prison setting and strict policies, the need for prenatal care is not seen as a top priority.

Prison Nurseries

Prison nursery programs give incarcerated mothers the opportunity to bond and care for their infant while being incarcerated. Prison nursery programs can encourage rehabilitation, in addition to “providing the physical closeness and supportive environment necessary for the development of secure attachment between mothers and their infants” (Smith Goshin & Woods Byrne, 2009, p.272). Prison nursery programs have been around since the 1890s, but do not exist in most states. In past years, women who were pregnant or who newly delivered were sent to a community facility if she met the crime and sentence length criteria (Shepard & Zemans, 1950). Perceptions about prison nurseries have fluctuated throughout history. A national survey in 1948 found that thirteen states allowed incarcerated mothers to keep their children with them; however, by 1970 many states had eliminated their prison nurseries (Radosh, 1988). According to Brodie (1982) and Radosh (1988), reasons for the repeal of prison nurseries included such things as: concerns related to security, liability, the potential effects of the prison environment on the child, and the stress of separation when the child has to leave. In theory, having a prison nursery would be the ideal solution to the issue of incarcerating mothers but, in reality, institutional facilities already are overburdened (Baunach, 1986). Another survey in 1987 found that only Suriname, Liberia, the Bahamas, and the United States separated incarcerated mothers and their infants (Kauffman, 2006).

In this day and age prison nurseries are on the rise. In 1998 a survey showed that New York, Nebraska, and South Dakota reported having functional prison nursery programs (Pollock, 2002). The rise continued, and in 2001, a survey revealed that four new states had prison nursery programs including Massachusetts, Montana, Ohio, and

Washington State. By 2008 eight states had prison nursery programs in at least one of their women's prison facilities which included: California, Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, South Dakota, and Washington State (Carlson, 2001; de Sa, 2006; Kauffman, 2006; Rowland & Watts, 2007; South Dakota Department of Corrections, n.d.; Stern, 2004; as cited in Smith Goshin & Woods Byrne, 2009).

Due to the small number of states that have prison nursery programs, it is very difficult to get into a program (Smith Goshin & Woods Byrne, 2009). Another issue that arises when gaining access into a prison nursery program is the strict eligibility criteria that are set by each state (Boudoris, 1996; Johnston, 1995; as cited by Smith Goshin & Woods Byrne, 2009). However, wardens are able to make exceptions for certain situations that are not specifically addressed in the law. As stated by Smith Goshin and Woods Byrne (2009), the general criteria for entry into a nursery program would include: "women who enter prison pregnant, were convicted of a non-violent crime, and were sentenced to a term of less than 18 to 24 months after the birth of their infant" (p.281). The specific criteria for the nature of the crime and sentence length are taken into consideration on a case by case basis.

In addition to criteria for incarcerated mothers to apply to nursery programs, there are also certain situations in which they are not allowed to apply at all. One situation in which an application will automatically be denied is if there is a history of child maltreatment which is often associated with this group (Smith Goshin & Woods Byrne, 2009). Even though many would agree that child abuse history is an important factor to determine if a woman should gain access into a prison nursery program, there are a few who view things differently. For instance Johnston (1995) claims that, "the use of child abuse history discriminates against minority mothers because child protective laws are disproportionately enforced, and crime type should not be used as it often does not reflect a person's actual crime" (as cited in Smith Goshin & Woods Byrne, 2009, p.281). Johnston (1995) also suggests that any mother who intends to fulfill the primary

caregiver role once released should be eligible for entry into a prison nursery program regardless of her crime and history. Kauffman (2006) also found, as Johnston (1995), that any inmate who plans to take primary responsibility for their children should be accepted even with a history of violence or child maltreatment.

Previous research has shown that prison nursery programs are effective. For example Carlson (2001), surveyed 43 women in Nebraska's nursery and found that, "95% stated that they had a stronger bond with their child as a result of the program, 95% stated that if given the same choice they would enter the program again"(p.278). There is a concern that children who spend a great deal of time in prison will begin to accept it as a normative setting (Drummond, 2000). However, it should be noted that this viewpoint lacks research evidence. Overall, there is evidence that supports the effectiveness of prison nurseries. However, some changes could be made to improve the child's development. Smith Goshin and Woods Byrne (2009) made the suggestion that prison nurseries should be more than a housing unit where the infant can co-reside with their mother, and should also incorporate age-appropriate stimulant materials to improve child development.

Infant and toddler age children could benefit most with stimulating materials in the sleeping and recreation areas, and community members who specialize in infant/toddler care would provide additional insight into how the nursery can be more effective. It has also been suggested by Smith Goshin and Woods Byrne (2009) that the current conservative approach to only admitting low risk mothers into nursery programs is not extremely beneficial to this population as a whole, because there are more women in need of this service that are high risk. Instead, an approach should be focused on creating a prison nursery with a therapeutic nursery philosophy. They advise that this approach would require, "resources to supervise and guide even higher-risk mothers to more positive parenting practices in a non-punitive environment" (Smith Goshin & Woods Byrne, 2009, p.289). Regardless of the approach that is taken, at the current time

prison nursery programs are still a creative and effective strategy to improve the bond between an incarcerated mother and her child.

It would be assumed that, since prison nurseries are on site where the mother is located, it would be easier for the mother and child to bond. However, this assumption has been challenged, and it is uncertain if the struggles the incarcerated mother faces are decreased with the child being in close proximity. In a study conducted by Luther and Gregson (2011), they concluded that “women’s decision making power as mothers was decreased and their capacity for creating a sense of home and family was diminished” (p.91). This was due to numerous prison policies that restricted mothers from making decisions about such things as: where the mothers could park their strollers, what their children could eat, who could touch their children, contacting the doctor, and choosing what bed their baby could sleep in. Many of the women were outraged that they were not allowed to decide what food their child could eat even if they had relatives pay for the food and bring it to the facility, or even if they themselves were provided money from WIC (Women, Infants, and Children).

Two major tensions that were found in the study were that women were angry that they were not allowed to sleep with their babies or allowed to decorate their cells to make it more of a home environment. These women were upset that they were learning parenting skills in their classes, but were restricted from putting any of those skills into practice by doing such things as trying to make a home-like environment. This study suggests that even though these mothers are trying to be good mothers and take what they have learned into practice, the fact still remains that they are parenting within a prison and are restricted from living up to their mothering ideal (Luther & Gregson, 2011).

Effects on Children

Hagan and Foster (2012) compiled numerous studies and presented a list of reasons why maternal incarceration has more negative effects on children than paternal incarceration. First, during early childhood, mothers are more likely than fathers to spend

more time with the child, and as a result, her absence creates a greater deprivation (Murnane, Maynard, & Ohls, 1981). Second, when a mother is incarcerated, it is unlikely that the child will remain in the care of their father, but instead be sent to another family member or end up in foster care (Glaze & Maruschak, 2008; Johnson & Waldfogel, 2004; Mumola, 2000). Third, most female prisons are located in remote areas that are miles from their children, and, as a result, it is less likely that they are able to receive visits from their children due to transportation complications (Coughenour, 1995). Fourth, children of incarcerated mothers over time are exposed to more risks in the home environment which puts them at a greater disadvantage than those children who remain with their mother while their father is incarcerated (Johnson & Waldfogel, 2004). Fifth, children who lived with their mothers prior to her incarceration have a higher chance of witnessing incarceration-related events such as being present at sentencing, compared to children whose father is incarcerated (Dallaire & Wilson, 2010). Lastly, previous research using teachers as the source of information about the children of incarcerated parents has found that maternal incarceration poses more threats to the child's social development compared to paternal incarceration (Dallaire et al. 2010).

Children of incarcerated mothers are at a higher risk for taking part in criminal behavior as they get older (Amlund Hagen, Myers & Mackintosh, 2005; Brody, Nagin, Tremblay, Bates, Brame & Dodge, 2003; Johnston, 1995; Myers et al. 1999; Sameroff, Guttman, & Peck, 2003; as cited in Lotze et al. 2010). A theoretical foundation that can put this process into a clearer perspective would be life course theory. Strong family relationships play a major role in how a child will act in adolescence and later in adulthood. Hagan and Palonni (1990) make a point that a negative event (like the incarceration of their mother) can begin a negative pathway of events that lead a child to become a delinquent. According to Sandifer (2008), life course theory is unique because it has the ability to focus on more than one aspect of life and on more than one relationship.

