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Abstract

Introduction and context: With the number of imprisoned women who also double as mother continue to grow, so has the number of innocent children accompanying their mother behind bars. Around the World, different countries have approached this issue in different ways within their respective national policy and legal frameworks. For instance, having different time frames upon which such children can be accepted to be admitted to or get separated from living with their imprisoned mothers behind bars. However, appreciating the perspectives of prison staff and the imprisoned mothers regarding admission and separation of the children while their parents are in prison especially in low resource countries. With a population of over 256 children residing in prisons with their imprisoned mothers in Uganda, Uganda Prisons Services offers a good study site to bridge the knowledge gap. This degree report is based on master’s thesis study of the views on how imprisoned mother and prison staff relate with separating the children living alongside imprisoned mothers. The study was conducted in Uganda Prisons services involving two prisons in Central Uganda.

Methods: The study employed a qualitative case study design and data was collected through in-depth and joint interviews to reach nine imprisoned mothers and two prison staff. Three imprisoned mothers were engaged through in-depth interviews. Joint interviews were also conducted with six imprisoned mothers—involving a dyad in each of the interview. The mothers were either convicts, on remand or committal; and seven mothers were staying with their children inside prison and/or had their children in a day care centre affiliated to the prison. While the other two mothers had been with their children inside prison but separated few weeks prior to the interviews. Analysis of data was through thematic analysis adopting the six-phase criteria suggested by Braun and Clark (2006). The study used mental models and theories on group and role identity to facilitate an understanding of the perspective with which participants related with the topic under study.

Findings: views obtained from imprisoned mothers were pre-occupied with the motherly-caring responsibilities and coping with prison time. While for prison staff, were about following the course of the law or seen in terms of additional/extra workload. Nonetheless, both showed concern about the child’s wellbeing and protection against excesses within the prison environment prison. It was interesting though that neither of them seemed concerned with - consideration for improving the inside prison condition for the stay of the child despite the elaborations on the perceived inadequacies relating to children’s stay in prison. Staff and imprisoned mother’s participation in separating the children is limited more to following of the law.

Conclusion: Overall, there were competing perspectives about the prison environment with regard to admission of children to stay with their imprisoned mothers and the eventual separation. A reflection on the different perspectives presented could be of advantage in streamlining the process and decision to separate such children including the admission into prisons and post-separation period.

Key concepts: Prison, imprisoned mothers, staff, Children, living alongside their imprisoned mother(s), views about separation, Separation process and decision, Uganda Prisons Act 2006.
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Chapter One

Introduction

1.0. Introduction

Over the year, the number of women going serving prison time has been increasing, and many of them also double as mothers. With caring responsibilities in the lime light yet in most cases, these mothers are the primary carers of their children has a bigger implications which may be in the form of adjustment and realignment of programs as regards to how the welfare and justice systems operate in order to cater for the children, since the two originally existed to serve parallel functions. Several countries around the world allow children to stay alongside their imprisoned mothers as they do their time in prison or await trial/sentencing, and Uganda is among such countries. The period with which the children can spend time in detention however, varies from country to country, and sometimes within a single country as it is for the United States (US); just like the varying reasons for either letting child (ren) stay or not stay in prison. Uganda for example under the Uganda Prisons Act, 2006, permits infants to live with their imprisoned mothers for up to when they are eighteen (18) months, and the child will be separated unless the Office of the Commissioner General of prisons thinks otherwise or is not satisfied with the alternative arrangement. Concerns about issues of attachment and question on whether the prison can serve as a good place for raising children has created a dilemma for advocates for the best interests of a child including but not limited to imprisoned mothers themselves and staff working with prison services (including professionals both social workers and others) which makes them rethink the different options. For the children admitted to stay with their mothers while they serve their prison time, may have to be separated away from staying in prison for the relevant reasons that may constitute the situation at the time. Interesting, whereas many studies have written a lot about separation and children of imprisoned mothers, little has been talked about with regards to where separation occur from prison and the alternatives for the child have to be sought outside the prison setting. This study therefore seeks to bring forth understanding of how imprisoned mothers and the prison staff relate with the process and decision to separate the children from living alongside their imprisoned mothers. And to draw the implication of such understanding for the Uganda Prisons Act, 2006.

1.1. Background

Worldwide, the number of women being sent to prison has been increasing overtime. The magnitude however, varies from country to country. This increase is said to have direct but also adverse effect on the children since many of the imprisoned women also double as mothers (Luyt, 2008, Seymour, 2008). For instance, Townhead reports that mothers constitute about 87% of women in Sao Paulo’s largest female prison in Brazil; 75% of 80% of female prison population in the United states have dependent children, while 55% of the imprisoned women (66% mothers) have children below the age of 16 (2006, cited in Luyt, 2008). A study by Luyt also found out that 70% of the imprisoned women in South Africa were mothers (2008). Similarly, in Australia, imprisoned women who had children who looked up to them for their wellbeing were about two-thirds (Sheehan, 2010). In a related study regarding detention and imprisonment; women, babies and children have been categorised among the vulnerable groups of those in prison in Africa. Wilson, reported that women formed between 1 and 6 percent of African prison populations, though with variations within and across regions (2010). While Town-head indicated that the risk of vulnerability they present in the wellbeing of children
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cannot be underestimated because of their role as primary caregivers (Australian Department of Justice cited in Burgess and Flynn, 2013). However, their small proportions have yet to attract much attention with regards to their distinctive needs (Bloom 2005; cited in Flynn, 2012). “Whilst the number of children affected by maternal imprisonment is much smaller than that of children whose fathers are in prison, research has indicated that the experiences of these children are qualitatively different and more severe”, (Flynn, 2012, p.286). It has been noted that while most children of imprisoned women live outside prison and must adjust to life without a mother, some are taken into prison with their mothers (Robertson, 2008), something that could impact on the wellbeing of the child. In the report of the special rapporteur on prisons and conditions of detention in Africa at the 52nd Ordinary Session of the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights; Med S.K Kagwa problematized the dilemma that imprisonment of the mothers present. He noted that “on the one hand, prisons clearly do not provide an appropriate environment for babies and young children; while on the other hand, the forcible separation of mothers and infants is highly undesirable” (October 2012). This alludes to what Myers et al., (1999, p.11) indicate, that, “children [of imprisoned mothers] typically experience a great many risk factors besides their mothers' incarceration”. It is observed that, such children require special consideration (Flynn, 2012) in as far as their care is concerned. Ferraro and Moe (2003 p.13), add that the “incarceration creates unique concerns about the welfare of their children from which most men are protected by the presence of a female partner who attends to their children”.

In South African women’s prison, children can live in detention with their mothers until up to the age of five (Preez and Luyt; cited in Luyt 2008); there is however, no warrant needed to admit a baby if the mother wishes not (Zyl, 1992, cited in Luyt, 2008). During the children stay in detention with their mother, the South African department of corrections is responsible for the sound physical, social and medical care (Luyt, 2008). In some other parts of the world for instance in Bolivia, children are allowed to stay with their imprisoned mothers to up until they are six years (Shahriari, 2014). In the United States however, authorities allow children to stay with their mothers for a varying period ranging from days to months. For example in states like Dakota, a thirty days’ period is permitted to enable children/infants stay with their imprisoned mothers inside (raptivism.com/site/mothers.htm cited in Stern, 2004). It was also indicated that children can stay with their mothers through until the complete serving their sentence in California and 12-18 months in Massachusetts, Nebraska and Washington state. However, in the state of New York, it was noted that imprisoned mothers serving a sentence of more than 15 months may lose their children if they did not have family members or relatives with whom the children could be left (Stern, 2004). Thus, “Keeping incarcerated mothers and their babies together can work pre-emptively against future psychosocial problems for the child and their associated burdens on the state. And also motivating the mothers to better themselves, both in prison and in their lives beyond”, (Stern, 2004, pp. 9).

Separation of children living in detention alongside their mothers has been recognised in international law. This has had impact on national laws of various countries, Uganda inclusive. At the international level, reference can be made to the United Nations Standard Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners, also known as the Bangkok Rules; for instance provides standards for admission of children to stay with their imprisoned mothers in prison. The document also includes rules under which separation of these children living alongside their mothers should be handled. For example; Rule 51 (1) provides that the decisions as to when a child is to be separated from its mother shall be based on individual assessments and the best interests of the child within the scope of relevant national laws; (2) The removal of the child from prison shall be undertaken with sensitivity, only when alternative care arrangements for
the child have been identified [...]; (3) After children are separated from their mothers and placed with family, relatives or in other alternative care, women prisoners shall be given the maximum possible opportunity and facilities to meet with their children, when it is in the best interests of the children and when public safety is not compromised.

Similarly, at the national level, separation of children or infants who live alongside their imprisoned mothers in prison in Uganda is also guided by the Uganda Prisons Act, 2006. It is provided for in section 59 (4) an infant [...] shall be supplied clothing and other necessities of life by the State until the infant attains the age of 18 months in which case the officer in charge shall, on being satisfied that there is a relative or friend of the infant able and willing to support it, cause the infant to be handed over to the relative or friend; and in subsection (5) Where there is no relative or friend who is able and willing to support the infant, the Commissioner General may, subject to the relevant laws, entrust the care of the infant to the welfare or probation authority as the Commissioner General may approve for that purpose.

As of January 1st 2013, Petride Mudoola reporting in the New Vision – a leading government owned newspaper that over 161 children were living alongside their imprisoned mothers in some of Uganda’s 21 female prisons. Whereas under the law, children must leave prisons at clocking eighteen months, as provided for under the Uganda Prisons Act, 2006, there were also reports of exceptional cases in which children were either allowed to stay for over or admitted to with their mothers even at 10 years (Mudoola, 2013). In such reports however, the viewpoint is normally, the wellbeing of the children and not necessarily the perspectives the prison staff or imprisoned mothers may relate with the process and the actual decision to separate the children from living alongside their imprisoned mothers. Yet, attention paid to their views could add meaning and sensitivity to the process and decision to separate children.

1.2. Problem Statement

Given the low percentages of imprisoned mothers against the prison population around the World, it would simply imply that children affected by this imprisonment is minimal too. Rodger indicates that, this conclusion is too problematic considering the wellbeing of the child than the many numbers affected by the imprisonment of fathers (1992). Schafer and Dellinger comparatively indicated that men are much more likely to have female partners to care for children during their incarceration (1999 cited in Ferraro and Moe, 2003) which is note the case for the women who have to use their female relatives rather than male partners to care for children in their absence (Ferraro and Moe, 2003). La Vigne, Davies and Brazzell (2008) in their research report, observed that, “whereas children of incarcerated fathers are typically placed with their mothers and often will not experience a significant change in their living situation, children of incarcerated mothers tend to have more varied and uncertain living arrangements. The majority do not live with their fathers, instead residing in the care of grandparents, other relatives, or friends” (La Vigne et al., 2008, p.3). It is however, discern whether such arrangements are formal or informal (Johnson & Waldfogel, 2002)

Imprisoned mothers and the children who live with them represent a defenceless group (EUROCHIPS, 2011). Children’s stay in prison with their incarcerated mothers present a tricky and problematic situation for both the imprisoned mothers and professionals engaged with this group. On the one hand it is argued that prison is not a good place to ensure the best interest of the child yet, on the other, reservations for the need to enhance attachment development may require a child especially the young ones to be with their mothers (Poelhmann, et al., 2010) even if it means serving prison-time with them. For instance, Wilson showed that the extended incarceration of mothers, combined with distance from their children, negatively affected
bonding (2010), in that some mothers forfeited their parental rights for the stability of their children (Sheehan, 2010). In some places around the world children are not allowed to stay in prison with their mothers in prison and as a result they are taken into alternative care or let to stay with the other parent outside prison. For example in California, it is reported that once a child is born in prison, the authorities immediately set in to separate them from their mother. In other countries like, Bolivia, South Africa, Brazil, and Australia children can stay with their imprisoned mothers in prison up until when they have reached a particular age (Luyt, 2008). In Bolivia for example, children can live with their imprisoned mothers up until six years, as noted by Shahriari in the Guardian of 20th April 2014. To illustrate how problematic the imprisonment of mothers and its implication on the wellbeing of their especially dependent children, there have been a number of studies, some that look at imprisoned mothers living with their children inside the prisons (see: Chen, 2009) while others have focused on the separation that imprisonment causes in the lives of children living on the outside (see: (Myers et.al, 1999; Sandifer and Kurth, 2000; Renny 2005; La Vigne et al., 2008; Murray and Farrington 2008; Murray, Farrington and Sekol, 2012; Stringer and Barnes, 2012).

