

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Leeson, Caroline ORCID logoORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5402-4660> and Morgan, Julia (2019)
Children with a parent in prison England and Wales: A hidden
population of young carers. *Child Care in Practice*. p. 1.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/4186/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If
you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13575279.2019.1680531>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of
open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form.
Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright
owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for
private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms
governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repository Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorks.ac.uk



Children with a parent in prison England and Wales: A hidden population of young carers

Journal:	<i>Child Care in Practice</i>
Manuscript ID	CCCP-2019-0019.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article (Word Limit: 5000)
Child Care in Practice Keywords:	Children's Rights, Resilience, Policy
Keywords:	prison, young carers

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Abstract

There are over 200, 000 children in the UK who are affected by parental imprisonment (Barnardo's, 2014). Children with a parent in prison are expected to engage in a great deal of physical and emotional caring to support their family, work which often has a negative impact on their own physical and emotional wellbeing as well as their academic achievement. In this paper, the caring experiences of children with a parent in prison are explored using Dani and De Haan's (2007) model of structural inequality to argue that the stigma and isolation experienced by children with a parent in prison is the consequence of a lack of political will to acknowledge the needs of a highly vulnerable group of children. It is contended that extending the eligibility criteria for young carers to include this group of children would significantly help to raise awareness, reduce stigma and offer effective support, thereby creating a more inclusive state. Whilst there is recognition of substantial deficits in the support offered to young carers, nevertheless, as a community, young carers are perceived more positively by society, meaning they have more constructive regard and fewer barriers to services than currently experienced by children with a parent in prison.

Introduction

Children with a parent in prison are rarely eligible to be regarded as young carers as most often the parent with whom they live do not meet the established criteria; they do not have a disability, a recognised physical or mental illness or certified drugs/alcohol problems (Gill, 2009; Sexton, 2016). Having a family member in prison can be distressing for everyone involved and a partners struggle to cope and manage everyday life is well documented (Boswell and Wedge, 2002; Gill, 2009; Sexton, 2016). Partners may seek help from their GP, but the family are unlikely to meet the ever-stringent criteria for additional support services,

1
2
3 leading to a lack of awareness of the caring responsibilities of the child(ren) (Leeson and
4
5 Morgan, 2014). Furthermore, there are often few community resources available, especially
6
7 if the partner, now in prison, was involved in crime(s) that had direct local impact (for
8
9 example, fraud causing local company to close) or invokes strong negative feelings such as
10
11 sexual or violent crimes (Gill, 2009; Morgan *et al.*, 2013). Thus, stigmatisation is a very real
12
13 experience for families of prisoners and many families keep their problems quiet for fear of
14
15 being rejected, scapegoated or looked down upon (Gill, 2009; Morgan *et al.*, 2013; Lanskey
16
17 *et al.*, 2015). Furthermore, the risk of stigmatisation leads many children to create a cover
18
19 story as to where their parent is, which isolates them further, preventing them from
20
21 confiding in friends or seeking help as they cannot tell the truth (Phillips and Gates, 2011;
22
23 Cherney and Fitzgerald, 2016). The consequence of trying to avoid any negative attention
24
25 means a lack of visibility enabling policymakers to continue to ignore their situation and
26
27 perpetuate the inequalities they experience as a result of having a parent in prison (Lanskey
28
29 *et al.*, 2015). In addition, any family fortunate enough to have some support often receive
30
31 that help from a charity or community group dependent on local or national funding
32
33 (Morgan *et al.*, 2013). In times of financial austerity, such provision is vulnerable, likely to be
34
35 impermanent and thus not reliable enough for families to trust (Lansley and Mack, 2015).
36
37 Thus, the parent at home finds that they have to rely on their child(ren) to get them
38
39 through; a set of circumstances that is only recognised and or detected when there are
40
41 difficulties such as poor school attendance or disruptive behaviour (Gill, 2009; Morgan *et al.*,
42
43 2013). In many situations, the child's caring responsibilities may have life altering impact;
44
45 they may leave school early without qualifications; they can become stressed and anxious
46
47 causing them to seek solace in unfortunate relationships, drugs or alcohol (Boswell and
48
49 Wedge, 2002; Schlafer and Poehlmann, 2010, Lanskey *et al.*, 2015).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 An examination of key journals in health, social work education and justice, shows a
4
5 burgeoning interest in the welfare and rights of families with a member in prison, but very
6
7 little research focus on the caring responsibilities held by the children. Thus, there is limited
8
9 awareness of the issue with the result that there is little or no impetus to address this
10
11 inequality (Children heard and seen, 2019). Furthermore, looking at websites of
12
13 organisations established to support those who fit the criteria of being a young carer, there
14
15 is no discussion of the caring responsibilities of this particular group of children.
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Structural inequality**

22
23 Structural inequality is articulated through mechanisms that regulate the behaviour of
24
25 society towards agreed and socially determined goals as well as those that redistribute
26
27 wealth and services through taxation, usually to the benefit of those regarded as deserving
28
29 (Gough, 2007). The lack of voice or political power of those regarded as undeserving gives
30
31 further, fertile soil for policies that ignore or minimise their plight (Dani and De Haan, 2007).
32
33 Dani and De Haan go on to argue that only through transparency, voice and accountability
34
35 will this situation be reversed, and a more equitable situation reached; when states become
36
37 inclusive rather than exclusive in their institutional structures, laws and policies. Thus,
38
39 structural inequality is closely linked with social exclusion as certain groups or individuals
40
41 are denied access to resources, deprived of meaningful participation in civil life and
42
43 consequently experience a limited quality of life:
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 'Social exclusion is a complex and multi-dimensional process. It involves the lack
52
53 or denial of resources, rights, goods and services, and the inability to participate
54
55 in the normal relationships and activities, available to the majority of people in a
56
57 society, whether in economic, social, cultural or political arenas. It affects both
58
59 the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society as a
60
61 whole.' (Levitas *et al.* 2007, pp. 25)