Life course theory explores how both parenting and the parent-child relationship can play a part in the criminal behavior of the incarcerated mother and her children. This theory supports and gives a direct focus to how increasing parenting skills can have a positive effect on an incarcerated mother's child (Sandifer, 2008). Life course theory also identifies ineffective parenting characteristics including, "lack of parent-child involvement, emotional ties, supervision, or discipline; parental absence and parental criminality; harsh, inconsistent, or ineffective communication or discipline; parental rejection; rigid control; and inability to set behavioral limits" (Sandifer, 2008, p.425; also see Farrington, 1986; Glueck & Glueck, 1950; Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986; Patterson, Reid, & Dishon, 1992).

Children with incarcerated parents, especially mothers, have a higher chance of having developmental issues (Lotze, Ravindran, & Myers, 2010). As noted by multiple sources these issues could include things such as: "externalizing disorders, internalizing disorders, school dropout, delinquency, and an increased risk of law breaking as adults" (Amlund Hagen, Myers, & Mackintosh, 2005; Brody, Nagin, Tremblay, Bates, Brame, & Dodge, 2003; Johnston, 1995; Myers et al. 1999; Sameroff, Guttman, & Peck, 2003; as cited in Lotze et al. 2010, p.702). School aged children of incarcerated mothers have difficulties at home and at school that can affect their academic performance and family relationships (Green & Scholes, 2004; Myers, Smarsh, Hagen, & Kennon, 1999; as cited in Lotze et al. 2010). When the child lives in an unstable environment, the child may develop insecure attachments with others which can result in negative effects as the child gets older (Poehlmann, 2005).

It seems that no matter how old the child is when their mother is sent to prison, detrimental effects occur. If contact cannot be consistent there is a chance that a mother may lose her motivation to become a better mother, and her children may begin to form negative perceptions about her from family members or friends that are unrealistic or untrue (Johnston & Straus, 1999). There is some speculation that children whose mothers

are incarcerated are better off without their criminal mothers in their lives, however, most research indicates that children whose mothers are incarcerated are greatly affected by it. Mothers play a key role in the household, and it is almost always presumed that when a father goes to prison, the children are in the care of the mother, but when a mother goes to prison, the children are in the care of relatives or some sort of foster care. When a child is passed over to a relative there are advantages and disadvantages. Some advantages to keeping the child within the family are that family members are more inclined to keep the connection between the child and the mother and visit her in prison regularly.

Another advantage that has been found is that these children also have higher feelings of being loved and safety than do children who end up in foster care (Hairston, 1999; as cited in Mackintosh, Myers, & Kennon, (2006). However, there are a few disadvantages of having children stay with relatives. It is most common that the grandparents become the caregivers of these children, and in reality the grandparents are typically older and less educated with no up-to-date teaching techniques, compared to foster parents who are monitored by the state and may be better trained to care for the children (Mackintosh, Myers, & Kennon, (2006). Some could argue that these children are better off within the foster care system.

How a child handles their emotions when faced with difficult situations is critical. Emotional self-regulation is important when it comes to managing emotions. Poor emotional self-regulation can be associated with internalized behavioral problems (Cole, Zahn-Waxler, Fox, Usher, & Welsh, 1996; Nelson, Martin, Hodge, Havill, & Kamphaus, 1999; Rubin, Coplan, Fox, & Calkins, 1995; as cited in Lotze et al. 2010). An example of a child with poor emotional regulation presented by Shields and Cicchetti (2001) is a child who cannot restrain themselves from crying or expressing that they are frightened and is sad most of the time. As a result, because this child is so easily overwhelmed by their emotions, they are at high risk for teasing and rejection by others. Lotze et al. (2010) agree that, “poor emotion regulation, combined with the experiences of maternal

incarceration, may put a child at much greater risk for behavior problems than anyone of these factors by themselves” (p.703).

The most common emotions that children of incarcerated mothers feel are anger, fear, depression, anxiety, and frustration (Snyder, 2009). Studies have also shown that, if a child witnesses their mother’s arrest, they have a higher chance of suffering from posttraumatic stress disorder and fear of state agents or court officials (Hannon, Martin & Martin, 1984; Kampfner, 1995; LaPoint, Pickett, & Harris, 1985; Myers, Smarsh, Amlund-Hagen, & Kennon, 1999; as cited in Snyder, 2009). It has been reported that most children of incarcerated mothers are disruptive in the classroom, are often suspended, fail classes, become antisocial, or have aggression problems with peers, and eventually drop out of school altogether (Johnston, 1995; Myers, Smarsh, Amlund-Hagen, & Kennon, 1999; as cited in Minhyo Cho, 2009).

Infants and toddlers are not the only ones who experience negative effects due to their mothers’ incarceration. According to Hagan and Foster (2012) studies have shown that children whose mother is imprisoned are less likely to attend college and, if they do they are less likely to graduate. The statistics show that, “if as few as 6% of the mothers in a school are imprisoned, the overall rate of graduation for other children in the school is reduced from about 40 to 30%, and when 10% of the mothers in a school are imprisoned, the graduation rate is reduced to about 25%” (Hagan & Foster, 2012, p.60).

As previously stated, there are many effects on children when the mother is absent due to her incarceration, there are also effects that are present even after the mother is reunited with her children. Due to the major changes in child welfare policy that became effective in the 1990s, maternal child reunification has become extremely difficult. The Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) introduced the “15 of 22” rule which, “mandated petition of termination of parental rights for children in out-of-home placement for a total of 15 of 22 months” (Kubiak, Kasiborski, Karim, & Schmittl, 2012).

For women whose sentences go beyond this time frame, regaining custody of their children becomes very difficult on top of other challenges like finding employment, housing, and possible relapses on drugs and/or alcohol (Phillips, Gleeson, & Waites-Garrett, 2009). If those issues were not enough, a released inmate mother also has to face the issues of reentering into the community. Community barriers that include “high unemployment, unsafe or unaffordable housing, and lack of mental health and/or substance abuse treatment may exacerbate successful reentry” (Freudenberg, Daniels, Crum, Perkins, & Richie, 2005; Messina, Burdon, Hagopian, & Prendergast, 2004; O’Brien, 2001, as cited in Kubiak et al. 2012). According to Kubiak et al. (2012), the complications and frustration that these women are faced with may cause them to reoffend and continue to have involvement with the criminal justice and child welfare system.

In order for incarcerated mothers to have a fighting chance at successfully rebuilding the relationship they have with their children upon release, correctional facilities need to implement parenting programs. Increasing an incarcerated mother’s parenting skills while they are doing time may increase their ability to be an effective parent once they resume their parenting responsibilities (Sandifer, 2008). Parenting programs for inmate mothers in past years have been criticized for, “lacking consistency, uniformity, and evaluation as well as teaching ideal parenting goals without providing actual parent-child interactional experiences in which to apply parenting skills” (Johnston, 1995; as cited in Sandifer, 2008).

According to Sandifer (2008) current parenting programs are lacking for two main reasons. One main reason is that they fail to combine classroom parent education, and the opportunity for the mother and child to interact so the mother can practice her newly learned skills. The second main reason why parenting programs are lacking is because they do not address the women’s drug and alcohol dependence issues. Most of these women are incarcerated for a drug-or alcohol-related offenses and, once released,

mothers will have to combat those addictions and try not to relapse. Sandifer (2008) highlights the fact that, “teaching skills and improving mother-child relationships are an important component of rehabilitative correctional programming for women” (p.426).

In order for parenting programs to be effective, trained correctional staff should encourage these women to participate in these programs, and emphasize that these programs have a family focus to better improve their family. As a result, if a parenting program is successful, more specialized programs could be added like a parenting program specifically for parenting children of certain ages (young children or teenagers) (Mignon & Ransford, 2012). Having specialized parenting education could also help the incarcerated mothers’ state of mind so she will not experience as much stress about how to be a parent and relate to her children. According to Sandifer (2008) parenting programs can improve incarcerated mothers’ emotional and mental health issues because the majority of their mental health needs coincide with family relationships.