Not so many studies though, exist to tell us more about the process and the decision to separate, children from staying with their mothers in prison; particularly how the imprisoned mothers and prison staff viewed the separation decision regarding children living alongside their imprisoned mothers inside prison. One of the few studies that paid attention to separation of children, in that case babies; conducted by Chambers (2009) for example; focused mainly on the psychological impact of forced separation on mothers and babies during detention. This aspect is also reiterated by Cowan-Christen (2012). Otherwise the studies available, barely focus on soliciting the views of imprisoned mothers, and professionals including social workers and non-social workers working in prison settings, about the decision to separate the children from residing with their imprisoned mothers. And this is the kind of knowledge the current study aims to focus on. Besides, the findings may also inform on how views of both mothers and staff are used in decision making on the separation.

1.3. Aim and research question
The focus of this study was to understand the different perspectives with which to look and the process and decision to separate children living alongside their imprisoned mother taking into account the voices of both the imprisoned mothers and the prison staff. Specifically, this study sought to answer three questions: 1) How do imprisoned mothers view the process and decision to separate to their children who live alongside them in prison; 2) How do prison staff view the process and decision to separate the children living in prison alongside their imprisoned mothers; and 3) How the mothers and Staff may participate in the separation decision.

1.4. Scope of the study
The study has been carried out in Uganda Prisons Services among women prison in central Uganda. Time and other resources available could hardly support the extension of the study to the other prisons located in other parts of the country, as primary data collection was permitted four days only by the Prisons authority. Data analysis and report writing started in December, 2014 through to May 2015. The focus was on reflecting how the staff of the prison as well as the imprisoned mothers, related with the process and decision to separate children from their mothers.
1.5. Significance of the study

Parental/mother imprisonment produce consequences that depict an entanglement between the institution of family and the justice system, which overwhelm these institution’s efforts to resolve, yet they compound each other’s effects (Chen, 2009). Sometimes, due to the mothers being the primary caregivers coupled with concern about attachment needs especially for the very young children, there has been an allowance in international human rights law, and also the national laws of the different countries to have young children admitted to stay with their parents in prison. For the case of Uganda, reference can be made to the Uganda Prisons Act 2006. Whereas the periods of stay and the condition of admission of the child to stay with their parents may vary across the national laws, common is that at a point in time when the children have to be separated. Therefore, there is to think in advance about the corresponding processes and decision to implement the separation. Rather than looking somewhere else, this study counts on the views of the imprisoned mothers and the prison staff to gain insights about what can preoccupy our minds when we start to contemplate about the process and decision to separate the children from their mothers. As thus;

The findings are expected to contribute to a body of knowledge relating to the different perspective in which the mothers staying with their children in prison, and professionals working in prisons view the separation decision. The findings could be used to inform and evaluate any of the interventions put forth by the ministry of internal affairs particularly the Uganda prisons in reinforcing their commitment to observing the Bangkok Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners, in particularly rule 49 - 52, the UN Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment particularly principle 31; the United Nations (UN) Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoner in particular rule 23(1 and 2). But also, Uganda as a state is party to many other human rights instruments and bodies. For example, Uganda has ratified the Convention on the rights of Children (CRC), and is a member to the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights. It is in the interest of the country to promote better conditions in prisons and detention. Findings thus provide a platform for self-reflection by the prison authority in Uganda onto how they are performing along a continuum of the relevant national and internal human rights instruments

Thus, the findings may also be helpful to the works of the Uganda Human rights commission – a state body responsible for monitoring the country’s human rights situation, and to the civil society including both practicing social workers and non-social work professionals working with prison services, researchers and academicians who engage and are interested in having deeper understanding of the concerns of imprisoned parents, particularly mothers living with their children inside prison and how to deal with the subsequent separation. It has to be reminded that in Uganda, the Uganda Prisons Act, 2006, also provides for separation of such children, although in a very abstract form.

Above all the study finding will help the student researcher himself to build an inner understanding of the subject matter but also contribute to the award of a MSc. in International Social work and human rights
1.6. Operational definitions of key concepts

_Uganda Prisons Act, 2006_: This is a principal guiding document in Uganda and law of the land that guides and regulates the practices of the Uganda Prisons Services

_Uganda Prisons Services_: It is the statutory body responsible for all the prisons in Uganda

_Prison_: According to the Uganda Prisons Act, 2006, Section 27(2) A prison includes the grounds and buildings within the prison enclosure and also any other grounds or buildings belonging to or attached to it and used by prisoners or the staff of the prison. Thus in this Imprisoned mothers.

_Staff_: In this study is used to imply the personnel formally appointed or recruited by the Ugandan Prisons services as its employee, to perform the tasks as may be stipulated in the service agreement. These may include both personnel in uniform as well as civilians. But excludes those not provided for under the Uganda Prisons Act, 2006, and those who may be contracted to provide services to the Prisons in their corresponding capacities. For clarity, two staff were interviewed

_Mother(s)_ : is used to mean any woman is in prison for the simple fact that she (may) have offended the law or committed a crime. And had at a point in time, had lived together with her child inside prison. Exceptions may be found but these could be contextually for comparison or emphasis.

_Child (ren)_ : Particularly in chapter four and five is used to refer to children living together with their mothers in prison. It is also used to mean these include children who spend both day and night together with their mother(s) as they serve time for the respective crime in a place which has been defined by the relevant authority as stipulated in the Uganda Prison Act, 2006, to constitute a Prison, and whose monitoring and welfare is largely the responsibility of the prisons services

_Views about separation_: The thoughts that preoccupy the prison staff and the imprisoned mothers when they are confronted with the idea of separating children from their mothers.

_Separation process_: A series of steps that may be followed or taken to enforce the separation of the child from the continued stay in prison with the mother.

_Separation decision_: One final result of the separation processor a series of results lead to the final decision have the child’s wellbeing taken care off outside of the prison and by someone else.
### Some Facts about Prisons for Women in Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal binding document</td>
<td>The Uganda Prisons Service Act, 2006</td>
<td>The Uganda Prisons Act, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal administrative authority</td>
<td>The Uganda Prisons Services</td>
<td>The Uganda Prisons Act, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Prisons for women are administered by female warders, and the male staff only man the main entrance to the prison premises</td>
<td>The Uganda Prisons Act, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Prisons</td>
<td>Twenty-one prisons, spread across the country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons Population</td>
<td>According to the Prison population report May 2015, there are 2016 female prisoners. The report also indicates that there are 226 babies admitted to the prisons with their mothers which is an increase from 161 in 2013. In most cases, where there are no day care centres, it is the prisons staff (warders) who take care of the mothers and their children. But in prisons where there are day care centres, there are special staff deployed to look after the children. Prison staff</td>
<td>The Uganda Prison population report May 2015, Petride Mudoola (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care centres</td>
<td>Over all, the prisons services only has two functional day care centres, one in Mbarara prisons in the West of the Country and the other at Luzira Maximum security prisons in the central. Children of prisoner as well as of prison staff spend time there.</td>
<td>The Uganda Prison population report May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routines in prison</td>
<td>The prison routines include; garden work where female prisoner may grow vegetables for their own consumption, cleaning of wards and staff offices, cooking for the prisoners also done by fellow prisoner</td>
<td>The Uganda Prisons Act, 2006 The Uganda Prison population report May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment, beyond not enjoying remission</td>
<td>It may involve losing some earned day earned days off; denial of visitations, isolate into solitary confinement depending on the status of imprisonment. We can also. Solitary confinement in particular, is mainly for security purposes in situations where a prisoner is violent towards others or has a contagious disease</td>
<td>Simon Kasyate (2014) in an interview with the spokesperson of the prison’s services – Mr Baine Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding</td>
<td>Three meals a day (Breakfast, lunch and supper). In bigger prisons supper and lunch are given at once. Special consideration for the sick and the women – sometimes get different types food combinations.</td>
<td>Simon Kasyate (2014) in an interview with the spokesperson of the prison’s services – Mr Baine Frank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.7.1. Facts Some Facts about Prisons for Women in Uganda. Cont’

| A day in a prison for women | - Female prisoners wake up as early as 5:30am  
- Porridge is served at 06:30hrs-07:30hrs  
- It is after the porridge, that prisoner will assemble in the labour ground where they are arranged according to their sentences and health status  
- They are later briefed of how their day has been prepared. This includes information on who is going to court, gardens, class and those to cook for the rest as cooking is not done by external persons  
- At midday, a midday lock-up is carried out to ascertain if those counted in the morning are still intact, establish those who are in court or out in the field and when this exercise is done, then lunch is served. | Simon Kasyate (2014) in an interview with the spokesperson of the prisons services – Mr Baine Frank |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wards</td>
<td>Prisoners with children and those who cook for others have separate wards, in big prisons like Luzira maximum security prison in Kampala</td>
<td>Simon Kasyate (2014) in an interview with the spokesperson of the prisons services – Mr Baine Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group therapy or socialisation:</td>
<td>This is mostly in the evening, normally between 6pm and 9pm, when they are in wards all locked, where ‘court sessions’ happen. These include religious sessions for prayer and sharing information and advice about each which works as therapy for many (Kasyate, 2014)</td>
<td>Simon Kasyate (2014) in an interview with the spokesperson of the prisons services – Mr Baine Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of prisoners who double as mothers</td>
<td>Majority of the female prison population are mothers</td>
<td>Penal Reform International (PRI) Foundation for Human Rights Initiative (FHRI), 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2
Literature review

2.0. Introduction
In this chapter, information related to children of imprisoned mothers is presented. However, not much was found regarding views of mothers and staff in relation to the process and decision to separate children living with their mothers inside prison. This notwithstanding, the current study benefited from studies related to imprisoned parents and their children. Such studies provided a wealth of information with many insights relevant to the current study.

The reviewed literature, was extracted and organised under three main themes which included: 1) research about children living alongside their imprisoned mothers as they serve their prison time, 2) research about Imprisoned Mothers and the life of their children outside prison, and 3) research on separation of children of imprisoned parents. However, it must be noted that issues therein may be overlapping for the three themes.

2.1. Research about children living alongside their imprisoned mothers
In most countries, most women in prison are mothers (Child Rights International Network, 2014), and they are often the sole or primary carer for young children (Sheehan, 2010; Poehlmann, 2010) and as such, they may have to continue with the caring role from behind bars. It has been indicated for example, that in Bolivia, prisons are home to about 1400 children (Friedman-Rudovsky, 2009) who live there alongside their parents (mothers). In this country, it is considered that children are much better off in prison with their parents than staying the harsh realities of poverty where relatives can hardly feed more mouths, yet orphanages are not a feasible options in a country also considered to be one of the poorest in South America (Friedman-Rudovsky, 2009). Arguing for the children to stay with their mothers in prison, attachment has been advanced as a justification. For instance, Friedman-Rudovsky writes about a psychologist at Semilla de Vida (Seed of Life) - a non-governmental organization that works with imprisoned mothers and their children observing that "it is important not to rip those bonds between parent and child" (2009). Further arguing that “releasing the kids from the prisons, would directly lead them onto the street”. Available literature indicates that “children who live in prison with a parent get there, either by moving in or being born there (Robertson, 2008). In Yemen, while some children stayed with their mother in prison because they were born there, others were reported to be staying there with their mother because they had been rejected by the family members (Al-Yarisi, 2014). Even with knowledge that prison is not a good place for raising children (Wangui, n.d.; Al-Yarisi, 2014), the stigma that comes as a consequence of women’s imprisonment in Yemen narrows options for mothers but to stay with their children in prison until they complete their sentence or at least the child (ren) reach the age of nine, which is the limit legally allowed to stay in prison (Al-Yarisi, 2014). This may also reflect on what Robertson (2008, p. 1) may have implied as a seemingly “broad consensus that sometimes the least bad option is for children to live in prison with a mother (or very occasionally father), despite the child having committed no crime”.