1
2
3 **Work done by the authors** with prisoners and their families' has consistently exposed
4
5 experiences of social exclusion and the negative impact of structural inequality meaning
6
7 that the children, especially, have become a hidden population of need.
8
9

10 **Children as young carers**

11
12 The Carers Act (2014) which came into force 1/4/15, defines a young carer as 'A person
13
14 under 18 who provides or intends to provide care for an adult' (Clause 63 (6) Carers Act
15
16 2014). The legislation further identifies young carers as children who are caring for a parent
17
18 or sibling with a disability or illness that requires considerable daily support, not met by
19
20 other services. Such support tasks may be practical in terms of household tasks and errands
21
22 or may be more intimate such as personal care, administering medication or supporting
23
24 therapeutic interventions (Tuffney, 2012). In addition, young carers are recognised as
25
26 providers of significant emotional support to the person in need of the care and many other
27
28 members of their family, often to the detriment of their own wellbeing (Children's Society,
29
30 2013). Historically, there has been considerable concern for the wellbeing of children with
31
32 significant caring responsibilities (*i.e.* Thomas *et al*, 2003) with a number of high profile
33
34 campaigns to raise public awareness and develop policy initiatives to support them
35
36 (Children's Society – 'Hidden' campaign, 2015 – 2017; Barnardos 'Still Hidden, Still Ignored'
37
38 report, 2017; BBC Children in Need fundraising event – each November). There has been a
39
40 consistent and increasingly vociferous message that children should not be expected to take
41
42 on such onerous caring responsibilities;
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54 'We should not expect children to be relied upon to undertake caring
55
56 which affects negatively their own development, well-being and
57
58 education' Saul Becker, Children Society, 2013, p. 3.
59
60

1
2
3 This message is underpinned by an extensive literature on the needs of young carers
4
5 (Tuffney, 2012; Smyth *et al.*, 2011; Children's Society, 2013; Leu and Becker, 2017) that
6
7 highlight the negative consequences they face. For example; poor educational attainment
8
9 resulting in a loss of employment options; lack of social opportunities leading to isolation
10
11 and frustration; emotional distress and fatigue as well as potential physical damage from
12
13 lifting and carrying heavy objects (Smyth *et al.*, 2011; Kennan *et al.*, 2012; Sharratt, 2014;
14
15 Kavanaugh *et al.*, 2015). This research resonates with that which looks at the consequences
16
17 for children with a parent in prison and appears remarkably similar, especially when looking
18
19 at the requirement to provide significant emotional support (Children's Society, 2013; Leu
20
21 and Becker, 2017) and the risk of distorted relationships (Smyth *et al.*, 2011; Tuffney, 2012).
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 In this paper, the tasks required of children with a parent in prison are identified, focussing
29
30 particularly on the emotional work they engage in as an argument is created that their
31
32 situation should be included in the definition of a young carer. The concept of structural
33
34 inequality (Dani and De Haan, 2007) is used to fully comprehend the impact that the current
35
36 situation has on a potentially vulnerable group of children and the institutional constraints
37
38 which the children frequently encounter as they try to cope with the situation they find
39
40 themselves in are explored. The concluding argument is that children with a parent in prison
41
42 are indeed a hidden population of children with significant caring responsibilities and should
43
44 be included in the definition of young carer. It is contended that only then might the UK be
45
46 regarded as an inclusive state (Dani and De Haan, 2007) providing fair access to support
47
48 services for those in need.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methodology

1
2
3 This paper is based on two qualitative research projects which took place during 2011 – 15;
4
5 one with a focus on the support offered to children of prisoners by schools in one local
6
7 authority in the South West of England and the other focused on the experiences of children
8
9 visiting their parents in prison. In the first instance, between January and July 2011, twelve
10
11 semi-structured interviews were carried out with stakeholders such as Probation; Youth
12
13 Workers; Educational Psychology; Local Authority Children Services; Youth Offending Teams;
14
15 Education Welfare and identified local and national charities involved in caring for children
16
17 with a parent in prison. Ten head teachers were also interviewed as well as six
18
19 children/young people and their mothers (Morgan *et al*, 2013a). The six families, who took
20
21 part in the interviews, were recruited via advertisements at the local prisons and relevant
22
23 charity groups on an opt-in basis. The children who took part in the interviews were aged 8–
24
25 13 years old: three boys and three girls. There were additional children within the 6
26
27 families, but consent was either not given by the child themselves or their mother felt that
28
29 the child was too young to take part in the interview and hence did not give her consent for
30
31 the child to take part in the interviews.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 As well as semi-structured interviews, questionnaires were sent to seventy-five schools
41
42 (primary, secondary, independent, pupil referral unit and special schools) in the local
43
44 authority with a covering letter explaining the purpose of the research. The questionnaires
45
46 were completed online or returned in a freepost envelope and were anonymous. A total of
47
48 nineteen questionnaires were returned with the majority having been completed by either
49
50 the Head Teacher or Deputy Head. Other members of staff who completed the
51
52 questionnaires were Parent Support Advisors, Head of Teaching and Learning, Teachers and
53
54 Head of Health and Safeguarding. It was not specified who should complete the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 questionnaire, being left to the discretion of the school. As much as possible, schools who
4
5 were invited to take part in interviews were not the same schools that completed the
6
7 questionnaires.
8
9