In addition, to having a parenting program, Mignon and Ransford (2012) suggest working with local social services agencies to assist with visitation services. These services could help families in finding transportation to get the children to the correctional facility more often to encourage mothers and their children to bond. Mignon and Ransford (2008) also believe that, “social service agencies can provide a bridge back for women into their local communities and assist in setting up services to prepare for reentry” (p.83).

In conclusion, it is clear from research that incarcerated mothers face a tremendous amount of struggles. One of these struggles includes not being able to see their children. In contrast, if they are allowed to see their children, these mothers struggle with the restrictions in place that make it almost impossible to make meaningful connections with their children. However, what is not clear from research is how correctional staff views incarcerated mothers. Correctional staff members spend the most

time with this population and could provide valuable insight on what could be improved for this population.

Correctional Officers

Correctional officers play a vital role in the criminal justice system. Correctional officers have a huge impact on inmates and how well they adapt to the prison environment. Vuolo and Kruttschnitt (2008) agree that, “correctional officers are the most visible and important connection prisoners have to the outside world” (p.309). Correctional officers have a very demanding job that requires them to interact with all kinds of people and their personalities. There are not that many recent studies that have focused strictly on the interactions between correctional officers and inmates, and there are even fewer recent studies that focus on interactional differences between male and female inmates and correctional officers. Some correctional officers are able to establish a positive relationship with inmates and gain their respect, and some officers fail to do so and have a hard time getting an inmate to cooperate (Vuolo & Kruttschnitt, 2008).

Female inmates are the fastest growing population within corrections and they are the most understudied (Kruttschnitt & Gartner, 2003). Some studies that have been conducted in past years have found some common trends or patterns in relation to how female inmates act from the perception of correctional officers. They found that female inmates tend to be, “emotional, manipulative, and impulsive, and they pose relatively little danger” (Britton, 2003; Carlen, 1983, 1985, 1998; Pollock, 1986; Rasche, 2001; as cited in Vuolo & Kruttschnitt, 2008, p.311). Research indicates that females tend not to hide their emotion, which puts correctional officers in a complicated situation. Pollock (1984) found that correctional staff felt that they had to watch how they said things or phrased things when talking to a female inmate. They also felt that they had to be more sensitive towards female inmates to avoid a bad situation. Some possible reasons as to why these women are so emotional and act the way that they do is because they are trying to express, “a cry for help, desire for attention, or attempts at manipulation through

provocation, intimidation, or sympathy” (Pollock, 1984, p.88). However, the officials who were involved in that study do strongly believe that women in a correctional setting are more emotional in general simply because they are women.

Research Question

Women often have the stereotype of being more emotional, compared to men who are known more to hide their emotions with withdrawal or physical activity (Pollock, 1984). Incarcerated mothers can be even more complicated for a correctional officer to deal with. It has also been found in past studies that the negative stereotypes that are associated with women in general have an even greater negative effect on incarcerated mothers (Beckerman, 1991; Mahan, 1982; Mann, 1984; as cited in Schram, 1999). Prison systems lack services to incarcerated mothers to help them emotionally cope with being separated from their children (Baunach, 1985). In conclusion there is some literature on how correctional officers view incarcerated women in general, but there is still a need for research that explores how correctional officers view incarcerated mothers. This study aims to provide insight into how correctional officers view incarcerated mothers.

A possible hypothesis for this study could be that female correctional officers will be more lenient on incarcerated mothers. This would make sense because the stereotype in American society is that women are seen as the primary caregivers in comparison to males. As a result of women being the primary caregiver it is generally understood that a mother has a stronger bond with the children, and mothers tend to stand by one another because they all have the same mindset that they would do anything for their children. So the results of this study should reflect the stereotypical views of society that women, specifically mothers, will be more lenient on one another and female correctional officers may feel more inclined to assist incarcerated mothers compared to male correctional officers.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

Participants

The sample for this study consisted of 21 correctional officers who all work at The Travis County Correctional Facility. The Travis County Correctional Facility was chosen because I had the opportunity to do an internship there within the programs department so the facility was familiar to me. The Travis County Correctional Facility houses both male and female inmates who range from minimum to maximum security. Correctional officers were chosen for this study because their voice is somewhat muted in most previous literature in relation to incarcerated mothers. The absence of the view of correctional officers when dealing with this specific population seems ironic since correctional officers deal with this population more hours on a daily basis than other professionals.

Within the correctional staff two shifts are made throughout the day: A shift and B shift. A shift begins early in the morning around 5:45 a.m. and lasts until around 2 p.m. B shift begins around 2 p.m. and goes until late at night. The survey was distributed to both A shift and B shift to those who volunteered to take the survey. During the A shift morning briefing there were about 35 correctional officers present, and out of that group of 35 only 12 people volunteered to take the survey and all of the 12 returned the survey. During the B shift afternoon briefing there were about 30 correctional officers present, and out of that group of 30 only 9 people volunteered to take the survey and all of the

9 returned the survey. Out of this total group of 21 correctional officers 43% were female and 52% were male. However, it should be noted that one (5%) correctional officer who participated in the study did not provide demographic information. Out of the 21 participants there was a wide age range. Age ranges were broken down into the categories of: 20-35, 35-50, 50-65, and 65-80.

Table 1

Demographics

Age	20-35	35-50	50-65	65-80
Female	5 (24%)	4 (19%)		
Male	3 (14%)	6 (29%)	2 (10%)	

Note: the gender & age of one participant is unknown

The majority of females (24%) fell under the age range of 20-35, and most males (29%) fell under the age range of 35-50. The other females (19%) fell under the 35-50 age range and no females fell under the 50-65 or 65-80 range. The males, on the other hand, had more variability with 14% in the 20-35 age range, and 10% in the 50-65 age range. Like the females, none were in the 65-80 age range.

How long a correctional officer has been employed at the facility was also different by gender. Length of employment was broken down into ranges by years which were: 6 months- 1 year, 2-5 years, 5-8 years, 8-11 years, and over 11 years.

Table 2

Length of Employment By Gender

Years	6 Month- 1	2-5	5-8	8-11	Over 11
Female	5 (24%)		1 (5%)		3 (14%)
Male	1 (5%)	3 (14%)	3 (14%)	1 (5%)	3 (14%)

Note: the gender & years of one participant is unknown

The majority of females (24%) fell under the 6 months to 1 year range while (14%) fell in the “over 11” year range with 14%. Males, on the other hand, had at least one correctional officer under each range. The 2-5 year range, 5-8 year range, and the over 11 year range all had 14% of officers reporting membership. The rest of the males fell under the 6 months -1 year range with 5% and the 8-11 year range with 5%.

Measures Used

This study is an exploratory study that was designed to gain insight into how correctional officers view incarcerated mothers. In order to do this each volunteered correctional officer was given The Correctional Officer Insight survey. In the beginning of the survey, respondents were asked to provide demographic information such as their sex and approximate age. The following questions were designed to get a better understanding of their experience working at the facility and how often they interact with women in general and also with incarcerated mothers. The next portion of the study consisted of 12 questions that were answered on a Likert scale, and the final section consisted of three open ended questions to get a better insight into their view of incarcerated mothers.

Results

As an exploratory study it is important to establish how much do correctional officers come into contact with incarcerated mothers. To begin, respondents were asked which inmate population (male or female) they most often come into contact with. Out of the group, 57% of the correctional officers mostly worked with males, and 33% of the correctional officers worked with females. Next, it was important to establish how frequently correctional officers come into contact with incarcerated mothers. The majority of correctional officers (43%) worked with incarcerated mothers “often,” other correctional officers (33%) said they “occasionally” worked with incarcerated mothers, and only 19% expressed that they worked with incarcerated mothers “sometimes.” This further provides evidence that there is a lack of interaction with the female population in general. However, it is interesting that even though only 33% of correctional officers’ worked primarily with female inmates, 43% of correctional officers’ work with incarcerated mothers “often.” Maybe this is due to more women are frequently transported to parenting programs, visitation, or visits to the health clinic.