Bronfenbrenner and Ceci (1994) have indicated that proximity in interactions between a mother and the child has a powerful predictor of development outcomes. For example the absence of a parent in a child’s life is noted to create a sense of insecurity later in life While this is said to be so, it is also noted that prison time leaves little opportunity for the children to bond or form...
relationships with other family members particularly their father and brothers and sisters; and this may affect their up-bringing (Wangui, n.d.). Many other reasons have been advanced for having children stay with their parents (mothers) in prison including but not limited to: the possibility of children having positive effect on their convict parents. Despite such arguments, the precarious situation they experience in detention alongside their mothers also raises questions over the children’s wellbeing. For example, they might be punished for what is normal behaviour for all children like waking up at night and directly sharing in solitary confinement as punishment for the mother’s misbehaviour inside prison (Friedman-Rudovsky, 2009). In Kenya’s prisons, children have to cue with their mothers to get food and have no chance to visit places like parks as prison to some is the only home they have known (Wangui, n.d.) cutting them off from other communities. Similar criticism is laid against foster care which would otherwise be an alternative to care for these children. For instance, Chen (2009) noted that “foster care often unnecessarily traumatizes children by cutting them off from their communities”. In some literature it has been shown that, those children while commuting from the prison facilities to school, experience isolation by their peer for example (Friedman-Rudovsky, 2009). This echoes findings in a study conducted by Kampfner in 1991 in which it was noted that children with incarcerated parents were teased more frequently at school (Jonston, 1995; cited in La Vigne et.al, 2008). With such conditions, mothers are at pain that their innocent children end up at the receiving end for the consequences of their [mother’s] actions (Chen, 2009).

In trying to tackle these concerns of children in detention alongside their mothers, interventions including placing children into alternative care options for instance in India Prison efforts have been made to have nursery schools for the children of prisoner but also made available for the children of female prison staff as way of encouraging interaction with the different groups of children (Robertson, 2012). Also in the, United Kingdom (Robertson, 2012) play areas are inspected by the same body that inspects other play area and schools to and can make recommendations for improvement. Other efforts include housing mothers with their infants/children in in self-care units, to increase on independence and a more supportive environment for their child (Robertson, 2012, p.23) in New Zealand. There have been efforts to improve the prison facilities as it is the case in most South American Prisons (Friedman-Rudovsky, 2009) to allow children to stay behind bars alongside their imprisoned parents. This has also been to some extent the case for the South Africa correctional facilities (Luyt, 2008). Yet even the child (ren) of imprisoned mothers living outside the prison settings whether in formal or informal care alternatives have also had their own tales of ups and downs as research has shown. Moreno (2009), for example presents that such children are socially stigmatisation as they may be perceived to be bad comparing with the crimes their parents (may) have committed, which they find difficulties to break free from.

2.2. Research about Imprisoned Mothers and the life of their children outside prison

Available literature shows that majority witnessed incarceration of their fathers than mothers (Glaze & Maruschak, 2008). It is however, it is indicated that the number of mothers going into has more than doubled compared to the rate of incarceration of fathers(Glaze and Maruschak, 2008). Despite the lower proportions, it is indicated that there is more complicated for children of with imprisoned mothers behind bars. For it was found out that more children of imprisoned fathers lived with their mothers unlike those with imprisoned mothers who experienced displacement as they mostly have to live in the care of grandparent or a relative (Johnson and Waldfogel, 2002) or other alternatives such as foster care. These new family arrangements also bring forth new twists and challenges, but also a whole new kind of risks.
For instance, children of imprisoned parents in foster care are said to be very vulnerable (Eurochips, 2011). Studies further indicate that children of imprisoned mothers for instance in the US are often overlooked by the overburdened criminal justice & child welfare systems (Sandifer and Kurth, 2000, p. 361). The children not only have to deal with parental separation and difficulties in attachment, Sandifer and Kurth also indicate that “the other negative outcomes to which they are vulnerable, are challenging to be dealt with by the ill equipped foster care” (2000, p. 361) for example, and the other care alternatives [researcher’s emphasis]. In Sweden and United Kingdom, samples of children with parents in prison revealed that a high proportion of them experienced disturbed sleep and nightmares (Jones, Gallagher and Manby, et al., 2013, p. 529). These difficulties, as Stringer and Barnes (2012) show, undermine the children’s cognitive, emotional, and intellectual abilities. This, in turn may also affect rebuilding mother-child relationships (Sandifer and Kurth, 2000; Stringer and Barnes, 2012). For example, parental incarceration is associated with higher risk for children's antisocial behaviour (Murray and Farrington 2008; Murray et.al, 2012). Adding that they may have worse reactions to parental imprisonment if their mother is imprisoned (Murray and Farrington, 2008). In their study, “parental arrest and children involved with child welfare service agencies”, Phillips, Burns, and Wagner (2004) found out that 2 in 5 children age 2 and older with arrested parents had a clinically significant emotional or behavioural problem.

In some cases, the children are not only separated from their mother but may also be separated from their siblings; such a situation may lead to additional strain on both the mother and children. This further complicates the mother’s ability to reunite after her release from prison (Sharp & Marcus-Mendoza, 2001, cited in Moreno, 2009). Both the mother and child (ren) have to deal with issues of abandonment and loss, and weakened attachment caused by separation. It is most difficult for most mothers to be separated from their children (Hairston, 2002) during the incarceration period, as they worry about what may happen to the children while they are away from home. Their concern relates to their children running the risk of inadequate ongoing care resulting from changes in living arrangements, potentially leading to mental problems, difficulty maintaining grades in school, and even health issues (Moreno, 2009, p. 8). Yet incarceration incapacitates mothers and there is very little that they can do for their children while behind bars (Moreno, 2009).

2.3. Research on separation of children of imprisoned parents

From the mothers’ perspective, a study by Luyt, found that a majority of imprisoned mothers thought that their children were better off staying with others outside the prison setting (2008). Such thoughts notwithstanding, the imprisoned mothers still felt it to be an additional punishment for not letting them care for their own children. As such, they found separation from their children to be very painful (Luyt, 2008; Robertson, 2012).

In the event of separation, children who do not stay under the care of family members may be placed in a formal child-care institution, such as a group home, or with foster families (Moreno, 2009). Once behind bars, the most likely family member who will care for the children of incarcerated mothers is a grandmother (Cowan-Christen, 2012). Whereas the grandmothers’ care has been advanced for continuity and preservation of family and culture for the child, the burden can be felt in the form of loss, poverty, discrimination and possibly abuse and neglect (Cowan-Christen, 2012) for both the child and the respective care giver. In most cases, children who are placed in kinship care arrangements is a result of maternal imprisonment, as Young and Smith (2000) point out. Luke argues that with the maternal imprisonment, children become vulnerable to a variety of personal and social destructive outcomes (Moreno, 2009). For
example, those placed into group homes often find themselves residing with confined delinquents, status offenders or youths considered at risk (Moreno, 2009). As such, the courts with the jurisdiction over deciding on care arrangements in this case, have been criticized for exposing innocent children to possible delinquency by placing them in group homes with high rates of placement instability and high-risk adolescents (Ryan, Marshall, and Herz, 2008, p. 1089). In terms of the impact of parental imprisonment on children Martin Mansby shows that it has traumatic consequence on many children (Jones, et al., 2013, p. 608). To emphasis this Cowan-Christen, points out that “a mother's separation from her children can be traumatic for the entire family”, (2012). Additionally, separation resulting from parental imprisonment, only multiplies stressors and repercussions for the family. Research also shows that the experiences that imprisoned parents go through may have a direct effect on their children. For example, Robertson (2012) shows how children whose parents are on death row get very confused about the apparent execution.

In a nutshell, whichever way, one may want to look at the case of children living alongside their mothers in prison, there is need to pay attention to the views of the mothers in question and the prisons wardens working with them. This has to be done in relation to their children’s living arrangements. Whether to separate the children and place them into alternative care or even have them in detention alongside their mothers as has been noted neither makes them risk free. Listening to the views of the mothers and those staff working with them could help in deciding on a less risky arrangement to enhance the wellbeing of children of imprisoned mothers, in a country like Uganda. Incarcerated women in particular should be cause for more concern given the fact that in most cases they are the sole caregiver, which Seymour (1998) has argued, is a risky factor for child abuse and neglect. Thus, the attention in this study is to analyze and discuss perspectives of the mothers and prison staff about the process and decision to separate the children from their mothers and perhaps draw implication for policy.
Chapter 3
Theoretical Frames of Reference

3.0. Introduction

Recent research exploring the imprisonment of women and the separation from their children has focused on the negative impact it causes on the wellbeing of the children (Enos 2001, cited in Naylor, 2003). Perhaps of the motivation for studies of the imprisonment of women and the eventual separation of children has been due to the caring roles of mothers. It has been noted for example that majority of the imprisoned women not only double as mothers (Burgess and Flynn, 2013) but they are also the primary carers (Seymour, 1998) of young children. With increasing imprisonment of women (Uganda 2012 Human Rights Report, EuroChips, 2011) despite their proportions compared to the male prisoner (Burgess and Flynn, 2013) leaves their children in a more vulnerable state than the children of imprisoned fathers. For example, Johnson and Waldfogel (2002), is reported to have noted that such children “may face comparatively greater stress and more cumulative risks in their environments than children of incarcerated fathers (Poelhmann et al., 2010, p. 577).

Whereas there have been studies on separation of children of imprisoned parents, they have if any exist relied on mental models or the identification with groups and their corresponding roles to engage the views of the mothers and more so the staff in relation to the process and decision to separate the children from their mothers. Most studies in the area have related mainly to the consequences of separation for example on the wellbeing of children (see Sheehan, 2010; Poelhmann, 2010) and not necessary on the mental construction about the separation process and decision even before it occurs. Enos (Naylor, 2003), for instance in her study did engage with imprisoned mothers but who never had the privilege to live along with their children inside prison. In any case, many such studies have looked at separation particularly where it has occurred at the outside of prison for instance during arrest. The mental model theory is in this case pursued to be appropriate in prompting forth the small-scale models that mothers and staff in prison have in their minds (Craik 1943; cited in Jones, 2011) about separation from the inside of prison.

Given the perception-like context in which the current study was conducted, it was found very interesting to use mental models and theories on group and role identity, as possible lenses to gain an understanding about the views of imprisoned mothers as well as the prison staff towards the process and decision to separate children living alongside their mothers in some of Uganda’s Prisons.

3.1. Mental models theory

Wind and Crook, (2005) contend that a mental model is one’s cognitive process of making sense about the world. This apparently is a process consisting of the adaptive belief constructs, values system, deep-seated assumptions, pictures/images, and generalizations which individual’s use to make sense about the world around them (Burns, 2005; Senge, 1990; cited in Shahzah, 2012). This way one can anticipate events, reason and also form explanations. And as such mental models are psychological representations of real-life, hypothetical, or imaginary situations (Fernández-Berrocal, and Santamaria, 2006, p.231). They can be constructed from perception, imagination, or the comprehension of discourse. Each mental model represents state of affairs from which people may draw conclusion or make contestations (Byrne &

It is thought in this study that describing the views about the separation of children living alongside the imprisoned mothers from the perspectives of the imprisoned mothers and the prison staff will generate valuable information on how the to relate with the separation process and decision. Arguing from a behaviour perspective Rutherford and Wilson point out that the human cognitive processes involve a computational structure (cited in Jones, et al., 2011), which is constructed in mental memory and can allow an individual to explore different possibilities mentally before acting (Jones, et al., 2011). This is claimed to be facilitated by the working memory [which] is the system responsible for selecting and manipulating information for the purpose of reasoning and learning. Changes made to a mental model in the simulation process for instance (May) represent what would happen if such changes took place in reality (Jones, et al., 2011). From a causal dynamic perspective, mental models are taken to imply causal knowledge (Jones, et al., 2011) in that it has the capacity to represent the cause and effect dynamics of a phenomenon especially when approached from the perspectives of systems and naïve theories (2011). It is for example argued that researchers interested in systems dynamics use the mental models construct vaguely as a matter of enhancing effectiveness of design and usability (Doyle and Ford, 1998). Used in this sense, mental models are conceived as a cognitive structure that enables a person to describe, explain, and predict a system’s purpose, form, function and state (Jones, et al., 2013). This may provide a basis that relates to sort of “continually clarifying and deepening the understanding of individuals within the organization as they focus their individual energies on what is truly important, developing patience, and seeing reality objectively”, (Senge 1991, p. 682).