10
11 In the second piece of research, conducted 2013-2015, 45 prisoners who were parents (both
12
13 male and female) as well as 22 prison officers and 8 members of visiting centre staff were
14
15 interviewed in five prisons in England and Wales about children visiting their parents in
16
17 prison. Contact was made with 15 prisons across England and Wales and an offer to
18
19 participate in the research was made to the Governor. Five prisons agreed to take part.
20
21 Three prisons were in the South West of England, one was in London and one was in Wales.
22
23 Four of the five prisons had male inmates whilst one housed female inmates. The semi-
24
25 structured interviews ranged from 1 hour to 2.5 hours long. Three focus groups with 25
26
27 different imprisoned mothers also took place and, just as in the first piece of research, the
28
29 caring responsibilities of children became evident in the narratives of all the mothers and
30
31 fathers involved in the research. It should be noted that it is not uncommon for children
32
33 whose mothers are imprisoned to be cared for by grandparents or the state, whereas
34
35 children whose father is in prison are most usually cared for by their mother (Raikes, 2016).
36
37 These two pieces of research were typical of this finding with all the children in the first
38
39 piece were cared for by their mothers and, in the second, the children were cared for by a
40
41 variety of relatives including grandparents (7), fathers (4), stepfathers (5) and 5 were in the
42
43 care of the local authority.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Full ethical approval for both projects was obtained from the University and the purpose of
54
55 the interviews was fully explained to all participants before they took place along with a
56
57 copy of an information sheet detailing the research aims and objectives and their role in the
58
59
60

1
2
3 process. In addition, ethical approval from NOMS (National Offender Management Service)
4
5 was given for the second piece of research as it concerned interviewing prisoners. As
6
7 children's rights were at the forefront of this research, only children who gave consent
8
9 themselves took part in either research project (Leeson, 2007) and support was arranged for
10
11 any participant in the research who felt that they needed it; this offer was taken up by just
12
13 one child.
14
15
16

17
18 Once all the data was collected, thematic data analysis was used to identify emerging and
19
20 recurrent themes and both researchers independently agreed the themes (Bryman, 2012).
21
22 Although the interviews were intended to explore three things: the quality of existing
23
24 support mechanisms for children with a parent in prison; what further support was required
25
26 and experiences of prison visiting, it was inevitable that data was gathered about their daily
27
28 routines and what the children were expected to cope with. Thematic analysis enabled the
29
30 emergence of a strong theme of the children having caring responsibilities that seriously
31
32 impacted their sense of wellbeing.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Findings

41
42 Three main themes related to the caring responsibilities of children with a parent in prison
43
44 were identified in the data. Firstly, how children care for their non-imprisoned parent;
45
46 secondly, how they care for their siblings; and, thirdly, how they care for their imprisoned
47
48 parent. Below, each theme is explored using the **concept** of structural inequality to expose
49
50 the consequences of failing to provide effective support services for a group of children that
51
52 have been hitherto ignored by politicians.
53
54
55
56
57

58 Caring for their non-imprisoned parent

59
60

1
2
3 Caring for a non-imprisoned parent, (in this research, their mothers), included being anxious
4
5 about her wellbeing and mental health as well as supporting her with household chores
6
7 including shopping, cooking and cleaning. The emotional caring required of children in these
8
9 situations was described as complex and often painful, isolating them from usual support
10
11 mechanisms as they sought to manage their own problems and those of the people around
12
13 them in a landscape full of stigma and negative judgement. For example, one child talked
14
15 about making a conscious decision not to tell her mother about things that were going
16
17 wrong in her life and any trouble at school, as she did not want to hurt or worry her mother
18
19 any further. She felt there was no one else she could talk to, as she was very aware of the
20
21 stigma attached to having a parent in prison and feared ostracisation and bullying from her
22
23 community. Another child talked about it being his responsibility to help his mum as much
24
25 as possible so that she was not too tired, given that she worked full time as well as having
26
27 the family to care for. Parents were, however, well aware of what their children were
28
29 doing; as one imprisoned father said;

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

‘He won’t talk to his mum about me at all as he thinks that she will get
upset.....she says she tries to talk to him about me but she gets upset and then
he gets angry and tells her that he doesn’t want to talk about me’ (Imprisoned
father)

Some children with a parent in prison are therefore experiencing living with an adult with
significant coping and health issues of their own (Souza *et al*, 2019). There is substantial
evidence of serious and debilitating feelings of loss and bereavement for the remaining
parent; sometimes leading to drug and alcohol dependency and/or the onset of mental
illnesses such as depression and severe anxiety as well as physical manifestations of stress
(Kjellstrand and Eddy, 2011; Manby *et al*, 2015) much of which remains undiagnosed;

1
2
3
4
5 'My partner is not coping well with me being in here.... she is crying and not
6 coping.... but she has fallen out with her parents because of me and she doesn't
7 have many friends so she relies too much on our 12 year daughter.... telling her
8 things that she shouldn't' (Imprisoned father)
9

10
11 The corollary of this set of circumstances often means that, if there are no other support
12 mechanisms available; either formal (statutory services) or informal (extended family) then
13 the child *has* to take on a significant emotional caring role, take a measure of control and
14 work to return some normality and routine to their family life. A number of children will
15 already have good problem-solving skills and will be able to seek social support for their
16 role, therefore being more likely to cope with the situation they find themselves in (Gillespie
17 *et al*, 2007). By disengaging with the emotion of the situation and becoming more problem
18 focussed, they will be able to navigate the complexities and pain of their lives skilfully:
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 'I have to help my mum a lot and school don't know all that I have to do'.
33 (Interview, child aged 10)
34
35
36