Total results from the Likert scale type questions are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Survey Results

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
It is important to keep a mother with her children even if she is an offender		4 (19%)	4 (19%)	10 (48%)	3 (14%)
Non-violent female offenders should not be sent to a correctional facility if she had small children under two		2 (10%)	2(10%)	12 (57%)	5 (24%)
A bond between mother and child can never be broken	2 (10%)	3 (14%)	6 (29%)	8 (38%)	2 (10%)
An inmate mother should be able to regain custody of her children once released		9 (43%)	10 (48%)	2 (10%)	
Inmate mothers can adequately mother their children from inside prison			2 (10%)	13 (62%)	7 (33%)
It is acceptable for the state to put an incarcerated mother's child up for adoption	2 (10%)	7 (33%)	8 (38%)	1 (5%)	3 (14%)
Correctional facilities should offer parenting programs to inmate mothers	12 (57%)	5 (24%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	
Jail or prison parenting programs have a positive impact on inmate mothers	5 (24%)	7 (33%)	9 (43%)		
Jail or prison parenting programs have a positive impact on children of inmate-mothers	4 (19%)	4 (19%)	11 (52%)	1 (5%)	
Inmate mothers (except those convicted of child abuse) should be allowed special visitation with their children	2 (10%)	8 (38%)	6 (29%)	4 (19%)	1 (5%)
Visitation from their children has a positive impact on the inmate mother	7 (33%)	11 (52%)	3 (14%)		
Visitation from the inmate mother has a positive impact on her children	4 (19%)	7 (33%)	7 (33%)	3 (14%)	

Correctional officers were asked to agree or disagree with, “An inmate mother should be able to regain custody of her children once released,” and 48% of officers chose *neutral* while 43% *agreed* and 10% *disagreed*. Correctional officers were asked to agree or disagree with: “Jail or prison parenting programs have a positive impact on inmate mothers.” Again, a large percentage, (43%) chose *neutral*, and 33% chose *agree*, and 24% chose *strongly agree*. The majority of questions that officers chose *neutral* on all have something to do with whether the mother will still have a positive impact on her children either while still incarcerated or once released.

Many correctional officers disagreed with the question: “Inmate mothers can adequately mother their children from inside prison.” About 62% of correctional officers chose *disagree*, 33% chose *strongly disagree*, and only 10% chose *neutral*. Correctional officers evidently do not believe that a mother cannot parent her children while being incarcerated. Another example would be the question, “Non-violent female offenders should not be sent to a correctional facility if she had small children under two.” The majority (about 57%) chose *disagree*, and 24% chose *strongly disagree*, leaving a tie with answer choices of *agree* and *neutral* with 10% each. The same conclusion that was drawn from the previous question can apply here as well only in this case correctional officers *strongly agree* that even non-violent offenders, should be sent to a correctional facility even if it means leaving behind small children.

In terms of questions where the answer choice of *agree* was used the highest, only three questions had this response. An example would be, “Visitation from their children has a positive impact on her children,” with 52% choosing *agree*, 33% choosing *strongly agree*, and only 14% choosing *neutral*. The result from this question shows that even though some correctional officers don’t agree that a mother can adequately take on a parent role while incarcerated, they do agree that visitation helps the mother. So many officers could support visitation because, hopefully, a mother seeing her children will make her want to not return to incarceration, but instead be with her children.

Another question that had interesting results was: “Visitation from the inmate mother has a positive impact on her children,” where both *agree* and *neutral* had the same number of responses (33%), 19% chose *strongly agree*, and 14% chose *disagree*. Overall visitation between the mother and her children seem to be viewed positively among correctional officers. On the question, “Correctional facilities should offer parenting programs to inmate mothers,” 57% chose *strongly agree*, and 24% chose *agree*, and *neutral* and *disagree* were both at 10%. The majority of correctional officers clearly

view parenting programs as an essential part of helping the mother become a better parent to her children.

The next part of the research assessed whether the gender and age of the officer affected the answer choice.

Table 4

Correctional Officer Response By Gender By Age

Question: “It is important to keep a mother with her children even if she is an offender”

Female

Age	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20-35		1 (5%)		3 (14%)	1 (5%)
35-50			1 (5%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)
50-65					
65-80					

Male

Age	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20-35		1 (5%)		2 (10%)	
35-50		1 (5%)	3 (14%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
50-65		1 (5%)		1 (5%)	
65-80					

Note: the gender & age of one participant is unknown but chose *disagree*.

For the statement, “It is important to keep a mother with her children even if she is an offender,” most *neutral* responses were from males between the ages of 35-50 (14% of respondents). However, more females than males regardless of age, did not agree that a mother should be able to have her children with her if she is an offender. Only one woman agreed with the statement and one offered a *neutral* response and the remaining women either disagreed or strongly disagreed. In comparison three men (one from each of the age groups except for 65-80) agreed with this statement. This is interesting because one would think that women (who are often mothers) would advocate keeping the mother and her child together at all costs. However, these results reflect the view that female

correctional officers believe that a mother who is an offender should not be kept with her children.

Gender and age of the officer were also examined with the question: “Non-violent female offenders should not be sent to a correctional facility if she had small children under two.”

Table 5

Correctional Officer Response By Gender By Age

Question: “Non-violent female offenders should not be sent to a correctional facility if she had small children under two”

Female

Age	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20-35			1 (5%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)
35-50				3 (14%)	1 (5%)
50-65					
65-80					

Male

Age	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20-35			1 (5%)	2 (10%)	
35-50		1 (5%)		4 (19%)	1 (5%)
50-65		1 (5%)		1 (5%)	
65-80					

Note: the gender & age of one participant is unknown but chose *strongly disagree*

For this question, age did not seem to matter; however, again, women seemed to be more likely than men to disagree that being a mother should affect women’s sentencing. Once again, all women, except one, either disagreed or strongly disagreed. There were two men who agreed that women with small children under the age of two should not be separated and fewer men strongly disagreed. It is interesting to note that only males agreed that non-violent female offenders should not be sent to a correctional facility if she has children under two, and no female correctional officers agreed to this on any age group.

The third question examined was: “Jail or prison parenting programs have a positive impact on children of inmate-mothers.”

Table 6

Correctional Officer Response By Gender By Age

Question: “Jail or prison parenting programs have a positive impact on children of inmate-mothers”

Female

Age	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20-35	3 (14%)		2 (10%)		
35-50		2 (10%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	
50-65					
65-80					

Male

Age	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20-35	1 (5%)		2 (10%)		
35-50		1 (5%)	5 (24%)		
50-65		1 (5%)	1 (5%)		
65-80					

Note: the gender & age of one participant is unknown but chose *Agree*

There are more similarities between genders for this question than for previous ones, while, once again, there were no patterns emerging due to age. For this question the majority of correctional officers have a *neutral* viewpoint (39% of all respondents were males and 15% of all respondents were females choosing this response). A substantial number of both men and women also agreed that visitation was positive for the children of incarcerated women (39% of all respondents). Only one female respondent disagreed with the statement. Again, this goes against the typical societal view that women (who might be mothers) would agree to do what is necessary to keep a bond between the mother and the child.

The final question examined was: “Correctional facilities should offer parenting programs to inmate mothers.”

Table 7

Correctional Officer Response By Gender By Age

Question: "Correctional facilities should offer parenting programs to inmate mothers"

Female

Age	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20-35	5 (24%)	1 (5%)			
35-50	1 (5%)	1 (5%)		1 (5%)	
50-65					
65-80					

Male

Age	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20-35	3 (14%)				
35-50	3 (14%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)		
50-65	1 (5%)			1 (5%)	
65-80					

Note: the gender & age of one participant is unknown but chose *Agree*

For this question the majority of correctional staff chose *strongly agree* over any other response. Once again, only one female respondent disagreed and, for this question, one male respondent also disagreed.

The next part of the survey assessed any correlations that could be drawn in relation to the gender and years of employment of officers and respondents' choices. Selected questions were chosen to illustrate the differences, if any, between male and female officers and the years of employment in relation to the response given. For the statement, "Inmate mothers can adequately mother their children from inside prison" the majority of officers disagreed regardless of the number of years working.

Table 8

Correctional Officer Response By Gender By Years at Facility

Question: "Inmate mothers can adequately mother their children from inside prison"

Female

Years	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6 months- 1 year			1 (5%)	4 (14%)	

Table 8 continued

2-5					
5-8				1 (5%)	
8-11					
Over 11				3 (14%)	

Male

Years	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6 months- 1 year					1 (5%)
2-5				1 (5%)	2 (10%)
5-8				1 (5%)	1 (5%)
8-11					1 (5%)
Over 11			1 (5%)	2 (10%)	

Note: the gender & years of one participant is unknown but chose Strongly Disagree

Also examined was the question, “A bond between mother and child can never be broken.” No patterns related to number of years of employment emerged. Again, the responses seemed to contradict what one might have assumed with more male officers than female officers agreeing or strongly agreeing that a bond between mother and child could never be broken.