Without duelling into discrepancy in the definition of mental models, or as to whether it is located in the working or long-term memory (Doyle and Ford, 1998; Jones, et al., 2011), there is an indication of existence of representation inaccuracies characterizing the mental models. However, it must be noted that the current study is not set out to measure how accurate or inaccurate the mental models can be. This study is also not looking at the design and/or usability of the prison system in relation to separation of children from their mothers. Whereas this may be implied, it is rather, to gain an insight into how both mothers and staff view this phenomenon given the environment within which they (mental models) are constructed. It has been argued that one’s ability to represent the ‘World’ accurately is unique to each individual (Jones, et al., 2011). In literature relating to mental models, it is underscored that each individual has own mental models based on the interaction with others (Hayes and Allinson, 1998). Mental models are the assumptions that shape what we choose to pay attention to, and they drive our actions (Baker and Saputelli, 2011). It is further emphasised that mental models are deeply ingrained, and often in our unconscious minds (2011). Kenneth Craik, in his writings, described a process whereby our minds construct small-scale models of reality from perception, imagination, or interpretation and use those models to reason, to underlie explanations, and to anticipate events (Baker and Saputelli, 2011). It is however, cautioned that there may exist a danger of ‘like-minded groups’ having the mental models resisting divergent thinking but inspiring stereotypical thinking (Hayes and Allison, 1998).

The current study is informed from (Hayes and Allinson, 1998) view point that every person in interaction constructs own mental models reflecting on own experiences and backgrounds. The Prison understood in organisational terms is characterized by interactions within and without its environment, and such interaction will shape the way with which the mothers and staff
relate with the process and decision to separate the children from their mothers. As Senge, has observed, this happens “as people see and understand more of the system within which they operate and the pressures influencing one another [...]” (1991). Further arguing that, improving individual understanding “requires bringing to the surface the mental models which staff [and also the imprisoned mother in this case] have of their organization and its relationship to other forces within the environment” (1991, p. 682). Bearing in mind that people construct their own reality (Berger and Luckmann, 1966 cited in Josselson, 2013) and reality among humans is co-constructed […] since] they cannot exist without the social forces (Josselson, 2013, p. 2) in the environment in which they live. This given that environmental complications are a result of human decisions and actions (Jones, et. at., 2011). It is hoped that, this way, using the lens of mental models in the current study can further shade light on, and document the different perspectives from staff as well as the mothers, see the process and decision of separating the children from their mothers, and how they relate to forces outside the prison setting.

3.2. Theories on group and role Identity

Well, it is envisaged that individual constructs of relating with particular phenomenon in an organisation is dependent on their anticipation or expectations, pressures in the present, and past experiences as it has been noted in mental models. It is also understood in this study that such mental models lend a lot to the way the individual in organisational context relate with groups and the corresponding assumed roles. Social identity theorists regard that group as a collective of similar persons all of whom identify with each other, see themselves and each other in similar ways, and hold similar views, all in contrast to members of outgroups (Stets and Burke, 2000, p. 227–228). According to Ramiah, Hewstone & Schmid (2011) humans are, unique social beings and expounding from a social identity complexity theory, they point out the consideration of ways in which the individual can negotiate their different social identities, and what this means for intergroup. Characteristically so, it is believed that “as individuals living within society, they traverse the continuum between personal and collective selves. In so doing, they may choose to adhere to personal standards of behaviour, or to norms set by the groups with which they identify (Ramiah et al., 2011, p. 44). The different social situations however, may lead members to particular group to exhibit salient behaviours (Hogg and Reid, 2006). Group members are motivated to protect their self-esteem and achieve a positive and distinct social identity. In social identity theory, a social identity is a person's knowledge that he or she belongs to a social category or group (Hogg and Abrams 1988 cited in Stets and Burke 2000, p. 225). A social group is defined as is a set of individuals who hold a common social identification or view themselves as members of the same social category. Through a social comparison process, persons who are similar to the self are categorized with the self and are labelled the in-group while persons who differ from the self are categorized as the out-group (Stets and Burke 2000). However, Boundaries are permeable, persisting despite the flow of personnel across them, and identity is constructed in transactions at and across the boundary (Jenkins, 2008, p. 44). During these transactions a balance is struck between (internal) group identification and (external) categorisation by others (Jenkins, 2008, p. 44).

From the identity theory on the other hand, regards the group as a set of interrelated individuals, each of whom performs unique but integrated activities, sees things from his or her own perspective, and negotiates the terms (Stets and Burke 2000). The core of an identity is the categorization of the self as an occupant of a role, and the incorporation, into the self, of the meanings and expectations associated with that role and its performance (Burke and Tully 1977; cited in Stets and Burke, 2000, p. 226). These expectations and meanings form a set of standards that guide behaviour (Burke 1991; cited in Stets and Burke, 2000). Different perspectives are involved among the persons in the group as they negotiate and perform their
respective roles, creating micro social structures within the group (Burke and Cast, 1997; Hogg and Reid, 2006). Thus, a role-based identity expresses not the uniformity of perceptions and behaviours that accompanies a group-based identity, but interconnected uniqueness. The emphasis is not on the similarity with others in the same role, but on the individuality and interrelatedness with others in counter roles in the group or interaction context. By maintaining the meanings, expectations, and resources associated with a role, role identities maintain the complex interrelatedness of social structures.

At the back of an identity, there is taking into account the meaning in relation to [individuals’] plans and activities (McCall and Simmons, 1978; cited in Stets and Burke, 2000). The part resources play is crucial in sustaining persons and interactions (Freese and Burke 1994 cited in Stets and Burke, 2000). This is so, because the meaning that results or is inherent in an activity itself revolves around managing discrepancies in the control systems, for example the lower and the higher control system that a group may have perceived to be occupying (Burke and Cast, 1997). As such, Stets and Burke, argue that, “one's identities are composed of self-views that emerge from the reflexive activity of self-categorization or identification in terms of membership in particular groups or roles” (2000, p. 225-226). As such, individuals view themselves in terms they obtain from group norms (Hogg and Reid, 2006)

“Having a particular social identity means being at one with a certain group, being like others in the group, and seeing things from the group's perspective. In contrast, having a particular role identity means acting to fulfil the expectations of the role, coordinating and negotiating interaction with role partners, and manipulating the environment to control the resources for which the role has responsibility” (Stets and Burke, 2000, p. 226)

From this, it can be indicated that people may have more than one identity at anyone point in time. For instance, the imprisoned women may identify themselves both as prisoners and mothers, in the same way the prison staff can as well double as mothers. Identifying with any particular group will definitely carry with its expectation or anticipations. This may mean considering a negotiation of different identities and roles may also affect the way in which one to relate with the process and decision to separate children from their mothers. Reflecting on the analysis of the organic and mechanical forms of societal integration by Durkheim ([1893] 1984), Stets and Burke posit that “people are tied organically to their groups through social identities; [and] they are tied mechanically through their role identities within groups” (2000, p. 228). Further adding that the role identities and social identities become simultaneously relevant and influential on, perceptions, affect, and behaviour (p. 228). The prisoner mother and the prison staff can thus be seen to occupy respective roles that correspond to the different group. Stets and Burke, (2000) point out that, when researchers focus on the different ways in which people are linked to groups, through social identities and through role identities, they conceptualize groups differently. It was within this spirit that the social identity theory and identity theories were considered as possible lenses to understand the different perspectives from the staff and mothers in prison view the phenomenon being studied in addition to mental models. Since “full understanding of the process and decision to separate children from their mothers must incorporate both the organic/group and the mechanical/role form because each links to individual identities in separate but related ways (Stets and Burkes, 2000, p. 228).
Chapter 4
Methodology

4.0. Introduction
This section presents the methodological approach to this study. It presents the research design, description of the study area, study population, sample including the selection of the sample. Also presented is the data collection method and tool, study procedure, data analysis, and ethical and practical considerations.

4.1. Study design
The study employed a qualitative case study approach with interest in describing the different perspectives with which the imprisoned mother and prison staff regarded the topic of study. It would have been most relevant to use phenomenology if the study focus was in soliciting for and communicating in lucid and empathetic terms, the meanings that participants and key informants attach to the process and decision of separation (Berglund, 2007). Smith consider case study as an empirical investigation of a specified or bounded phenomenon (1978; cited in Mabry, 2008, p.216). The focus of study – the case – may be as minutely targeted as a single person. The case may also be selected because of the researcher's interest in a particular instance or site or because of the case's capacity to be informative about a theory, an issue, or a larger constellation of cases. The study was thus exclusively qualitative and descriptive in nature in order to provide greater insights about the different perspectives with which prison staff and imprisoned mothers relate with the separation of children from their mothers. Curtin and Fossey (2007), have pointed out that qualitative research focuses on a person’s own perspectives, views and experiences.

4.2. Study procedure
On arrival in Uganda, the researcher held preliminary consultation meetings with the Office of the Commissioner General of Uganda Prison Services, which indicated the need to apply for grant of permission from the Commissioner General to conduct the master’s thesis study with Uganda’s Prisons Services. An application (see appendix 4) for grant of permission to conduct research was made to the office of the Commissioner General of Uganda Prisons in the month of August, 2014. This was accompanied with letters of recommendation from the researcher’s supervisor and the programme administrator in the Department of Social Work at the University of Gothenburg. This was aimed at gaining permission of access to the prisons, prison staff and the imprisoned mothers whose children live alongside them inside the prison. However, this initial application was turned down by the authorities at Uganda Prisons Services citing security threats as the reason as indicated in a written response on behalf of the office of the Commissioner General (See Appendix, 5).

Given the specific context within which the study was to be conducted, there was no other place where permission could be sought. An appeal was made for reconsideration of an earlier decision denying the researcher access to prison (See appendix 6). As Gallagher, Creighton and Gibbon (1995) have shown, in the appeal made, the researcher shared the brief concept of the study proposal with the office of the Commissioner General at Uganda Prison Services Headquarters in Kampala. Later, the researcher was invited for a meeting at the office of the Director of Correction services under the Commissioner General’s office to review the content. Subsequently, permission to conduct research in the two prisons was granted (see appendix 7).
This strictly provided four days; 18th – 21st of November, 2014, in which the interviews should be done and the researcher was attached to the Research Department of the Prisons Services. The letter granting permission was presented to the administration of the respective prisons with a detailed information sheet upon which, the administrators selected purposively, the imprisoned mothers and prison staff to be interviewed.

The interviews were conducted within the Prisons premises in one of the offices provided, after gaining permission from the authorities at the respective prisons as well as the potential participants. Because of the prison rules to not record voices of prisoners unless one is their counsel, the researcher simultaneously had to interview and take the notes at the same time given that a request to call a third person to take the notes as the conversation evolved was also denied. This was so because the letter granting permission only indicated the researcher’s name and was supposed to be followed strictly. Also, if bringing in a note taker were to happen, the researcher had to make a new application for grant of permission to have another person (note taker) to accompany the Interviewer. Neuman has shown that sometimes in research studies, researchers are confronted with situations in which they have to make important decisions within a very limited time (2004). This was one such situation encountered in the current study. Consequently, having considered the timeframes allowed and the fact that it had taken almost three months for the researcher to get permitted to have access to the prisons, as Gallagher et al., points out; the researcher made an expedient decision to simultaneously interview and take the notes as well (1995). The interviews took thirty to forty minutes to avoid over inconveniencing prison routines, and more so for the mothers who needed to take care of their children. According to the national guidelines for research involving humans as research participants provided for by the Uganda National Council of Science and Technology (UNCST) – a government body with the mandate to regulate the conduct of research involving human subjects, requires that “research should be conducted in a manner that does not violate rights and welfare of human research participants and their communities” (2014, p.2). The period with which the interviews took place is interpreted as falling within the scope provided for under the UNCST guidelines and not compromise on the feeding need of infants as well as the responsibility of their respective mothers.

Data was analyzed mainly through inductive thematic analysis. The interview notes which were taken in Luganda were translated to English since the research report would be written in English as stated in the Handbook for the Social Work 2579 Degree report for academic year 2014/15 for the Masters of Science Degree in Social Work and Human Rights. Only interviews note from the conversations with mothers were translated given that the interviews with the prison staff were conducted in English. Analysis adopted the six-phase steps from Braun and Clarke (2006)

4.3. Description of the study area
The study was conducted in Uganda within Uganda Prisons Services under the docket of Ministry of Internal Affairs (MoIAF). Uganda is a landlocked country found in East Africa. It is bordered by South Sudan to the North, Kenya to the East, Tanzania to the South, Rwanda to the South west while the Democratic Republic of Congo to the West. The prison population stood at 42000 inmates as of April 2015 (Kasasira, 2015) and the oldest prison facility in the country – Luzira Maximum Security Prison was constructed in 1924 to accommodate 600 inmates was reported to be hosting 8000 inmates behind bars making it the most congested in the country (Mudoola, 2015). It also has separate wings for men and women prisons. In terms of staffing Uganda prisons services is supposed to have 17,000 personnel at minimum but after recruiting 1228 in April, it could only make it 7448 according to statement made by the
Commissioner General of Uganda Prisons Services Mr. Byabasaijja (Kasasira, 2015) way below the required minimum. The country also has about 21 women prisons, (Mudoola, 2013) and according to Section 59 of the Uganda Prisons Act 2006, infants or children can be admitted to stay with their mothers as they serve their prison time. However, a few of them admit prisoners with their infants.