37 Many children, however, do not have these skills or become exhausted with the effort
38 required and thus need significant support, especially if their incarcerated parent is away for
39 a long time. Throughout our discussions, we found that those children who exhibited an
40 initial capacity to cope would fare worst, as any underlying or subsequent need would be
41 undetected because the adults around them (teachers, friends, parent and extended family)
42 assumed they are okay until there was serious, concrete, external evidence that this was not
43 the case. Most commonly, evidence that the child was not coping was picked up via
44 indicators of poor attendance or behavioural issues within school for which there are clear
45 protocols and processes, rather than through any more subtle signs that all was not well.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59 Thus, those who keep their circumstances and their struggle to themselves often experience
60

1
2
3 significant cost to their own wellbeing (Morgan *et al*, 2013a). Furthermore, many will refuse
4
5 offers of help should they be forthcoming as they have shouldered the responsibility and
6
7
8 feel it is their duty to support their parents:
9

10
11 'We've got a young lady that I was going to add on to this is a young lady who is
12 very seldom in, she very seldom attends, and when she's here she's very
13 agitated. She never goes into any particular lesson and stays in the lesson even
14 though they're timetabled. She wants to go to the toilet all the time, and the
15 reason for that is she normally secreted her telephone on her somewhere and
16 she's anxiously phoning home to see if mum's okay, because mum's disabled,
17 mum's on her own, mum has abused alcohol and drugs in the past, and is still
18 trying to get round that, and dad was in prison, just recently come out, started
19 to buy presents for the daughter but by doing that he's trying to buy her
20 affection and also taking her out of school when she is here.' (Head Teacher, 3)
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 What was clearly demonstrated was the ambivalence that children, their families and the
31 professionals around them felt about how they might ask for help and how that help might
32 be offered. In terms of structural inequality, the teaching professionals identified there was
33 very little guidance or policy structure to assist them compared with the systems available
34 for other groups of children such as those with special educational needs or those who raise
35 safeguarding concerns. Furthermore, it was clear that the children felt that the stigma and
36 possible ostracization they may experience were too great a penalty to risk talking about
37 their situation and that they were significantly disadvantaged as a consequence (Children
38 heard and seen, 2019). It was a consistent theme amongst professionals interviewed that
39 the only structural way forward in terms of supporting children with a parent in prison was
40 where the child could be assessed as having academic or behavioural problems or when
41 there were child protection concerns. The lack of access to resources and services
42 experienced by children with a parent in prison fits with the working definition of social
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 exclusion developed by Levitas *et al.* (2007) and is evidence of structural inequality (Dani
4 and De Haan, 2013), with a lack of policy direction and poor provision of services for
5
6 children with a parent in prison as a consequence of a pervasive, negative view of those
7
8 who offend. This situation is further compounded by the knowledge that people dealing
9
10 with so – called ‘achieved stigma’ attempt to conceal their circumstances for fear of meeting
11
12 rejection and being regarded negatively (Cherney and Fitzgerald, 2016: p.18). Thus, the
13
14 structural inequality experienced by prisoners and their families means that not only are
15
16 there few services available to them, but also any existing provision is unreachable as they
17
18 try to ‘identity manage’ (Ibid, p. 18) the stigma they experience or fear experiencing.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 According to Dani and De Haan (2007), structural inequalities can be evidenced through
27
28 cultural norms and this was certainly the case when listening to the stories we were told by
29
30 the children and their families. Already well established in the UK is the powerful discourse
31
32 related to those who most deserve societies help (most recently the rhetoric of hardworking
33
34 and/or just about managing families – Gabb and de Jong, 2017) and those who do not (the
35
36 rhetoric of idle, workshy, feckless). It has been argued that this discourse has been
37
38 normalised and now proliferates an increasingly neoliberal social policy landscape (Wiggan,
39
40 2012; Pantazis, 2016). Thus, the way social and material power is distributed creates the
41
42 circumstances for structural inequality; it is not the ‘fault’ of the individual (Royce, 2009) yet
43
44 that is the way it is increasingly portrayed and experienced (Lansley and Mack, 2015; Gabb
45
46 and de Jong, 2017). Families with a member in prison are characteristically subjected to
47
48 significant negative discourses; for example, that they are guilty by association and
49
50 therefore unworthy of help, leading to a lack of political will to improve their circumstances
51
52 (Morgan and Leeson, 2015). Furthermore, families with a member in prison are commonly
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 seen either in terms of their capacity to avoid recidivism by reintegrating a prisoner
4
5 following release or as a cause for concern regarding generational criminal activity (Will *et*
6
7 *al*, 2014; Ministry of Justice, 2017) rather than having support needs and rights separate to
8
9 those of the offender.
10
11
12

13 **Caring for their siblings**

14
15
16 Children reported that they were often heavily relied upon to support their younger
17
18 brothers and sisters with tasks such as homework, taking and collecting them from school or
19
20 nursery, bathing and putting them to bed - generally behaving as parents themselves,
21
22 experiencing a role reversal that was hard to undo when no longer required. Parents were
23
24 aware of what their children were doing and expressed gratitude for their support during a
25
26 very difficult time:
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 'My daughter has taken the role of mum at times' (Parent 4)
34
35

36
37 Parents were also saddened that their child was in this position, but could see no other way
38
39 forward as their own struggle with the emotional impact of their partners incarceration had
40
41 left them emotionally unavailable for their children and unable to cope with the rapid
42
43 change in circumstances, the stigma and practicalities of their situation:
44
45
46

47
48 'This experience has changed my family and not for the better' (Parent 2)
49
50