Table 9

Correctional Officer Response By Gender By Years at Facility

Question: “A bond between mother and child can never be broken”

Female

Years	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6 months- 1 year		1 (5%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
2-5					
5-8				1 (5%)	
8-11					
Over 11			1 (5%)	2 (10%)	

Male

Years	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6 months- 1 year	1 (5%)				

Table 9 continued

2-5	1 (5%)	1 (5%)		1 (5%)	
5-8				1 (5%)	1 (5%)
8-11			1 (5%)		
Over 11		1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	

Note: the gender & years of one participant is unknown but chose Neutral

The final statement examined was, “It is acceptable for the state to put an incarcerated mothers’ child up for adoption.” Again, there was no discernible pattern based on number of years of employment.

Table 10

Correctional Officer Response & Gender & Years at Facility.

Question: “It is acceptable for the state to put an incarcerated mother’s child up for adoption”

Female

Years	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6 months- 1 year		1 (5%)	2 (10%)		2 (10%)
2-5					
5-8			1 (5%)		
8-11					
Over 11	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)		

Male

Years	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6 months- 1 year			1 (5%)		
2-5		1 (5%)		1 (5%)	1 (5%)
5-8		1 (5%)		1 (5%)	
8-11		1 (5%)			
Over 11		1 (5%)	2 (10%)		

Note: the gender & years of one participant is unknown but chose Neutral

Slightly more males than female (about 20% of all respondents) did think that it was acceptable for the state to put incarcerated mothers children up for adoption. More females chose the *neutral* response (20% of all respondents). It is interesting that slightly fewer females than males disagreed with the statement. This is interesting because, again,

women are viewed as the primary caregiver and one might assume that women would disagree with adoption.

The next part of the survey consisted of short answer questions to allow correctional officers to give their own opinions on incarcerated mothers. Three questions were presented to correctional officers as follows: (1) Can a woman in jail be considered a “good mother”? Explain why or why not, (2) Does the jail have a responsibility at all to help an inmate-mother be a better mother to her children, and (3) If you could change anything on parenting programs for inmate mothers what would you change? For each question that was asked, similar responses were grouped together and different themes were drawn for each question.

For the first question, there were five themes drawn: (1) overall can't be a good mother due to her absence and choices; (2) being in jail doesn't define the person; (3) yes, she can be a good mother because not all are career criminals; (4) yes, she can be a good mother depending on past record/ on the circumstances; and (5) yes, she can be a good mother only if she is making effort to change while incarcerated and plans to be a parent once released.

Themes one, four, and five all had an equal number of respondents. Under the first theme, correctional officers (their gender is identified) responded with comments that include:

(M) Generally no. A mother in jail (long term) is like a woman “playing house.” The children need consistent and steady attention- a steady role model. Children feel or can feel it is their fault that mommy is not with them all the time. It is not natural for mothers to be a part.

(F) No, I have observed over the years that most mothers are addicts. A lot of them expose their children to abusive relationships by getting involved in bad relationships.

(M) I think an inmate can't be a good mother. She isn't there with her children night and day. She will miss out on all the important developmental events in her children's lives. In the end the inmate mother will teach her children one of two things: (1) that criminal behavior is acceptable. “If mama did it, why can't I”? (2) The child will learn to resent

their mother because she hasn't been there to guide the child through childhood.

Correctional staff members who answered with variations of this theme believe that if the mother is incarcerated and absent from her children for long, she can't be considered a good mother anymore. So it would seem that a "good mother" is one who is defined by being actively involved in the child's life and there to guide them, and if they are not present in the child's life than they are considered not a "good mother."

Under the fourth theme correctional officers responded with comments that include:

(M) Depends on circumstances. A "murderess" (convicted of murder) might not be the best role model.

(F) Depending on criminal offense yes a woman can still be considered a good mother if she cares for her child and still takes care of them upon release.

(M) Possibly it depends on the crime they were convicted of. If it was to protect her children than yes. If a mother is convicted of abuse or is a habitual offender then their privilege of a mother should be stripped.

It would seem that under several themes, the offense that was committed has a huge factor in whether a woman is a "good mother" or not. Many correctional officers appear to be more understanding if certain circumstances arose (abuse, violence, etc.). If the mother committed the crime to protect her children, then she should be considered a "good mother" still. Many officers also highlighted that other factors also come into play such as a mothers' previous record and if she is a career criminal or not.

For the fifth theme, correctional officers responded with comments such as:

(F) Yes, a good mother is in how she parents and navigates life's struggles. A mother being in jail is a learning opportunity for the mother and child. It is in the relationship and relational nature and bond between mother and child.

(F) Inmates can become good mothers in jail. While they aren't actively parenting, they can be taking steps to better themselves and their parenting skills.

(F) If a female is taking classes provide by programs to better her or parenting skills, she is working to improve her life. Possibly improving to be a “good mother.”

The fifth theme seems to be the most positive in regard to the inmate-mother making changes to her life while she is incarcerated. These correctional officers believe that if the mother is actively trying to become a better mother and taking advantage of the programs and classes offered at the jail then she can still be considered a “good mother.”

For the second question, “Does the jail have a responsibility at all to help an inmate-mother be a better mother to her children,” four themes were identified: (1) “not a responsibility” but good for the view of society/others can influence the mothers but not correctional staff directly; (2) yes, we do have a responsibility; (3) no, it’s more up to the individual to change not the responsibility of the facility; and (4) no, jail is here to administer punishment only.

The first and second theme appeared in the most responses and those are the ones that will be explored. For the first theme correctional officers responded with comments that include:

(M) Not a “responsibility” but it is good for the system to assist those who need help getting back on the path to recovery. Good for society in general. Some don’t have a good start prior to being incarcerated.

(F) No, but programs through volunteers may help inmate-mothers.
(N/A) Yes, all society should be responsible for all people.

Under this theme it seems that correctional officers are saying that they themselves don’t have the responsibility to give help to these mothers but someone else should such as those who work in programs or those who volunteer from the community. It is almost if correctional officers don’t want to have the responsibility of how a person turns out, and do not want the burden of feeling that they themselves were part of the reason why the inmate-mother couldn’t get her life back on track.

With the second theme, correctional officers responded with comments such as:

(F) The jail has a responsibility to give a firm foundation. This is to include visitation, communication, programs and classes, as well as counseling if needed. The mother herself needs to put forth some effort.

(M) Yes, we have custody of her person, the state should offer the chance for betterment of her children.

(F) Yes, if we were to help the mother change and become a better example for her children then we may decrease the chances of her children becoming offenders.

Under this theme correctional officers express that the facility does have a responsibility to help these mothers become better mothers for the sake of her children. They believe that in order to help these mothers not to return back to jail/prison then something has to be done now to help them. These officers also express the need to provide services to them so that they will hopefully get released and set a better example for their children, but these women cannot do that on their own and need assistance to help them.

Under the final question (If you could change anything on parenting programs for inmate mothers what would you change?), it was more difficult to create different themes. The only clear theme that was identified was that they either had no response or they felt like they didn't know much on the subject to provide an answer. These correctional officers responded with comments such as:

(M) N/A I don't have enough information on this subject.

(F) Not familiar with all the programs Travis County provides so it would be hard to say.

(F) I've never attended one so I don't know.

It is clear by these responses that many officers, a total of 11, do not know all of the programs and services that are offered to these women. It is possible that their lack of knowledge is related to incarcerated mothers' lack of provided information as to what is offered at the facility. Correctional officers should be aware of what is being offered at the facility and what programs are in place to help incarcerated mothers so they can begin to make lifestyle changes. It should be noted that even though most correctional officers do not know what services are offered at the facility, some of them did,

however, give suggestions of what changes they think they would want to see. These correctional officers responded with comments such as:

(F) I would teach more about how to turn incarcerations into learning opportunities. Also teaching humbleness and accountability. Also there needs to be some teaching on coping skills and having perspective. These women need education and leadership. They are as a population a broken group. They are strong but often misguided and have no mentors or own mothers to look up to. I would really like to see some programs that get away from the victim mentality and more to a self-empowerment mentality.