4.4. Study population
The study was conducted among women prisons. Uganda has about 21 prisons for holding women Prisoners spread across the country with varying capacities in services provision (Mudoola, 2013). Given the interest in mothers living with their children in prison and the fact that the prison administration noted that not all the 21 women prison admit inmates with their children, two prisons were selected for the study. At the time of the study, the two prison had a combined total of about 56 children living with their mothers. The study population included two clusters. Prison staff and mothers with children behind bars. The prison staff were those who frequently interacted with the mothers and played a role in making decisions about the wellbeing of the respective children as well as their separation. This clustering was more informed from the need to have different identity groups in order to understand the different perspectives about the study (Stets and Burke, 2000).

4.5. Sampling procedure and Size
Two prisons (A and B) located in the central region of the country were purposively selected with guidance from the office of the Director of Corrections in Uganda Prisons Services. Carrying out the study in these prisons enhanced triangulation in terms of space, which involves “the collection of data about the same phenomenon [is carried out] in two places or in order test multi-site consistency…” (Shih, 1998, p. 636). Similarly, the selection of the mothers and staff to be interviewed was also done purposively with the help of the prison administration based on the details shared in the information sheet. The mothers were either living with their children inside prison (seven mothers) and/or had their children separated just a few weeks prior to the interviews. For those who lived with their children, the children’s age ranged from one month to five years. The mothers’ age on the other hand ranged from twenty-six years to thirty-eight years. The mothers were also in prison for the different crimes which they may (except for the one who had been convicted) have committed respectively; and they were either on remand, or committal. The staff interviewed on the other hand were responsible for issues of admission and separation of the children.

Whereas the selection (prisons, staff and mothers) as in the above presentation was largely by a strategic step that was undertaken in the process that helped to get the appropriate cases from whom data relevant to understanding of the study topic and answer the research questions. Patton 1990 has been quoted to have underscored that:

“The ‘logic’ and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich are those cases from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research, thus the term purposeful sampling purposeful sampling (Coyne 1997, p.624)

For participants to be included into the study, a mother for instance must have been living with her child inside prison or the child was under the jurisdiction of the prison setting for most of their wellbeing including attending the day care center administered by the prison services. The staff on the other were supposed to have close interactions with the mothers in most of the decisions relating to the children. The overall the selection of the participants depended on the
basis that they were knowledgeable experts of the domains of interest (Tongco, 2007) to the study given their interactions and experiences in context. This also relates to what Suri (2011, p. 66) comments about the application of Patton’s strategies to purposive sampling in qualitative research, that “purposeful sampling requires access to key informants in the field who can help in identifying information-rich cases”. In the current study, the Officer In-Charge of the respective prisons were approached and helped in the identification of the potential participants who were interviewed in the end. Neergard had earlier on pointed out the critical role of sampling in determining the quality of research outcomes and as a result underscores the need to choose cases that are able to provide the best possible information (Neergard and Ulhøi, 2007, p.11). It was thus in the best interest of the study that the cases selected would illuminate relevant incites about the area of study. Summing up what Mabry (2008) has explained, that “the identification of a case to be studied will largely depend on the researcher's interest, his or her industry in identifying a case informative enough to be worth studying, and his or her skill in negotiating access to its site” (p. 16).

As one may observed in table 1, three (in-depth and joint) interviews were successfully conducted with nine mothers, (seven of which were still living with their children inside prison while two had had their children been separated a few weeks prior to interview (these two were interviewed in a joint interview). The children had also been living alongside their mothers in prison). Also, two interviews were conducted with the staff working with the Uganda Prisons Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Matrix showing data collection methods employed and the participants engaged at the respective prisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6. Data collection methods and tools

In-depth and joint interviews

Data was collected using unstructured interviews involving both in-depth and joint interviews. Polak and Green (2015) define a joint interview as involving an encounter between an interviewer and a dyad implying two interviewees. For the case of this study the dyad involved the mothers. While in Pathfinder International Tool Series, an in-depth interview is defined to mean conducting intensive interviews with a small number of respondents to explore perspectives on a particular idea (Boyce and Neale, 2006). These were used to obtain detailed information from primary participants and selected professional staff. Spenser points out that interviews reflect narrative truths than historical truth (1984, cited in Josselson, 2013, p.3), in which data generated enables us to encounter mental sets of participants about subjectively created reality in which they experience life (Fosshage, 1995, cited in Josselson, 2013, p.3). The preference, as observed in Lofland and Lofland, “non-standardized interviews best fulfil the case that the essence of research interview is the guided conversation” (1994; cited in Fielding and Thomas, 2003, p.124). This enhanced flexibility and elicited rich, detailed material and insights useful in the analysis (Fielding and Thomas, 2003). Besides, Interviews provide in-depth information pertaining to participants’ experiences and viewpoints of a
particular topic (Turner, 2010, p.754). To allow for a higher response rate and taking into account the discursive nature, unstructured interviews were most appropriate. Therefore, other than a structured interview which can “run the risk of inadvertently communicating experts’ knowledge” (Morgan, Fischhoff, and Bostrom, 2001, p.23), an interview guide on the key themes was utilized. Reference about the details of the interview guide employed (see appendices 1&2). These were employed in a way that allowed flexibility in the questions asked but maintaining the general issues/questions as they appeared on the guide. Flexibility in asking questions based on the perceived prompts from the participants (McNamara, 2009 cited in Turner, 2010). The evolvement of constructed interpretations (Josselson, 2013) in the interview, basically enabled the researcher to sustain focus and freedom and adaptability in obtaining (relevant) information from the participants (McNamara, 2009 cited in Turner, 2010). Each interview as result informed issues to consider in the next interview, which also helped in managing within the provided time limits. As Mabry contends;

“A qualitative case researcher is expected to improve on the original blueprint as information emerges during data collection. For example, […] if unanticipated aspects of the case come to light, the researcher is expected to capitalize on the new opportunities and progressively focus the study on the features of the case which gradually appear to be […] significant” (2008, p.216).

Document Review
In order to aid the understanding of the studied social world (Macdonald, 2003, p.196); a review of official reports, policies, legislations, journal and newspaper articles and publications, was undertaken whose information assisted in the discussion of findings. As Denzin (1970 cited in Macdonald, 2003) notes, documentary review is a vital part in triangulation. This is a call for greater attention to acknowledge the work done by other authors [and how it relates to the current study,] and more to avoid plagiarism [which is unethical in research], in the information that was obtained and used as these greatly contributed to quality of the results that are presented (Macdonald, 2003, p.204-05). The information that was reviewed came from mainly earlier studies, reports, conferences and publications and articles in newspapers. This was aimed at enhancing an understanding of the research topic for the current study.

To identify such earlier studies for review, several search words in combination were used to search through the different data bases including PsycArticles, ProQuest Research Library, Web of Knowledge/Web of Science, Social Sciences Full Text, SocINDEX, Family and Society Studies World-wide, Sociological Abstracts, and Google Scholar, google search, social service abstract were searched. Reference lists in articles were also scanned to gain information on any other related documents to consider for the review. Documents focusing on children of incarcerated parents, imprisoned mothers, Laws related to incarceration of women and the prison environment and literature on separation of children of imprisoned mothers, the conditions they live in, were used to determine the relevancy and subsequent consideration for the present study. The review also included data presented at conferences. Reviewed data involved both quantitative and qualitative studies.

The documents reviewed provided relevant and rich information that helped to understand the study in relation to research done earlier but also in relation to the legal provision in both the national and international instruments. The Uganda Prisons Act, 2006 which is the guiding principal document for the Uganda Prisons Services, and the United Nations Standard Rules (Bangkok Rules) for the Treatment of Women Prisoners were some of the key documents reviewed, as these documents try to address the concern of separating children living in prison.
alongside their imprisoned mothers. The Uganda Prisons Act, 2006, in particular helped to draw broader lines and a more diversified picture of some issues as raised by the prison participants.

4.7. Data processing and analysis

Process of the data stated with writing the notes from the conversations with the participants. These notes were later typed into Microsoft Word documents in Verbatim as captured during the interview experience. The data set relating to interviews with the mothers was back translated to English given that they were conducted in Luganda—one of the popular languages spoken in the country. It was also the preferred language by all the mothers themselves. This could have been probably due to the inability to express themselves well in English. However, the current study was not aimed at emphasizing the mode of communication and linguistic style nor did it aim for extensive narrative analysis (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009, p.180) but rather aimed at reporting the subjects ‘accounts in a readable manner (Ibid, 2009, p.181) in order to produce a more coherent output (Ibid, 2009, p.184, 186). The translation was cautiously done not to lose the content and the context. Whereas notes from memory were not written, admittedly for fear of running into the risk of making up data (Fielding 1999, 532). It is acknowledged that by not doing so, the study missed out on having a complete account of the conversation, more so that the leverage of relying on audio recordings was not possible. For sure, this might have contributed another angle to relate with about the findings of the study.

To complete the Analysis the study employed thematic analysis. Thematic analysis was preferred on the basis that it provides foundational method for qualitative analysis as Braun and Clarke (2006), seemed to imply. The method also provides core skills, useful for conducting many other forms of qualitative analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.4). From this point of view, thematic analysis may be characterised not as a specific method but as a tool to use across different methods (Boyatzis, 1998 cited in Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.4). None-the-less, as Braun and Clarke, recommends, thematic analysis is a method in its own right (2006). Thus, the study adopts the six-step criteria for doing qualitative thematic analysis suggested in Braun and Clarke (2006). The data corpus¹ for analysis included the notes gained from interviews with both the Prison staff as well as the imprisoned mothers. The analysis was guided by the research question.

The analysis started inductively by reading and re-reading the data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). This helped in familiarising broadly the depth and breadth of the content therein, in the data. Braun and Clarke (2006), have advised that it is ideal to read through the data item at least once before coding can begin. Reading through data item (interview notes) several times, helped the researcher in familiarising with the concepts therein and also be able to look at the interconnections and context. As a results re-reading through the typed notes for each data item, words considered key to understanding the study topic were being selected as part of the analysis.

These were also highlighted in colour, copied and pasted into a comment box as data extracts. Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 79) define data extract as referring to “an individual coded chunk of data, which has been identified within, and extracted from, a data item”. Data item in this case included individual notes gained from each interview conducted with the mothers and staff respectively. Having keywords in a comment box, helped to ease the work of gathering

¹Data corpus refers to all data collected for a particular research project (Braun and Clarke, 2006. p. 79)
the relevant codes together from each data item\(^2\) available for each data set. Two data sets were utilised; one involving interviews from the two-prison staff and the other gained from the conversations with the mothers. A long list of codes (Braun and Clarke, 2006) was generated.

Table 2: Analysis Matrix showing an Example of how the results were arrive at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Main themes</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Corresponding data extract or codes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imprisoned mothers’ perspectives about the process and decision to separate their child</td>
<td>Nine (9)</td>
<td>Separation in terms of opportunities for coping with prison time</td>
<td>This focused on codes as used in a way that reflected an aid to the imprisoned mother as far as managing with the prison time was concerned</td>
<td>Difficult, explanation, explain Women Child becomes, good destruction, independently provide needs; Misbehave, contemplation, great relief, decision and prison, Time, thoughts about prison, Relief from pressure; Doubles negative thoughts, wandering and mandated time, case file</td>
<td>Children stay in prison as motivating behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison staff’s perspectives about the process and decision to separate their child</td>
<td>Two (2)</td>
<td>Concern about Extra workload</td>
<td>This was analyzing in relation to the data emerging from the interviews that hinged on either increasing and/or decreasing the responsibility of the prison staff towards the children as well as their mothers</td>
<td>Alternative care arrangement, responsibility, necessary facilities and environment Negativity and resistance Continuation of the care responsibility</td>
<td>1) Negativity from relatives 2) Managing resistance from mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How mothers and staff may participate in separating the child from their mother</td>
<td>Nine (9) imprisoned mothers and two (2) prison staff</td>
<td>Openings for participation</td>
<td>Analysis focused on instance in active involvement of participants see in informing the direction of the process and decision to separate the child</td>
<td>Identification, assessment, contacts, confirming, relatives, NGOs, Good Samaritan, Culture, rejection, age of the child, reminding, initiation</td>
<td>Initiating the separation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different codes were later sorted and located under different themes. Further analysis of the codes extracted guided in generating subthemes for meaningful groups. It is argued that codes identify a feature of the data that appears interesting to the analyst (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.18) as can be observed in table 2.