51
52 There appeared to be little alternative to relying on this support and although the children
53
54 saw it as the most useful thing that they could do to help their parent, there was no doubt it
55
56 could be an onerous task often meaning their own studies became a secondary or minor
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 concern. Schools were also well aware of what children with a parent in prison had to deal
4
5 with; despite the families often making great effort to keep their difficulties to themselves:
6
7
8
9
10

11 '....this particular young man is he's actually quite grown-up for his age because
12 he's had to become the father figure, and so he's done everything for mum at
13 home, everything for the little ones. Trying to run in and do his exams. Go back
14 home and make sure everything's fine, so he's taken that role on because...'
15
16

17 (Head Teacher 5)
18
19
20

21 'He is now the man of the house.... I say to him you must look after your
22 brothers and be the man of the house' (mother)
23
24
25

26
27 'I tell him that he is the oldest and he must look after his younger brothers and
28 sisters and make sure that they are doing what they should be doing....I don't
29 want them to get into trouble as my mother lives in a sh*t area and I am not
30 there to look after them...there is a lot of pressure on him to ensure that all is
31 well with his brothers and sisters' (Imprisoned mother talking about her 14 year
32 old son who lives with his 6 siblings at his grandmothers).
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 School staff described themselves as powerless or limited in their capacity to support these
40 children, as, once again, unless the child was causing a safeguarding or academic concern
41 there was little that could be offered because children with a parent in prison are not an
42 identified or priority group for service provision (Morgan *et al*, 2013b):
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 'When we know about it we try and do what we can, but again it is a bit limited
50 to be honest' (Head teacher, interview)
51
52
53

54 'I'm sure if I brought my PSA on to it I'm sure she might be able to scrubble
55 round and find something but I wasn't aware there was a statutory duty to
56 anything' (Head teacher, interview)
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 When asked what access they had to resources to support them in working with children
4 with a parent in prison, virtually all school staff replied there was nothing available for
5 families separated by imprisonment although they did have resources to support families
6 experiencing other forms of separation such as bereavement, divorce or military activity.
7
8 The inappropriateness of trying to use such resources was clearly articulated by one of the
9 children spoken to, who recalled reacting badly to a well-intentioned teacher who tried to
10 empathise with their situation using a book designed for families experiencing divorce:
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 I told my teacher because I thought it would be good for school to understand
22 and my teacher gave me booklet about parents who split up – MY MUM AND
23 DAD HAD NOT SPLIT UP (child raises voice). The teacher gave it to me in front of
24 my class all in the open – I had to tell them about my dad because of this. (Child;
25 aged 12)
26
27
28
29
30

31 One teacher spoke about using the internet to look for his own resources and reported that
32 this had been difficult to achieve, leaving him feeling frustrated and powerless to support
33 the children in his care. Had these children been regarded as young carers, there would
34 have been much greater empathy for their situation and more resources for school staff to
35 use in supporting the child in his/her efforts to care for their family. Whilst it is noted that,
36 in many local areas, services for young carers are poor (Aldridge *et al*, 2016), nevertheless
37 there are more than for those with a parent in prisons, who are being asked to fulfil the
38 same or similar caring tasks. The lack of clear institutional and policy structures to support
39 children and their families, compound the powerlessness they feel and make it even less
40 likely that they will seek help. Where there are systems to support children in terms of their
41 studies, these are so poorly resourced that they are unlikely to offer much respite or help
42 (Morgan and Leeson, 2019). Dani and de Haan (2007) talk about how the labels and
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 categories used in policy frameworks serve to reinforce inequality and that is visible here;
4
5 children bereaved through military action, divorce or death have resources and services to
6
7 help them cope that are enshrined in policy, because their circumstances are socially
8
9 acceptable and invoke positive emotions such as sympathy and empathy. Children with a
10
11 parent in prison, on the other hand, are not regarded in the same way, the 'achieved' stigma
12
13 of offending behaviour (Cherney and Fitzgerald, 2016) means there are fewer services;
14
15 piecemeal and often dependent on the attitudes, priorities and capacities of those that
16
17 deliver them (Leeson and Morgan, 2014). This is an untenable situation of inequality,
18
19 especially when the United Nations Commission on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, Unicef,
20
21 1989) is considered. There are several Articles such as Article 8, the right to a family life and
22
23 Article 12, the right to express their views, where children with a parent in prison should
24
25 have their voices heard and their needs acknowledged. However, as Codd (2019) states;
26
27 children with a parent in prison are less likely to have the wherewithal to make their views
28
29 known because of the stigma attached to their situation, thus ensuring the perpetuation of
30
31 structural inequality – a system that gives rights, but only to those who are regarded as
32
33 deserving them or who have the articulacy or support to be able to demand them.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Caring for their imprisoned parent

45
46
47 There was a clear thread running through the data of the children expressing deep concern
48
49 for their parent in prison and their extreme frustration that they could not address these
50
51 anxieties by regularly visiting and seeing how they were for themselves:
52
53
54
55

56 'My dad has no-one to talk to – he worries – he has depression' (Child,
57 aged 12)
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 It doesn't even mean that he's going to be local because even though
6 we've got 3 prisons down here he could well be put anywhere within the
7 UK, in which case that becomes an issue in terms of visiting, because you
8 don't have that regular contact, and you won't necessarily be seeing
9 them every weekend. (Head teacher)
10
11
12
13

14 'she worries about me and thinks that I will be hurt or that I am
15 upset.....she cries and tries to be brave but won't say how she is feeling
16 as she doesn't want to upset me...her focus is on me' (imprisoned
17 mother taking about 8 year old daughter).
18
19
20
21
22