(N/A) Doesn't always need to be a "feel good" program. Some people need reality.

(M) Would not allow repeat offenders, it is obvious they don't get the picture.

So it seems that those officers who are somewhat familiar with the programs and services at the facility do have some input on what they would change. Coping skills and self-empowerment is a very positive change to make to programs that are already implemented at the facility. In regards to the second comment that was provided, that correctional officer may be correct that most programs that are offered try to sugarcoat the situation or the unfavorable behavior that brought the mother to jail/prison to begin with. Most programs don't seem to go deep enough into the areas that are harder to discuss such as family, abuse, and violence that all deal with the same emotions such as hurt, disappointment, embarrassment, and anger. So maybe if programs focused more on the real issues and not make things sound less serious than they really are, then some progress could be made with this specific population. In regards to the third comment it does make logical sense to not let repeat offenders into a program because clearly they simply don't want to change.

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSION

Because this study was based on those officers who work at the Travis County Correctional Facility, it is limited. It may be that other institutions that have a larger population of incarcerated mothers could possibly provide more information. The way that these correctional officers view incarcerated mothers cannot be generalized to other institutions. Regardless, this study does provide some foundation to how correctional officers view this specific population, but it should be stressed that more research is needed in order to gain a better understanding of the relationship between correctional officers and inmate-mothers.

From this study, it seems as though half of correctional officers show some tolerance in their opinions towards incarcerated mothers, while other correctional officers believe that they are there strictly to enforce punishment. From the data collected, it was found that an officers' gender did not greatly affect how an officer responded. However, it is interesting that the proposed hypothesis for this study was not supported. The hypothesis was that female correctional officers would show more leniency towards incarcerated mothers because they are women and mothers, but the results from this study show a different state of affairs. As it turns out, male correctional officers showed slightly more leniency towards incarcerated mothers compared to female correctional officers. Further research is needed to determine why exactly male correctional officers were more lenient compared to female correctional officers. A possible reason could be that female correctional officers are ashamed or highly disappointed in mothers that get incarcerated, because they know that once a woman is incarcerated, she is leaving her children behind. This may be maybe upsetting to female correctional officers.

From this study, it is clear that correctional officers do not really know what programs and services are offered at the facility; therefore, they are not informed well enough to help incarcerated mothers find programs to help them. Jennifer Scott coordinates the many programs offered to incarcerated mothers. Volunteers from the community facilitate the majority of these programs at the Travis County Correctional Facility. The programs that are more popular include anger management, seeking safety, and parenting classes; additional programs are instructed by groups such as Truth Be Told.

It does not make sense that these officers are so negative and so condemning about only administering punishment when they are not even aware what programs and assistance the facility offers. It is disappointing that the majority of these officers do not know what's going on in the facility in regards to programs, but yet they get upset when they see a previously incarcerated mother return to incarceration because she didn't know how to start her life on the right track. Maybe if correctional officers had known what programs were offered, she could have been given contact information of agencies that are in her community to help her on the right track and maybe not have returned to incarceration.

If correctional officers were more informed about what the facility offers, then they could relay that information to inmate-mothers and encourage them to take certain programs to better their parenting skills. In order to fix the issue of correctional officers not being informed enough about available programs to incarcerated mothers, it seems clear that training or a briefing about programs is needed. After correctional officers know what programs are offered and encourage incarcerated mothers to participate in these programs, hopefully, they will take what they have learned and turn their lives around to improve their lives and the lives of their children.

APPENDIX

Correctional Officer Insight Survey

Purpose: My name is Danielle Bridges. I am completing a master's degree in the Department of Criminal Justice, Texas State University-San Marcos. This survey will be used as a part of my graduate thesis. The purpose of this survey is to understand correctional officers' views regarding incarcerated women who are also mothers.

1. What is your gender?

Male Female

2. What is your age?

20-35 35-50 50-65 65-80

3. How long have you worked at the facility?

6 months- 1 year 2-5 years 5-8 years 8-11 years over 11 years

4. Which inmate population do you primarily work with?

Male Female

5. Do you come into contact with female inmate mothers?

Often Sometimes Occasionally Never

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
It is important to keep a mother with her children even if she is an offender	1	2	3	4	5
Non-violent female offenders should not be sent to a correctional facility if she had small children under two	1	2	3	4	5
A bond between mother and child can never be broken	1	2	3	4	5
An inmate mother should be able to regain custody of her children once released	1	2	3	4	5
Inmate mothers can adequately mother their children from inside prison	1	2	3	4	5
It is acceptable for the state to put an incarcerated mother's child up for adoption	1	2	3	4	5
Correctional facilities should offer parenting programs to inmate mothers	1	2	3	4	5
Jail or prison parenting programs have a positive impact on inmate mothers	1	2	3	4	5
Jail or prison parenting programs have a positive impact on children of inmate-mothers	1	2	3	4	5
Inmate mothers (except those convicted of child abuse) should be allowed special visitation with their children	1	2	3	4	5
Visitation from their children has a positive impact on the inmate mother	1	2	3	4	5
Visitation from the inmate mother has a positive impact on her children	1	2	3	4	5

For these questions, I would like to find out more about your opinions of inmate-mothers.

1. Can a woman in jail be considered a “good mother”? Explain why or why not.

2. Does the jail have a responsibility at all to help an inmate-mother be a better mother to her children? Explain.

3. If you could change anything on parenting programs for inmate mothers what would you change? Explain.

REFERENCES

- Allen, S., Flaherty, C., & Ely, G. (2010). Throwaway moms: Maternal incarceration and the criminalization of female poverty. *Affilia: Journal of Women & Social Work*, 25(2), 160-172. doi:10.1177/0886109910364345
- Amlund Hagen, K., Myers, B. J., & Mackintosh, V. H. (2005). Hope, social support, and behavioral problems in at-risk children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 75, 211-219.
- Bates, R., Lawrence-Wills, S., & Hairston, C. F. (2001). Children and families of incarcerated parents: A view from the ground. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois at Chicago, Jane Addams College of Social Work, Jane Addams Center for Social Policy and Research.
- Baunach, P. J. (1985). *Mothers in prison*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Baunach, P. J. (1986). *Mothers in prison*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transition, Inc.
- Beck, A. J., & Mumola, C. (1999). Prisoners in 1998. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Beckerman, A. (1991). Women in prison: The conflict between confinement and parental rights. *Social Justice*, 18, 171-83.
- Berry, P. E. & Smith-Mahdi, J. J. (2006). Doing mothering behind bars: A qualitative study of incarcerated mothers. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, 29(1), 101-120.
- Bloom, B., Owen, B., & Covington, S. (2003). *Gender responsive strategies: Research, practice, and guiding principles for women offenders* (NIC Publication No. 018017). Washington, DC: National institute of Corrections.

- Bonczar, T. (2003). Prevalence of imprisonment in the U.S. population, 1974-2001. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Boudouris, J. (1996). *Parents in prison: Addressing the needs of families*. Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Britton, D. M. (2003). *At Work in the Iron Cage. The Prison as Gendered Organization*. New York: New York Univ. Press.
- Brodie, D. L. (1982). Babies behind bars: Should incarcerated mothers be allowed to keep their newborns with them in prison? *University of Richmond Law Review*, 16, 677-692.
- Broidy, L. M., Nagin, D. S., Tremblay, R. E., Bates, J. E., Brame, B., Dodge, K. A., et al. (2003). Developmental trajectories of childhood disruptive behaviors and adolescent delinquency: A six site, cross-national study. *Developmental Psychology*, 39, 222-245.
- Bureau of Justice. (2007). *Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics*. On-line. Retrieved August 20, 2008, from <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/tost6.html#6>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (2008). *Parents in Prison and their Minor Children*. Retrieved at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/pptmc.pdf>. Retrieved on July 2, 2012.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Prison Inmates at Midyear 2008- Statistical Tables*, NCJ-225619 (Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, 2009).
- Cahalan, M. (1986). *Historical corrections statistics in the United States, 1850-1984*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Carlen, P. (1983). *Women's Imprisonment: A Study in Social Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Carlen, P. (1985). *Criminal Women: Autobiographical Accounts*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Polity.