One of the shortcomings of this type of analysis maybe that it is not aligned to any theory (Braun and Clarke, 2006) and yet the current study is informed within frames of reference of

\(^2\)Data item refer to each individual piece of data collected (Braun and Clarke, 2006) in this case the individual interview notes obtained from each of the imprisoned mothers and prison staff interviewed.
mental models and theories in role and group identity. However, the reader ought to also note as Braun and Clarke (2006) indicate, that inductive thematic analysis given its theoretical freedom, is a flexible and useful research tool, which can potentially provide a rich and detailed, yet complex account of data. Whereas the data extracts consequently gave way to the themes, it must be acknowledged that the organisation, naming and the subsequent definition of the emerging themes was partly the researcher’s ingenuity. This contends with an earlier assertion by Ely et al., (1997: 205-6, cited in Braun and Clarke, 2006) about the language of themes emerging during analysis in which they noted:

“Can be misinterpreted to mean that themes „reside“ in the data, and if we just look hard enough, they will „emerge“ like Venus on the half shell. If themes „reside“ anywhere, they reside in our heads from our thinking about our data and creating links as we understand them”.

Patton, adds that the credibility of the researcher is especially important in qualitative research as it is the person who is the major instrument of data […] analysis (1990, cited in Shenton, 2004). This could relate to what Renny Golden refers to as “the ‘burden of the thicket’ in authentically representing the voices of those interviewed” (O’BRIEN, 2009).

4.8. Ethical considerations
After gaining permission of access to the women’s prison by the administrator of the respective prison, the purpose of the study was explained to the Officer in Charge (OC) of the prison. In addition, a letter of grant of permission from the Uganda Prison Services headquarters and an information sheet about the study in detail include the interview guide were presented. The selected participants were also informed of the purpose of the study, the benefits and risks associated with participation in the study. Assurance of confidentiality and anonymity (unless it was the decision of the participants to be made known particularly relating to their stories) of the interview data despite the presence of the prison warden. In this case, it was explained that, it is the prescribed role for the officers of the Prison Service, to safe guard confidential information relating to the prisoner. In order to ensure anonymity, no names were asked of the participants, however in order to identify the corresponding data generated, the study allocated codes for each participant including both the staff and the mothers and later on pseudo during the write-up names were assigned as way of maintaining their human face in this report. The importance of their participation was communicated and they were informed of the voluntariness in their decision to participate i.e. they reserved the liberty to refuse to participate including withdrawing from the interview even when they were selected by the prison administrators.

Given the potential for participants feeling uneasy to withdraw their consent in the researcher’s presence and right before the interview, it was reassured that it is their inherent right to choose not to and this would not raise any penalty from the authorities. All this was done to enable participant make a decision to be engaged in an interview from a well-informed perspective. Talking about an informed consent as a process, Macklin points out that, it involves “informing potential research subjects and obtaining their freely granted permission to conduct an intervention” (1999, p.83). The details in the consent form can be noticed in appendix 3. As may be noted in the study procedure; much as possible the researcher did not stop at explaining the consent form but throughout the entire study tried to ensure it covers all the necessary ethical requirement as underlined by different authorities in the field of research for instance by Kvale and Brinkmann (2009, p.70-76); Sections Research should be conducted in a manner that does not violate rights and welfare of human research participants and their communities.
(2014, p.2) by Uganda National Council of Science and Technology, Gallagher, et al., (1995), Macklin (1999) among others. Particularly for the imprisoned mothers and confidentiality was not absolute as interviews were done with a watchful eye of the prison warden, however, the interviews were conducted in physically secure offices of the prison in order for the participants to feel more relaxed, safe and at ease.

4.9. Practical Consideration

An ethical dilemma arose in the process as the researcher was informed that according to the prison’s rules, one cannot interview an inmate in the absence of a prison warden. It was either to abide by the rules of the community (in this case the prison) or not conduct research because of confidentiality and privacy concerns. More over one may debate the power issues for instance Dahl’s conception of Power where the [Prison Staff] have power over the [Prisoner mother] ((Dahl 1957, 202-203; cited in Digeser, 1992) in which prisoner mother may not refuse to participate if asked by the warden. It cannot be ignored given that an interview is shaped by the researcher and the participant in a specific context (Neuman, 2004, p.290). Given that in a prison setting, a prisoner is subordinate to the staff, is likely that the presence of the staff during the conversations with the mothers had an influence on the responses. This can also make the reader to wonder if there was voluntariness in participation, or it was participation out of obedience. None the less, as Gallagher et al., (1995) have indicated in dilemmas of this nature, and the specific context in order to obtain information, the researcher had to abide by the rules. The prison officers, however have a responsibility to keep confidential information safe, as has been stated and/or may be implied in Section 50 of the Uganda Prisons Act, 2006.

“Other offences a prison officer or any other person employed in a prison who, outside the ambit of his or her functions under this Act and without the prior authorization of the Commissioner General or the officer in charge— [----](d) conveys or permits any letter, document or other article to be conveyed out of a prison, or informs the press or any other person of any confidential matter concerning a prison or a prisoner or any confidential matter derived from official sources connected with or related to the Service, commits an offence and is liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding thirty currency points or imprisonment for a period not exceeding twelve months or both” (Uganda Prisons Act, 2006).

Sometimes, researchers are confronted with a dilemma of having to make decisions between competing ethical principles (Neuman, 2004). In this particular case, abiding by the rules was prioritized, with a personal judgment that confidentiality and privacy would not overly be compromised.

Whereas, at the stage of explaining the consent form it had been indicated that there would be no financial benefits accruing from the voluntary participation, questions of compensation and reciprocity also came in. After completing all the interviews at the respective prisons, as a token was passed appreciation (in form of a small stipend about for refreshments) was shared with the imprisoned mothers who participated in the interviews through the Officer In-Charge. Although this would not create any significant improvement on their wellbeing, it was out of the researcher’s sensitivity and empathy (Neuman, 2004) towards the imprisoned mothers.

4.10. Language Preference

All the mothers despite the varying ethnic backgrounds and thus varying language mother languages, preferred speaking in Luganda. Probably they felt this was the one way in which they would express themselves to enable the researcher to understand. However, it could have
been a careful selection by the prison staff with sensitivity to language. This way, there may have been a bias along language lines and the other mothers who would have complimentary or divergent lines of thought were left out. On the other hand, the staff preferred to be interviewed in English. This could have been a result of status of English as the official language used in public places of work. Whereas it is difficult to a conclusive judgement about the level, it is acknowledged that the staff’s expressions in English was very good.

4.11. Generalization
Payne and Williams, (2005, p. 296) comment that “to generalize is to claim that what is the case in one place or time, will be so elsewhere or in another time”. This could be a result of the dominance of the positivists’ line of thought that continues to dominate research including in the social sciences. This has made many researchers to try to fit in the situation which can at times diminish the trustworthiness of findings particularly in qualitative studies. The descriptions in the current study is to bring to our attention what we can learn from the mothers and staff but not to use it necessarily use it to make predictions about similar situations. Nonetheless, whereas the findings of this study may not be generalized globally as Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) have contended, analytically, the concerns raised have implications on the Uganda Prison Act 2006, for instance in terms of how admission and separation of children is concern. Given that this is the supreme law of the land in relation to the activities of the prisons services in the country, any changes to it that may accrue from the current study may affect the situation in the other prisons where children are allowed to stay for instance how are the prison buildings and the entire environment positioned to negotiate the child centred perspective. This may also carry implications for the other laws on protection of the child, and the way other actors relate to the issue of children living alongside their mothers in prison.

4.12. Trust Worthiness
Trust worthiness of any study as observed by Barbour, is understood to entail “the extent to which the findings are an authentic reflection of the personal or lived experiences of the phenomenon under investigation” (1998; cited in Curtin and Fossey, 2007). Besides documenting the methods of data collection and analysis (Higgs, 2001; cited in Curtin and Fossey, 2007), substantial chunks of narratives have been presented to enrich the descriptions of the findings in the results chapter. In this chapter, examples of how findings were arrived at has also been presented (see table 2) to help the reader to relate with the analysis and confidence in the findings.

Apart from the space triangulation which was undertaken, other criterion of judging study trust worthiness for example method triangulation was employed in the study. In particular, the study used a combination of in-depth and joint interviews which helped to provide comparison and clarification of perspectives immediately during the interview process but also continued later through the analysis process. In the study’s view, however, employing focus group discussion would have brought to fore the dynamic aspects of interaction at the heart of focus groups (Parker & Tritter, 2006, p.34). Perhaps this could have yielded further insights and clarification that may have enriched the study findings and lay claim since in social research, it is advised to triangulate methods as a way of providing checks on credibility (Shenton, 2004). But it must also be recognised that triangulation of methods can be challenged by “the uncertainty of not knowing what to do with findings that did not converge and to the amount of effort required to produce the narrow goal of confirmation” (Curtin and Fossey, 2007, p. 90).
Nonetheless, as Denzin indicates ‘combining multiple observers, theories, methods and data sources [researchers can] overcome the intrinsic bias that comes from single methods, (1970, p. 313; cited in Curtin and Fossey, 2007). However, as (Merriam, 1998) writes in Tuli (2011) the study also utilised quotations of actual conversation with participants, aimed for a better understanding for the reader but also, trustful reporting on part of the researcher.
Chapter 5
Study Results

5.0. Introduction
Results presented in this chapter draws from the raw data obtained through interviews conducted with both the mothers (nine) and staff (two). The interpretation being made here are guided by theories on mental models as well as theories on role and group identity. The findings in particular focus on views of mothers and staff in as far as separating the children from their mo is concerned and how they participate in the process and decision. The findings largely show that mothers and staff hold perspectives informed by their belonging to particular groups and associated roles. Their expectations, perceptions, and interests are very crucial in how they relate with separating the children. The findings are thus divided into three sections following the three research questions which the study sought to respond to. The first section describes the views of mothers in relation to the process and decision to separate the children. The second section considers the perspective of prison staff, and the third section looks at how the mothers and the staff participate in the process and decision to separate the children.

5.1. The mothers’ perspective on separation from their children
One of the key questions of this study was to understand the mothers’ views about separating their children who live with in prison. The findings in this regard revealed themes, including; motherly care responsibilities, opportunities to cope with prison time, responsibility to protect, and an expected vulnerability and moment of reflection.

5.1.1. Motherly care responsibilities
It is informed from this perspective that in order to understand a person it is important to consider how people perceive the roles associated with the particular groups they identify with. From this angle, the study sought how the mothers conceptualized motherhood and the concept mother. This was from the understanding that participants being mothers, motherhood is so important given the associated roles, anticipations and expectations. This provides the crucial lenses on how they relate with the process and decision to separate their children.

Findings revealed a number of views relating to the participants’ perceived roles associated with motherhood or being a mother. Participants interviewed related their status in terms of imprisoned mothers on care responsibilities. Mothers also tried to relate their current view of motherhood or being a mother to how they performed the roles of child care before prison set in. Key sub themes with regard to this subject include the following

5.1.1.1. Mother as one who stands in when men run away from responsibility
In this case, mother is seen to look after the children by providing for food and clothes to the children. A mother who is working is seen as an added advantage particularly in circumstances where men (fathers) may have neglected their responsibilities. This can be observed as one of the participants lamented about as below

A mother has to look after the children, provide for food and clothes to the children. Especially if you are working, then you take the most part in caring because men of these days have neglected their responsibilities (Butundu, Imprisoned Mother)
You have to look after the home and know if your children have eaten and I mean eating well. And if the child is sick, you have to take them for treatment... that is all the work of a good mother (Namukose, Imprisoned mother)

The concern of a working position seems to be so important to reflect on given that these are new mothers confined to the chains of the prison. Implying that the advantage that work adds to motherhood experience changes and impact significantly on the perceived caring roles. Such limitation if looked at from the mental models perspective is likely to shape the way mothers may construct their mindsets about separation process. As the mothers spend time in prison, probably they get to appreciate more the workings of the prisons environment and the pressures inherent (Senge1991) which affects their in group as mother in performing the associated roles and which influences them to develop particular mental constructs in relation to their abilities to provide for the child.