23 Visits are an important aspect of the reality of having a parent in prison; the capacity
24 to connect and reassure themselves that all is well is important and all the children
25 spoke to emphasised this. However, the provision of a visiting service is fraught with
26 ambivalence. Prisoners are reluctant to have their children experience the intrusive
27 search procedure and the sight of their parent in an alien environment. Children and
28 parents spoke about the restrictions on visiting in terms of time allocated and
29 activities engaged in;
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 'I don't like that we can't just go and play, he just sits there and can't move. I
39 don't talk to the staff because I'm there to see my dad, not them and there isn't
40 enough time'. (Child aged 13)
41
42

43 'Only did it once but was made to feel bad for doing it'. (Parent)
44
45
46
47

48 Both children and schools spoke of the difficulty of allowing children time off school to
49 visit their parent as it is disruptive to their education and frequently not encouraged
50 by education officials:
51
52
53
54

55 'I can't see my dad much as most visits are in school time and the prison is miles
56 away so I would miss lots of lessons. School gets cross when my mum asks them
57 if I can go so now I only go in holidays.'(Child aged 10)
58
59
60

1
2
3 Basic visits (twice a month) are enshrined in law, yet only last an hour and may not be
4 suitable or possible for children to attend, usually because they are held during the
5 school day and it can be complex to extricate children from their lessons to attend a
6 prison that could be many miles from home (Morgan *et al*, 2013b). Standard visits
7 (three times a month) and the highly prized enhanced visits (four or five times a
8 month) are often used as privileges that the prisoner has to earn, usually as rewards
9 for good behaviour, and can be removed should their conduct deteriorate without
10 regard for the impact on families (Barnardo's, 2014). Thus, a child who needs that
11 visual reassurance of seeing their parent misses out, often at the last minute, with the
12 subsequent negative impact on their own health and wellbeing. The Farmer Review
13 (Ministry of Justice, 2017) called for visits to be a right rather than a privilege; it is
14 clear that this change will be slow to implement as it requires a substantial shift in
15 perspective by both policymakers and the wider society; offenders fit the Moral
16 Underclass Discourse (Levitas *et al*, 2007) and are therefore regarded as less than
17 others. Once a group of people are 'othered' in this way, it could be argued that
18 structural inequality is facilitated and legitimised (Dani and De Haan, 2007).
19 Without liaison with education authorities, it is likely to still be an issue for a child to
20 visit their parent regularly as schools remain reluctant to allow children time off from
21 their studies (Morgan and Leeson, 2019). The consequence of regarding those who
22 break the law and given custodial sentences as inferior or unequal to the rest of
23 society is that their unequal status is conferred to their children by association. When
24 a prisoner is denied a visit because of his/her actions within the prison, the power and
25 control exercised by the prison authorities further underlines the disadvantage felt by
26 the child and further embeds inequality. Levitas *et al* (2007) identify a close link
27 between social inequality and social exclusion and this is clearly played out when
28 considering services and support for children with a parent in prison. At a recent event
29 organised by Children Heard and Seen (2/7/19), children with a parent in prison called
30 for visits to be a right not a privilege – it remains to be seen if their voice is heard.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 Conclusion

59
60

1
2
3 Structural inequality has featured in debates about race, gender, education, health
4 and housing issues (Dani and De Haan, 2007), but there has been limited exploration
5 when looking at the lives of children with a parent in prison. It is evident from the
6 above discussion that children who have a parent in prison experience structural
7 inequality first-hand as they are consistently ignored by politicians and policymakers
8 when making decisions about the ways to deal with those who offend. It has been
9 argued that the way in which offenders are regarded - as bad people with unhealthy
10 relationships who should be incarcerated - is too simplistic in terms of the
11 consequences for their families (Turanovich *et al.*, 2012). The extension of stigma to
12 the family of offenders (Goffman, 1963; Cheney and Fitzgerald, 2016) ensures the
13 perpetuation of structural inequality through the attribution of unequal status in
14 terms of rights and opportunities (Dani and De Haan, 2007). The perceived need to
15 punish offenders and to control their activity within the prison environment ensures
16 that the wellbeing of prisoners' children is very low on the list of priorities, despite a
17 number of initiatives identified, such as those in the Farmer Review (2017).
18 Furthermore, there continues to be a lack of awareness of how children suffer
19 emotionally when they are unable to reassure themselves that their parent is coping.
20 It is clear from this work and that of others (Barnardo's, 2014; Manby *et al.*, 2015; Raikes,
21 2016) that a large proportion of children with a parent in prison suffer significant emotional
22 harm whilst their parent is away and this paper has shown the significant caring
23 responsibilities that are added to their burden by a society that appears to show a lack of
24 interest in their wellbeing when compared with other vulnerable groups of children. For
25 example, the voices of children with a parent in prison have been absent from any debate
26 about the needs of children identified as young carers, with the consequence that their
27 service provision is limited or non-existent

28
29 Dani and De Haan (2007: p. 22) argue that a society has to facilitate transparency, voice and
30 accountability with an equality of agency in order to be considered inclusive. What has been
31 shown through this paper is that there is a long way to go to achieve any of these for
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 children who experience having a parent in prison. There has been little public debate as to
4
5 the needs of children who find themselves in this situation, little opportunity at a national,
6
7 political level for their voice to be heard and no single body has been made accountable for
8
9 their welfare meaning that there are several competing agendas and little political will to
10
11 diminish the social exclusion of a large number of vulnerable individuals. There is still a
12
13 concentration on the improvement or maintenance of prisoners' connections with their
14
15 family in order to prevent or inhibit recidivism, rather than on acknowledging/addressing
16
17 the substantial caring responsibilities of the child him/herself. Indeed, the Farmer report
18
19 only mentions caring three times and only in the context of the parent in prison maintaining
20
21 *their* caring responsibilities. It has to be acknowledged that there is some, limited
22
23 movement; there are instances of good practice that support children with a parent in
24
25 prison such as those identified in the Farmer Review (Ministry of Justice, 2017) and the work
26
27 of organisations such as Children Heard and Seen (2019) are helping to push that agenda,
28
29 but it would seem that a sustained, national framework providing services for the child who
30
31 has a parent in prison is still a long way off.