- Carlen, P. (1998). *Sledgehammer: Women's Imprisonment at the Millenium*.
Houndsmills, Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Macmillan.
- Carlson, J. (2001). Prison nursery 2000: A five-year review of the prison nursery at the Nebraska Correctional Center for women. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 33, 75-97. doi: 10.1300/J076v33n03_05
- Carson, A. & Sabol, W. (2012). Prisoners in 2011. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Casey-Acevedo, K., Baskken, T., & Karle, A. (2004). Children visiting mothers in prison: The effects on mothers' behavior and disciplinary adjustment. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 37(1), 418-430.
- Chambers, A. N. (2009). Impact of forced separation policy on incarcerated postpartum mothers. *Policy, Politics & Nursing Practice*, 10(3), 204-211. doi: 10.1177/1527154409351592
- Cole, P. M., Zahn-Waxler, C., Fox, N.A., Usher, B.A., & Welsh, J. D. (1996). Individual differences in emotion regulation and behavior problems in preschool children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 105, 518-529.
- Coughenour, J. C. (1995). "Separate but unequal: Women in the Federal Criminal Justice system," *8 Federal Sentencing Project Reporter* 142-44.
- Covington, S. (2002). A womens journey home: Challenges for female offenders and their children. Paper presented at the "From Prison to Home" conference. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health Services.
- Dallaire, D. H., & Wilson, L. C. (2010). The relation of exposure to parental criminal activity, arrest, and sentencing to children's maladjustment. *Journal of Child and Family studies*, 19, 404-418.
- De se, K. (2006). Evvent to highlight first prison nursery in California. *Oakland Tribune*.
http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qn4176/is_20061118/ai_n16861580

- Drummond, T. (2000). Mothers in prison. *Time Magazine*.
<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,998404,00.html>
- Enroos, R. (2011). Mothers in prison: Between the public institution and private family relations. *Child and Family Social Work, 16*, 12-21. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2206.2010.007000.x
- Farrington, D. (1986). Stepping stones to adult criminal careers. In D. Olweus, J. Block, & M. Radke-Yarrow (Eds.), *Development of antisocial and prosocial behavior* (pp.359-384). New York: Academic Press.
- Ferszt, G., & Erickson-Owens, D. (2008). Development of an educational/support group for pregnant women in prison. *Journal of Forensic Nursing, 4*, 55-63.
- Freudenberg, N., Daniels, J., Crum, M., Perkins, T., & Richie, B. E. (2005). Coming home from jail: The social and health consequences of community reentry for women, male adolescents, and their families and communities. *American Journal of Public Health, 95*(10), 1725-1736.
- Gabel, K., & Girard, K. (1995). Long-term care nurseries in prisons: A descriptive study. In K. Gabel & D. Johnston (Eds), *Children of incarcerated parents* (pp.237-254). New York: Lexington Books.
- Glaze, L. E., & Maruschack, L. M. (2008). Parents in prison and their minor children. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/pptmc.pdf
- Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1950). *Unraveling juvenile delinquency*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Green, M., & Schloes, M. (2004). Education for what? Attachment, culture and society. In M. Green & M. Schloes (Eds), *Attachment and human survival* (pp.37-51). London, UK: Karnac.

- Greenfeld, L. A., & Snell, T. L. (1999). Women Offenders (NCJ 175688, special report). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Hagan, J., & Foster, H. (2012). Children of the American Prison Generation: Student and school spillover effects of incarcerating mothers. *Law & Society Review*, 46(1), 37-69. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5893.2012.00472.x
- Hagan, J., & Palonni, A. (1990). The social reproduction of a criminal class of working class London circa 1950-80. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96, 265-297.
- Hairston, C. F. (1999). Kinship care when parents are incarcerated. In J. P. Gleason & C. F. Hairston (Eds.), *Kinship care: Improving practice through research* (pp.189-214). Washington DC: CWLA Press.
- Hairston, C. F. (2003). Prisoners and their families: Parenting issues during incarceration. In J. Travis & M. Waul (Eds), *Prisoners once removed: The impact of incarceration and reentry on children, families, and communities* (pp.259-282). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Hannon, G., Martin, D., & Martin, M. (1984). Incarceration in the family: Adjustment to change. *Family Therapy*, 11(3), 253-260.
- Houck, K. D., & Loper, A. B. (2002). The relationship of parenting stress to adjustment among mothers in prison. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 72(4), 545-558.
- Johnson, E. I., & Waldfogel, J. (2004). Children of incarcerated parents: multiple risks and children's living arrangements. In Pattillo, Mary, David Weiman, & Bruce Western, (Eds). *Imprisoning America: The Social effects of Mass Incarceration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Johnston, D. (1995). Effects of parental incarceration. In K. Gabel & D. Johnston (Eds), *Children of Incarcerated Parents*. (pp.59-88) Lexington Books.

- Johnston, D. (1995). Interventions. In K. Gabel & D. Johnston (Eds), *Children of incarcerated parents* (pp.199-236). New York: Lexington Books.
- Johnston, D. (2003). What works: Children of incarcerated offenders. In V. L. Gadsden (Ed), *Heading home: Offender reintegration into the family* (pp.123-153). Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Johnston, J. R., & Straus, R. B. (1999). Traumatized children in supervised visitation: What do they need? *Family and Conciliation Courts Review*, 37, 135-158.
- Kampfner, C. J. (1995). Posttraumatic stress reactions in children of imprisoned mothers. In K. Gabel & D. Johnston (Eds.), *Children of incarcerated parents* (pp.89-100). New York: Lexington Books.
- Kauffman, K. (2006). Prison nurseries: New beginnings and second chances. In R. Immarigeon (Ed), *Women and girls in the criminal justice system. Policy issues and practices strategies*. Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.
- Knight, M., & Plugge, E. (2005a). Risk factors for adverse perinatal outcomes in imprisoned pregnant women: A systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 5, 111-118.
- Knight, M., & Plugge, E. (2005b). The outcomes of pregnancy among imprisoned women: A systemic review. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, 112, 1467-1474.
- Kruttschnitt, C. (2010). The paradox of women's imprisonment. *Daedalus*, 139(3), 32-42.
- Kruttschnitt, C. & Gartner, R. (2003). Women's imprisonment. *Crime and Justice*, 30, 1-81.

- Kubiak, S., Kasiborski, N., Karim, N., & Schmittel, E. (2012). Does subsequent criminal justice involvement predict foster care and termination of parental rights for children born to incarcerated women? *Social Work in Public Health, 27*(1/2), 129-147. doi: 10.1080/19371918.2012.629888
- Kubiak, S., Kasiborski, N., & Schmittel, E. (2010). Assessing long-term outcomes of an intervention designed for pregnant incarcerated women, *Research On Social Work Practice, 20*(5), 528-535. doi: 10.1177/1049731509358086
- LaPoint, V., Pickett, M. O., & Harris, B. F. (1985). Enforced family separation: A descriptive analysis of some experiences of children of Black imprisoned mothers. In M. B. Spencer, G. K. Brookins, & W. R. Allen (Eds.), *Beginnings: The social and affective development of Black children* (pp.239-255). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- LeFlore, L. & Holston, M. A. (1989). Percieved importance of parenting behaviors as reported by inmate mothers: An exploratory study. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 14*(5), 21.
- Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1986). Family factors as correlates and predictors of juvenile conduct problems and delinquency. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (eds.), *Crime and justice: An annual review of research* (Vol. 7, pp. 29-142). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lotze, G. M., Ravindran, N., & Myers, B. J. (2010). Moral emotions, emotion self-regulation, callous-unemotional traits, and problem behavior in children of incarcerated mothers. *Journal Of Child and Family Studies, 19*(6), 702-713. doi: 10.1007/s10826-010-9358-7
- Luther, K., & Gregson, J. (2011). Restricted motherhood: Parenting in a prison nursery. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 37*(1), 85-103.