This is notable in the participants’ conceptualization of a good mother as guiding and instilling discipline is concerned. In this regard, issues about the time available to their children is considered key to the mothers, in which it is indicated that such time is limited if one is in prison. Nonetheless, among some of the mothers, there is at least an expressed appreciation and value for this limited time. It comes out as an opportunity to at least communicate to their children unlike when they are on the outside. This was indicative in the level of skepticism that some of the mothers associated with the decision to separate the child as explained by one of the mothers in the following excerpt.

Being a mother, means looking after your child in every condition that may arise in life and guiding them on what should and should not be done... but as a mother, being in prison, you find that there is limited time to talk to the child and unlike when it is at home.... but if you have your child in prison the time you may have available may be little... however, it is better because when the child is far away for example at home [elsewhere], away from the prison, you can only talk to them when they visit. For instance, talking to them about how to behave in life becomes difficult. Outside this prison, you are not there when they misbehave to give guidance [...] be done (Kabuo, Imprisoned Mother)

5.1.1.2. The one concerned about Education of the child
To mothers interviewed, education is a role of a good mother. Having this cognition, some participants underscore that separating children may enable them to get an education on the outside. This is perceived to offer an opportunity to harness the children’s potentials for a better future.

Related to the education role of the mother, is the issue of native language and culture. Emerging from the interviews, mothers noted that this is also a responsibility of a mother as she is perceived to be a big help in the process through which a child learns the native language. Thus, the process and decision to separate the child, evokes thoughts on whether the child will have an opportunity to learn the native language and culture or not. The concern is that in the event that separation occurs, children may learn a language of those whom they stay with which may not be their native language especially if they are not relatives which is perceived to be hurt so much among some of the mothers interviewed. This could partly explain why some of the mothers held the preference that their children live with relatives or a family member and/or sibling in order to learn their culture and the language. This can be observed in the following illustration.
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When you have a child inside prison, you are able to teach them the language for example the native language than when they are just out there.... Because when they are out there, they only learn the language of the people where they grow up from and that hurts especially if it is not your own the mother Language (Lunyolo, Imprisoned Mother)

I wanted my child to know his siblings and grow with them so he can be known among the relatives and even learn the language... Because for me, if they bring here other children, I cry a lot. (Namukose, Imprisoned mother)

In the above illustration, the mental construction around the issue of passing on cultural knowledge for instance in the form of teaching the native language can is perceptibly a role of a mother, and it influences how the participants look at separation. The implication may actually be that the participant feels that she will not be able to conform to the attributes associated to the mother group (Ramiah and Hewstone, 2011). Also, the issue about crying on seeing other children visiting could be a result of a depersonalisation of the participants’ perception in view of the prevailing environment. Probably the concern is that bringing other children inside prison, a mother will not be able to meet the emotional and value significance (Hoggs and Reid, 2006) required of a mother towards her child. Perhaps the mothers consider the situation around the visitation not appropriate as it may involve crowds and noise which makes children upset and anxious as Anaraki and Boostani, (2014, p. 3102) have pointed out. This may create pity for the situation and probably have emotions expressed through crying.

5.1.1.3. Exercising independence and control in decision making over basics for the children

This is more prominent especially in regard to feeding the child in the prison. Such results from the perceived level of dependence and the control involved, in terms of making to dietary choices for the child as far as nutrition is concerned. Whereas there was an appreciation of the efforts of the Prison authority to provide for the basic need, the incapacitations with which mothers face in relation to providing and/or making independent choices about changing diet to meet the dietary needs of the child evokes a lot of pain. Some mothers compared to the situation where a mother on the outside of prison can make decisions on a daily basis about which food combination to avail her child. Yet inside prison she has to wait for what the authority or warden decides upon to feed the child, which may not even meet a balanced diet – a perception held among some of the mothers. Consequently, to some mothers, a child to live outside prison is welcomed with optimism that the child will be able to have a change in diet. Excerpts obtained in some of the interviews collaborate this line of thought as illustrated below;

Separation would be good that you no longer stay with them [the children] inside prison.... At least out there, they will be able to eat well for example be able to have a balanced diet because there can be a change in what to prepare and eat unlike here in prison where the baby feeds on ‘Posho’ [Corn bread] and beans, and you are unable to change the diet which may not be good for the baby (Butundu, Imprisoned mother)

Generally, it can be noticed that belonging to a particular identity group carries with its corresponding roles. From a mental model perspective, it pushes the members of the group to build and questions interests, expectation as they acknowledge the pressures present. This in turn shapes the way in which the mothers in prison may construct an understanding about a decision and process to separate the child, because this the touches perceived value with to identify with the ‘mother group and motherhood’ in an environment of a child and
imprisonment. Associating the self with a good mother group creates a particular reality about prison especially in relation to fulfilling what is expected of a group member. This seems to resonate well with the assertion that “if people think that groups are real will proceed to construct that reality” (Jenkins, 2008, p. 12). How the concerns about education, independence and control over diet and guiding and disciplining constructed within the meaning of mother and motherhood in a prison context will most definitely inspire the kind of reality that the mothers develop about the process and decision to separate their children. This could be so as they have to negotiate within the apparent limitations visualized within the prison setting in performing motherhood. Jenkins observed in social identity theory that the way one values and perceives the self, determines behaviour towards a particular environment or phenomenon (2008).

5.1.2. Separation in terms of opportunities for coping with prison time

The views developed from this perspective about the separation were conceived around the difficulty or ease with which to manage prison time amongst the mothers. The separation is seen to provide moments for the participants to reflect on the mechanism to cope. Seemingly, depending on how a participant relates with separation, its occurrence or not, can represent both difficult and relief or leverage. In such instances, it can be observed that, it is not necessarily true to say that because people identify with the same group, they will hold similar views as has been noted in Stets and Burke (2000; Jenkins, 2008). This however is in agreement with Jenkins (2008) observation that hierarchies of collective identification may conflict with hierarchies of individual identification. But also, through mental models, it has been argued that one’s ability to represent the ‘World’ accurately is unique to each individual (Jones, et al., 2011) and therefore each mother has own mental models based on the interaction (Hayes and Allinson, 1998) within the prison environment. This may shape how the participant may choose to pay attention to, which drives their cognition (Baker and Saputelli, 2011) in relation to the process and decision to separate the child.

5.1.2.1. Aids to manage negative thoughts

Separation of the child sounds bells relating to aids to manage negative thoughts inside the prison walls. This relates to the case files [crimes with which they have been sent to prisons in the first place]. For some participants, to live with children provides a positive distraction from negative thoughts. Separation in this case would imply taking away this fall-back position. In some instance, however, this view is contradicted as some participants indicated that the child’s stay in prison instead doubled negative thoughts which keeps such mothers wandering when the time for separation will be due. These thoughts are related to a number of issues including but not limited to the capacity to provide, possibilities of relatives visiting, contemplation about the how the child feels, and demands from the child for provisions. For example, in a joint interview, two mothers whose children had been separated from them a few weeks prior to the interview related to the separation decision in two contrasting angles. On one hand, one of them indicates the separation as relieving off the stress of caring and yet the other, on the other hand perceives it to generate further stress.

Whereas for both mothers there is an interest in how they cope with prison time the ways to achieving this is different. Further Illustrations from the mothers in many instances present not a single line of view. Interview excerpts from some of the mothers are illustrative about this profound concern to cope with prison time and can be observed in the following statements.

*When a child is separated... it is better to have the child out because you can imagine a child is crying for food but you don’t have. It doubles the negative thoughts. Today is for example, a*
visitation day, but my relatives are very far. How will my child feel if other inmates are getting relatives bringing food stuff and yet for me, I do not have?! (Kabuo, Imprisoned Mother).

I felt very bad... because when the case file was overwhelming me, I could turn to my child for some sort of destruction but now this has increased [probably implying that the condition has worsened] and sometimes, I even fail to eat (Namukose, Imprisoned Mother).

Sometimes, the child in prison can cry for what to eat yet you do not have what to give her so separation is a big relief and you do not feel pressured.... The child does not know what you are going through in prison, they may want something because they have seen someone else eating yet you do not have the capacity to provide. [...] once a child is taken away, you know that you have only one file left on your case file (Lunyolo, Imprisoned Mother).

5.1.2.2. Children stay in prison as motivating behaviour
Findings also indicated that some participants for example, staying in prison with their children provides a motivation to behave well, including towards offending inmates. This is done to avoid earning themselves further punishment for instance solitary confinement, yet it would also mean that the child as well would share in this experience as one of the mothers had explained in the following excerpt.

If you have misbehaved for example, you have insulted someone or fought; women are given an extra punishment by confining them in solitary places but if you have a baby you don’t go there because when you think about the child and wander what would happen to him (her) if you earn yourself that solitary confinement. That is why for me, even if someone abuses me, I just keep quiet as my response. I try to behave well for my child and that way I reduce on the stress. You can see that inmate who came here crying, it is because she is complaining about solitary confinement yet she is the one who misbehaves (Nakato, Imprisoned Mother).

As can be observed in the above statement, the consideration of the child in relation to the would-be negative consequence that responding otherwise still reflects back on to the perception about a good mother in sub section (5.1.1) as one who cares for her child even in very hard conditions. The intertwining of identification and interest (Jenkins, 2008) becomes evident. This however, makes it difficult to comprehend that the connection of identification to motivation and behaviour is not straight forward or cannot be predicted as it has been observed in Jenkins (2008, p. 6-7). But the above illustrations can be interpreted in Kenneth Craik’s process (Baker and Saputelli, 2011), where mothers imagine and anticipate the consequences of solitary confinement and how it may affect the child to justify the kind of response they take when confronted with insults from fellow prisoners. In the current study, opinion is that probably if it is not of consequences on the child, the reaction to offence may turn out different it seems. Research show that expression of identity keeps changing (Ethier and Deaux, 1994) this could be a show of how groups and situations somehow submerge uniqueness and cause member to behave differently as situations and membership to groups change (Hoggs and Reid, 2006, p. 7). It is with such that the action of the mother not to confront her offenders can be interpreted as protecting the positive attributes (Hoggs and Reid, 2006) about motherhood as a way of matching perceptions to standards (Burke and Cast, 1997). This may result in redefining the mental models of what behaviour of self and that of others mean the participants in the immediate situation (Hayes and Allinson, 1998), ex
5.1.2.3.  Post Prison Explanations
Keneth Craik’s view is also present in the study findings in which mothers are concerned about *explanations to the child at Post-Prison period*. As mothers are confronted, with the impending separation, some of them seem to engage in an ex ante evaluation of how the relationship with their children would be like. This applies especially when they may be tasked by their children to provide explanation on what happened for the children to live alongside them in prison. Separation from this view, is seen as way of enabling children to find answers or explanations by themselves. Particularly, it is anticipated that the routine visit allowed by the prisons would in a way facilitate the process for the child (ren) to get all the clarifications they need. This can be observed in the following illustration.

> Being a mother with a child in prison means raising a child while having a lot of thoughts and when you know that there is something to explain in the future... Because when the child you have been with in prison grows up, will still ask you about what happened. And that to me is the most difficult thing because I really do not know what I will tell my child if he ever asks me what happened. However, when they separate you, I think the child can start to see the difference and at least start getting an explanation on his own relating to the mother’s condition as he sees you in usual clothes different from what people whom he stay with at home put on (Kabuo, Imprisoned Mother).

From the above, it can be noticed that an imagery about what the situation will be like at post prison time guides the mother perception about the separation and through an evaluation locates the needed support in terms of visits and the ability of the child to appreciate the difference and get answers to the mother’s imagined questions. From such a point of view, separating the child may be welcomed as an added advantage to the mother.

Generally, the perspective of coping with Prison time as observed in the above presentation reflects on the uniqueness with which each of the participant experiences the same situation even when they may belong to the same group as mothers with children living together in prison. From Hayes and Alinson (2008) point of view it can be comprehended in this study that the uniqueness in interaction by the different mothers with their environment make them construct varying mental sets about separating their children.