32
33 This paper demonstrates that children with a parent in prison *are* young carers and argues
34
35 that the current eligibility criteria should be amended or extended to allow their work to be
36
37 recognised and their needs met in a non-judgmental, non-stigmatised environment. There is
38
39 a high degree of social acceptance and value placed on a child who cares for apparent or
40
41 sibling with a disability, thanks to the hard work of those who have raised our awareness of
42
43 their existence. The same should be accorded to children with a parent in prison; they have
44
45 done nothing wrong (Morgan and Leeson, 2019) yet find themselves in a situation where
46
47 they have to do a great deal of emotional and physical hard work to keep their family intact.
48
49 As it stands, the absence of national, effective support systems; the consequence of a lack
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

of political or social will is having a deleterious effect on children and families of prisoners.

Children with a parent in prison experience, first hand, systematic structural inequalities

which should be interrogated, challenged and reformed.

References

Aldridge, J., Cheesbrough, S., Harding, C., Webster, H. and Taylor, L. (2016) *The lives of young carers in England omnibus survey report: Research report*. London: Department for Education. Department for Education Research Report; DFE-RR636

Barnardo's (2014) *Children affected by parental imprisonment*, http://www.barnardos.org.uk/what_we_do/our_work/children_of_prisoners.htm (accessed 20/2/18)

Boswell, G., Wedge, P. (2002) *Imprisoned fathers and their children*. Jessica Kingsley, London

Bryman, A. (2012) *Social research methods*, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Cherney, A. and Fitzgerald, R. (2016) Efforts by Offenders to Manage and Overcome Stigma: The Case of Employment, *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, Vol. 28(1), pp. 17 - 32

Child Law Advice Centre (2018) *What is a young carer?* <https://childlawadvice.org.uk/information-pages/young-carers/> (accessed 02/07/18)

children heard and seen, (2019) *Seven calls to action*, 2/7/19, <https://childrenheardandseen.co.uk/news/seven-calls-to-action/> (accessed 18/7/19)

Children's Society (2013) *Hidden from view; the experiences of young carers in England*, www.childrenssociety.org.uk/young-carers (accessed 02/07/18)

Codd, H. (2019) *The rights of children of imprisoned parents*, in Hutton, M. and Moran, D. (Eds.) *The Palgrave handbook of prison and the family*, Switzerland, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 365 – 384 in Hutton, M. and Moran, D. (Eds.) *The Palgrave handbook of prison and the family*, Switzerland, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 365 - 384

Dani, A. and De Haan, A. (2007) *Structural Inequalities and Inclusive Institutions*, In Dani, A. and De Haan, A. (Eds.) *Inclusive States: Social Policy and Structural Inequalities*, Washington D.C., The World Bank, pp.3-38

Gabb, J. and de Jong, S. (2017). *Focus: Families and relationships across crises*. Discover Society, 44. Open University; <http://oro.open.ac.uk/50244/3/50244.pdf> (accessed 12/02/19)

Gill, O. (2009) *Every night you cry: case studies of 15 Bristol families with a father in prison*. Barnardo's South West.

- 1
2
3 Gillespie, B., Charboyer, W. and Wallis, M. (2007) Development of a theoretically derived
4 model of resilience through concept analysis, *Contemporary Nurse* Vol. 25(1), pp. 124–135
5
6
7 Goffman, E. (1963) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall
8
9 Gough, I. (2007) *European Welfare States: Explanations and Lessons for Developing*
10 *Countries*, In Dani, A. and De Haan, A. (Eds.) *Inclusive States: Social Policy and Structural*
11 *Inequalities*, Washington D.C., The World Bank, pp. 39 - 72
12
13
14 Kavanaugh, M., Noh, H. & Studer, L (2015) It'd be nice if someone asked me how I was
15 doing. Like, 'cause I will have an answer": exploring support needs of young carers of a
16 parent with Huntington's disease, *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies: An International*
17 *Interdisciplinary Journal for Research, Policy and Care*, Vol. 10 (1), pp. 12-25,
18
19
20 Kennan, D., Fives, A. & Canavan, J. (2012) Accessing a hard to reach population: reflections
21 on research with young carers in Ireland, *Child and Family Social Work*, Vol. 17, pp. 275–283
22
23
24 Kjellstrand, J. & Eddy, J. (2011) Parental Incarceration during Childhood, Family Context, and
25 Youth Problem Behavior across Adolescence, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, Vol. 50(1),
26 pp. 18-36
27
28
29 Lanskey, C., Losel, F., Markson, L. and Souza, K. (2015) Re-framing the Analysis: A 3-
30 dimensional Perspective of Prisoners' Children's Wellbeing, *Children & Society*, Vol. 29, pp.
31 484–494
32
33
34 Lansley, S. and Mack, J. (2015) *Breadline Britain – the rise of mass poverty*, Bristol, Policy
35 Press
36
37
38 Leeson, C. (2007) *Going round in circles: key issues in the development of an effective ethical*
39 *protocol for research involving young children*, in: Campbell, A. & Groundwater-Smith, S.
40 (Eds.) *An Ethical Approach to Practitioner Research*, London, Routledge, pp. 129 - 143
41
42
43 Leeson, C and Morgan, J. (2014) Strategic planning for support services for children with a
44 parent or close relative in prison, *Social Policy and Administration*, Vol. 48(7), pp. 848–863
45
46
47 Leu, A. and Becker, S. (2017) A cross-national and comparative classification of in-country
48 awareness and policy responses to 'young carers' *Journal of Youth Studies* Vol. 20(6), pp. 750 -
49 762
50
51
52 Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Fahmy, E., Gordon, D., Lloyd, E. and Patsios, D. (2007) *The multi-*
53 *dimensional analysis of social exclusion*, Bristol, University of Bristol
54
55
56
57 Manby, M., Jones, A., Foca, L., Bieganski, J. & Starke, S. (2015) Children of prisoners:
58 exploring the impact of families' reappraisal of the role and status of the imprisoned parent
59 on children's coping strategies, *European Journal of Social Work*, Vol.18(2), pp. 228-245,
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Ministry of justice (2017) *The Importance of Strengthening Prisoners' Family Ties to Prevent*
7 *Reoffending and Reduce Intergenerational Crime (Farmer Review)*, London, Government
8 Publications
9