- Mackintosh, V. H., Myers, B. J., & Kennon, S. S. (2006). Children of incarcerated mothers and their caregivers: Factors affecting the quality of their relationship. *Journal of Child & Family Studies, 15*(5), 579-594. doi:10.1007/s10826-006-9030-4
- Mahan, S. (1982). *Unfit mothers*. Palo Alto, CA: R & E Research Associates.
- Mann, C. R. (1984). *Female crime and delinquency*. University, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Maruschak, L. (2008). Medical problems of prisoners. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Messina, N., Burdon, W., Hagopian, G., & Prendergast, M. (2004). One year return to custody rates among co-disordered offenders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 472-486*.
- Mignon, S. I., & Ransford, P. (2012). Mothers in prison: Maintaining connections with children. *Social Work in Public Health, 27*(1/2), 69-88.
doi:10.1080/19371918.2012.630965
- Minhyo Cho, R. (2009). The impact of maternal imprisonment on children's educational achievement. *Journal of Human Resources, 44*(3), 772-797.
- Moe, A. M., & Ferraro, K. J. (2006). Criminalized mothers: The value and devaluation of parenthood from behind bars. *Women and Therapy, 29*(3/4), 135-164.
- Mumola, C. J. (2000). *Incarcerated parents and their children*. U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Washington, DC. #NCJ 182335.
- Murnane, R. T., Maynard, R. A., & Ohls, J. C. (1981). Home resources and children's achievement. *The Rev. of Economics and Statistics, 63*, 369-77.
- Myers, B., Smarsh, T., Amlund-Hagen, K., & Kennon, S. (1999). Children of incarcerated mothers. *Journal of Child and Family Studies 8*(1), 11-25.

- Nelson, R. (2006). AJN Reports: Laboring in chains: Shackling pregnant inmates, even during childbirth, still happens. *American Journal of Nursing, 106*, 25-26.
- Nelson, B., Martin, R. P., Hodge, S., Havill, V., & Kamphaus, R. (1999). Modeling the prediction of elementary school adjustment from preschool temperament. *Personality and individual differences, 26*, 687-700.
- O'Brien, P. (2001). *Making it in the "free world": Women in transition from prison*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Patterson, G., Reid, J., & Dishon, T. (1992). *Antisocial boys*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
- Phillips, S. D., Gleeson, J. P., & Waites-Garrett, M. (2009). Substance-abusing parents in the criminal justice system: Does substance abuse treatment improve their children's outcomes? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 48*, 120-138
- Poehlmann, J. (2005). Representations of attachment relationships in children of incarcerated mothers. *Child Development, 76*, 679-696.
- Pollock, J. M. (1984). Women will be women: Correctional officers' perceptions of the emotionality of women inmates. *The Prison Journal, 64*.
doi:10.1177/003288558406400108
- Pollock, J. M. (1986). *Sex and Supervision: Guarding Male and Female Inmates*. New York: Greenwood.
- Pollock, J. M. (2002). Parenting programs in women's prisons. *Women & Criminal Justice, 14*(1), 131-154. doi: 10.1300/J012v14n01_04
- Radosh, P. (1988). Inmate mothers: legislative solutions to a difficult problem. *Crime and Justice, 11*, 61-77.
- Radosh, P. F. (2004). Reflections on women's crime and mothers in prison: A peacemaking approach. In M. Chesney-Lind and L. Pasko (Eds.), *Girls, Women, and Crime*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Rasche, C. (2001). "Cross-sex supervision of female inmates: An unintended consequence of employment law cases brought by women working in corrections." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Atlanta.
- Rowland, M., & Watts, A. (2007). Washington State's effort to the generational impact on crime. *Corrections Today*.
http://www.aca.org/publications/pdf/Rowland_Watts_Aug07.pdf
- Sameroff, A., Guttman, L. M., & Peck, S. C. (2003). Adaptation among youth facing multiple risks: Prospective research findings. In S. S. Luther (Ed), *Resilience and vulnerability: Adaptation in the context of childhood adversity* (pp.364-391). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandifer, J. L. (2008). Evaluating the efficacy of a parenting program for incarcerated mothers. *Prison Journal*, 88(3), 423-445.
- Savelsberg, J. (1992). Law that does not fit society: Sentencing guidelines as a neoclassical reaction to the dilemmas of substantivized law, *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1346-81.
- Schirmer, S., Nellis, A., & Mauer, M. (2009). *Incarcerated parents and their children: Trends 1991-2007*. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project
- Schram, P. J. (1999). An exploratory study: Stereotypes about mothers in prison. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(5), 411-426.
- Sentencing Project: Research and Advocacy for Reform (2008).
www.sentencingproject.org
- Sentencing Project: Research and advocacy for reform (2011) & (2012). Retrieved from
www.sentencingproject.org

- Shepard, D., & Zemans, E. S. (1950). *Prison babies: A study of some aspects of the care and treatment of pregnant inmates and their infants in training schools, reformatories, and prisons*. Chicago: John Howard Association.
- Shields, A., & Cicchetti, D. (2001). Parental maltreatment and emotion dysregulation as risk factors for bullying and victimization in middle childhood. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 30*, 349-363.
- Smith Goshin, L., & Woods Byrne, M. (2008). Converging streams of opportunity for prison nursery programs in the United States. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 48*(4), 271-295. doi: 10.1080/10509670902848972
- Snyder, Z. K. (2009). Keeping families together: The importance of maintaining mother-child contact for incarcerated women. *Women & Criminal Justice, 19*(1), 37-59. doi: 10.1080/08974450802586869
- South Dakota Department of Corrections. (n.d.). Mother-infant programs. Pierre, SD: Author. <http://doc.sd.gov/adult.facilities/wpmip.aspx>
- Stern, A. H. (2004). *Babies born to incarcerated mothers*. New York: National Resource Center for Foster Care and Permanency Planning. http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/socwork/nrcfcpp/downloads/information_packets/babies_born_to_incarcerated_mothers.pdf
- Vainik, J. (2008). The reproductive and parental rights of incarcerated mothers. *Family Court Review, 46*(4), 670-694. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00231
- Vuolo, M. & Kruttschnitt, C. (2008). Prisoners' adjustment, correctional officers, and context: The foreground and background of punishment in late modernity. *Law & Society Review, 42*(2), 307-335.

- Weiss, J. A., Hawkins, J. W., & Despinos, C. (2010). Redefining boundaries: A grounded theory study of recidivism in women. *Health Care for Women International, 31*(3), 258-273. doi:10.1080/07399330903052160
- West, H. C., & Sabol, W. J. (2009). *Prisons inmates at midyear 2008-statistical tables* (NCJ 225619). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Wilderman, C. (2009). Parental incarceration, the prison room, and the concentration of childhood disadvantage, *Demography, 46*, 265-80.
- Women's Prison Association. (2006). The punitiveness report—Hard hit: The growth of imprisonment of women, 1977-2004. Retrieved July 2, 2012 from www.wpaonline.org/institute/hardhit/index.htm
- Women's Prison Association. (2009). *Prison nursery programs a growing trend in women's prisons*. www.corrections.com/news/article/21644
- Women in Prison Project of the Correctional Association of New York. (2006). *When "free" means losing your mother: The collision of child welfare and the incarceration of women in New York State*. http://www.correctionalassociation.org/publications/download/wipp/reports/When_Free_Rpt_Feb_2006.pdf
- Wooldredge, J. D., & Masters, K. (1993). Confronting problems faced by pregnant inmates in state prisons. *Crime and Delinquency, 39*, 195-203
- Zaitzow, B. H. (2001). Whose problem is it anyway? Women prisoners and HIV/AIDS. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 45*(6), 673-690.
- Zimring, F. E., Hawkins, G., & Kamin, S. (2001). *Punishment and democracy: Three strikes and you're out in California* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 114.

VITA

Danielle Marika Bridges was born in Washington D.C. on February 9, 1989 and is the daughter of Earnest Charles Bridges and Natasha Maria Bridges. After completing her work at Judson Senior High School, Converse, Texas, in 2007, she entered Hardin-Simmons University where she obtained her Bachelor of Behavioral Science in psychology in 2011. After that she entered Texas State University–San Marcos and received her Master’s degree in criminal justice and a forensic psychology certificate in 2013. Following her completion of her Master’s she is going to Chicago to attend the Adler School of Professional Psychology to pursue her doctorate in clinical psychology.

Permanent address: 8319 Parry Path

Converse, Texas 78109

This thesis was typed by Danielle M. Bridges.