10
11 Morgan, J., Leeson, C., Carter Dillon, R., Wirgman, A. and Needham, M. (2013a) A Hidden
12 Group of Children: Support in Schools for Children who Experience Parental Imprisonment,
13 *Children and Society*, Vol. 28(4), pp. 269 -279
14
15

16
17 Morgan, J., Leeson, C & Carter Dillon, R., (2013b). How can schools support children with a
18 parent in prison? *Pastoral Care in Education*. Vol. 31(3), pp. 199-210
19
20

21
22 Morgan, J., and Leeson, C. (2015). How can schools support children who experience the
23 imprisonment of a parent or close relative? *Every Child Journal*, Vol. 5 (1), pp. 20-26
24
25

26
27 Morgan, J., and Leeson, C. (2019) *School experiences of children of prisoners: Strengthening*
28 *support in schools in England and Wales*, In Hutton, M. and Moran, D. (Eds.) *The Palgrave*
29 *handbook of prison and the family*, Switzerland, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 503-518
30
31

32
33 Pantazis, C. (2016) Policies and discourses of poverty during a time of recession and
34 austerity, *Critical Social Policy*, Volume: 36(1), pp. 3-20
35
36

37
38 Phillips, S. and Gates, T. (2011) A Conceptual Framework for Understanding the
39 Stigmatization of Children of Incarcerated Parents, *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, Vol.
40 20(3), pp. 286 -294
41
42

43
44 Raikes, B. (2016) *Unsung heroines: celebrating the care provide by grandmothers for*
45 *children with parents in prison*, *Probation journal*, Vol. 63(3), pp. 320 -330
46
47

48
49 Royce, E. (2009) *Poverty and power; the problem of structural inequality*, Maryland, USA,
50 Rowman and Littlefield
51

52
53 Sexton, T. (2016) Incarceration as a Family Affair: Thinking Beyond the Individual, *Couple*
54 *and Family Psychology: Research and Practice*, Vol. 5(2), pp. 61–64
55
56

57
58 Sharratt, K. (2014) Children's experiences of contact with imprisoned parents: A comparison
59 between four European countries, *European Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 11(6), pp. 760–
60 775

1
2
3 Schlafer, R. & Poehlmann, J. (2010) Attachment and caregiving relationships in families
4 affected by parental incarceration, *Attachment & Human Development*, Vol. 12(4), pp. 395-
5 415
6

7
8 Smyth, C., Blaxland, M. & Cass, B. (2011): 'So that's how I found out I was a young carer and
9 that I actually had been a carer most of my life'. Identifying and supporting hidden young
10 carers, *Journal of Youth Studies*, Vol. 14 (2), pp. 145-160
11

12
13 Souza, K., Lanskey, C., Markson, L., Lösel, F. (2019) *Partners of incarcerated men:
14 questioning caring stereotypes*, in Hutton, M. and Moran, D. (Eds.) *The Palgrave handbook
15 of prison and the family*, Switzerland, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 203 - 228
16

17
18 Thomas, N., Stainton, T., Jackson, S., Wai Yee, C., Doubtfire, S. & Webb, A. (2003) Your
19 friends don't understand': Invisibility and unmet need in the lives of 'young carers' *Child and
20 Family Social Work* Vol. 8, pp. 35-46
21

22
23 Tuffney, C. (2012) Children as Carers, *Archive of Disease in Childhood*, Vol. 97 (2), pp. 93-95
24

25
26 Turanovich, J., Rodriguez, N. and Pratt, T. (2012) The collateral consequences of
27 incarceration revisited: a qualitative analysis of the effects on caregivers of children of
28 incarcerated parents, *Criminology*, Vol. 50(4), pp. 913 - 959
29

30
31 UNICEF (1989) *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*, www.unicef.org.uk
32

33
34 Wiggan, J. (2012) Telling stories of 21st century welfare: The UK Coalition government and
35 the neo-liberal discourse of worklessness and dependency, *Critical Social Policy*, Vol. 32(3),
36 pp. 383-405
37

38
39 Will, J., Whalen, M. & Loper, A. (2014) From One Generation to the Next: Childhood
40 Experiences of Antisocial Behavior and Parental Incarceration Among Adult Inmates, *Journal
41 of Offender Rehabilitation*, Vol. 53(3), pp. 190-210
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60