5.1.3.  Responsibility to protect
Findings indicated an overarching view among the participants about the responsibility to protect children. Protection in this case, is considered in relation to the excesses with the prison environment that have the likelihood of causing harm to the child. Although there was also interest about the children’s safety on the outside, from this perspective, participants are mainly concerned about the protection of the child from the inside environment of the prisons. Particularly, there was some kind of wariness about separation, as some participants reserved a level of uncertainty on whether the children once released from their care can be delivered to the intended destinations.

5.1.3.1.  The potential violence and abuse that could arise in prison
Results also revealed that the participants are very wary about the potential of violence and abuse that could arise in prison, which may affect the child but also cause embarrassment to the mother. For the case of embarrassment to the mother, some participants relayed their views in relation to the feelings experienced as a result of the ‘innocent’ actions of the children. For instance when they (children) talk about their mothers’ bodies to the other people inside the
prison environment. It was reported that sometimes mothers may undress while the children are watching, and as a result, the children relay information back to whichever audience they come across in the prison little knowing that this evokes feelings of embarrassment to the mother. Such encounters keep some mothers wandering when the separation will actually occur. This also has a gendered perspective, as noticed in the expression below.

...You see when you have a child, they see other women undressing and are necked and all these things and the words said especially in the bathrooms; for the children who can talk go out there and tell other people what they saw and heard and this is really embarrassing. But Also not good for the children. For the boys, they keep wandering and asking why they are different from their mothers. There was a day when a woman entered with her child (a boy) inside the bathroom and she was necked. Then later the boy went out and told other people what he had seen. As a mother, to me this is very embarrassing (Nakato, Imprisoned Mother).

On the part of children, the study shows that imprisoned mothers are very much concerned about the abuse and violence that children are exposed to in the prison, for example foul language including calling each other by the names of crimes that (may) have been committed. Also the fright that children may experience, and costing the child knowledge of social networks were cited. This in the participants’ opinion was not good for the children and as such needed protection. In terms of the child’s age, it is perceived by some mothers that, especially when a child reaches two years needs to be in prison on the consideration of the kind language used among the prisoners that the child should not listen in. For instance calling each other among the mothers by the crimes committed is noted to feature prominently in the wards and thus separation is viewed as help to prevent the children from getting spoilt. This is notable in the excerpts below.

I felt good when I had that my child is going to be separated... because here in prison, they hold women for the different crimes and children do not need to be here. And sometimes, our colleagues use (say) strong words that are vulgar and you see, young children grasp things very fast and in that way they can get spoilt (Mukebezi, Imprisoned Mother)

In terms of children getting frightened, some mothers reflect on children’s encounters where the child is scared by a goat. Mothers also recognise that their children cannot act like children on the outside who would may way as a signal of some form of happiness at noticing the mother’s return home. Some of the mother noted that this does not happen to their children. Perhaps they expected the children to wave in delight probably when they notice the mothers’ return from the prison engagements like the mandated labour. The behaviour of the children and the expectations from the mother and the corresponding comparison with the outside of prison environment has an effect on how the mother relates with separating the child.

5.1.3.2. Apprehension about Identity Confusion
Some participants were also apprehensive about identity confusion going on inside the prison. Here the associated concern was the likelihood on part of the child not to recognise their real mother. This was on account that given the same uniform that inmates are provided with, and maybe because it is something they have to put on daily, makes it difficult for the child to identify with the real mother.

If you are separated – it is good because it helps the child not to grow in prison.... Because for example, being here [prison] it confuses the children as it takes them long to find out who their
real mother is; especially when they when we are in our Uniforms (Mukebezi, Imprisoned Mother).

5.1.3.3. Right to belong in a community of relatives.
Some participants in this study seemed to hold themselves in guilt position for not helping their children to connect with and be known to their relatives because of having them staying in prison. This is evident in the illustration below

*Because of staying with my child in prison, I have not been able to help my child know his relatives and siblings. And I think this will cost him so much. Because you see this child sees the other children here in prison being visited by their fathers and even if he is only three and a half years old, he always cries especially when he hears when people asking me, about where his father is and I say that he is dead* (Nakato, Imprisoned Mother).

Holding such views could be result of not being visited by the relatives. But also, it is possible that the relatives are located far away from where the mother has been imprisoned and can hardly afford the means to make visits. Some of the children are single orphans, and for the mothers in this respect, separating the children generates many convolutions.

5.1.4. An expected vulnerability and a moment to reflect
From this perspective, participants related with as one that is predetermined that must happen and one that had to be reflected upon. Separation challenges some of the imprisoned mothers interviewed to reflect particularly at the time when they were being admitted to prison either with children or as expectant mothers, as staff on duty informed them that time will come in future and the children will have to be taken away. This made them to look at the decision and process for separating their children as expected but also something they can hardly do anything about. At the moment of admission particularly for the mother with a child, one is informed that at a point in time during imprisonment, the child will be separated.

On the other hand, the mothers confronted with the reality about powerlessness given their prisoner position. This is revealed in separation as it one of the things they cannot stop unless it is out of the lenience from the Prisons authority. This seemed to be strengthened through subsequent reminders from the prison staff especially as the mandated time for separation approached. This is illustrated in the excerpt below

… *When I came here, I was told that the child has to leave the prisons when they make one year and eight months. But the OC (Officer in-Charge) was lenient enough to allow my child to stay with me and now he is three and a half years... otherwise If the age of the child is way beyond the one expected for stay in prison... as an imprisoned mother, you may not do much to disagree because when you have just been admitted with your child, you are told that someday will come and the child will have to be separated from you* (Namukose, Imprisoned Mother).

The above presents have more to do with power, in which the mother group seems to be in the subordinate position in relation to the staff. This echo calls by Ramiah et al., (2011) to pay attention especially to power relations between groups when considering the effects of social identification.
For the mothers interviewed, this keeps them under task to think about the carers for their children. However, to some this does not go well they reflect about the times before prison especially when the conditions were not good. Subsequently, they keep wandering where the child will go and how they will be once the separation takes place. Thoughts about the state of life before imprisonment and after separation in relation to where the mother has been imprisoned also sets in. Distances between prisons and the homes of the respective mothers or even the non-relatives where the child is likely to go at separation is also assessed. Consequently, some mothers in the current study voiced to worry that they may not be close to their children and contemplate about any possibilities of visits. The conclusion is that the visits will be hard to come by and limited if it happens, particularly so for those where the distance involved between home and prison is very far.

For some who may have had a difficult past especially when it came to meeting the basic of life, for instance shelter or had unreliable social networks to provide for the child; separation was another dilemma that they have to face. This is reflected in some of the excerpts below.

*You sometimes realise that your husband died and yet by the time you left for prison, you were staying in 'omuzigo' [a single room rented house], and you know that you have no other place to take the child. It becomes great relief when you hear that the prison authority is taking the child to a day care centre instead otherwise where would the child go* (Lunyolo, Imprisoned Mother).

*When you do not have any money and/or something for the child, another mother can help and provide. But some mothers even keep wandering when the child will reach the mandated time period so that they can be taken away. However, for some of us have been given long sentences and there is not even any one to come and visit because my relatives are very far* (Kabuo, Imprisoned Mother).

It can be observed that whereas some of the mothers illustrated to feel bad at thinking about the process and decision to separate their children, for those whose homes or relatives were noted to be far in particular, expressed a sense of comfort and relief, especially if the separation resulted in placing their children into a day-care centre or kindergarten with a watchful eye of the prison and/or close to the Prison where they can easily get information about how the children are doing.

Generally, imprisoned mothers relate with the separation of children living together with them in prison along a number of perspectives. These different lenses seem to carry with them several concerns, which have already been raised above. They reflect the associated anticipations, pressures, past and present experiences for mothers as they exist within the prison environment, and are evident in the construction of mental models (See Shahzad, 2012). As belonging to a group of mothers, it can be noticed that the several anticipations and interests in motherhood and about being a mother negotiates how the mothers’ interviewed in this study finally perceive the process and decision to separate the children.

### 5.2. Staff perspective on separation of children from their imprisoned mothers

The second question in this study sought the views of prison staff in relation to the process and the actual decision of separating the children living with their mothers inside prison. The staff engaged in interviews included those directly concerned with the separation decision and both were also mothers. The emerging data seemed to speak to four themes and these included; i)
concerns about the work load ii) also concerns about protection especially of the children, iii) the staff were also concerned about the wellbeing of the child, and the other was the concern about the laws. These are elaborated further below.

5.2.1. Concerns about workload

Seen in relation to what is the (main) expected role of the prisons, findings revealed that the prison staff view separation as good because the prison is not a place for the child. There is thinking among the staff who participated in this study that children and especially the expectant mother who later deliver in the care of the prisons are a burden added to the work that prisons have to do. From the interactions with the staff who participated in the study, arose the issue lack of the necessary facilities and environment to facilitate the staff in performing the kind of additional role children’s admission into prison presents. This evident in the illustration below

*Whereas children miss the parenting bit... if the separation does not happen, it gives us more work because as prisons, parenting is not our role. Although as prisons we give someday to have the children interact freely with their mothers, it cannot be compared to the space a mother needs to be with her children* (Sharline, Prison Staff)

Besides the expressed frustration among the mothers in relation to separating the children as noted by staff separation is understood to be ridden with challenges. It is during this process that staff may face resistance and negativity from the Mothers and the child’s relatives respectively. On the part of mothers, staff interviewed indicated that some of them may not want to accept to let go off their little children. However, it is also noted that they have to abide because rules are rule. This relates to the view from the mothers that separation stems the reality about the prison mother’s position of powerlessness.

On the other hand, the relatives may not want to accept responsibility to take care of the child. While the reasons for the negative response from the relatives may be many and varied, one such reason is that the relatives only want to run away from responsibility. There is also an understanding that some relatives tend to displace anger towards the child against the actions of the mother, who could have probably been imprisoned for a supposed murder of the child’s father or depending on the kind of crime for which she has been imprisoned. From workload perspective, it is seen to increase the burden of finding other solutions for instance getting an alternative carer in the separation process as one of the staff noted:

*Prisons looks at the part of serving the sentence according to law. This child has to be in the public yet there is rejection sometimes. But when we find that the family has rejected the child for example, if the mother is said to have murdered the father, relative may transfer the anger on to the child... In this case we try to find an NGO to help and bring the morale for children and also enable them go to school* (Sharline, Prison Staff)

Nonetheless, even the process of looking for an alternative care arrangement, separation becomes a way of passing on responsibility from the prisons to another party. It is understood here as a deliberate process where the actual decision results in someone else taking up the responsibility of caring for the child. Such positing of responsibility can be either to the relatives of the child and/or a Good Samaritan who could be a non-governmental organisation (NGO), church or an individual that would be willing to take on the caring role for the child.
Once separation is done, responsibility or deliberate steps to contact the guardians of the child by the prisons is five years and anything after that has to be initiated from the outside (Sharline, Prison Staff)

When the baby reaches three years, is taken to a school there in ‘Biina’ so that they can join Nursery [pre-primary] – the school has both Nursery and primary sections. At this point, the child is out of our hands, and we start processing a court order. What remains for us in most cases, we can only monitor the conditions during holiday for those children taken up by NGOs like Wells of Hope and Family of Africa (Diana, Prison Staff)

It is with such that separating the child from the mother is viewed as relieving the prison and prison staff from a burden of care that was in the view of the staff interviewed, not supposed to be for the prisons in the first place and relegating their role to monitoring of the conditions. From this point of view, one can note that the actual and perceived workload that the prisons and prison staff are faced with has a bearing on how some of the prison staff view the separation of children.

All the perception of a continuation of the caring role for the prisons beyond prison physical boundaries as the authority for example monitoring may be in accordance with the Prisons Act, 2006, of the republic of Uganda. The continuation of monitoring the conditions of the child wherever s/he is and with whomever is caring for that child is to help relay feedback to the mother but this is on request. This may attest to the view that reflects an organisation as a set of implicit and explicit rules that make members behave in a particular way (Hayes and Allinson, 2008, p. 848). Nonetheless, taking from the role identity theorists, Burke (1980, cited in Stets and Burke, 2000 p. 227) is said to have pointed to the interest in “matching between the individual meanings of occupying a particular role and the behaviours that a person enacts in that role while interacting with others”. In this sense, the prison staff identifying with the role of protecting the innocence in the children, and the expectations and meanings they develop from this perspective guides them to look at separating the child from the mothers in a particular way (Burke 1991; Stet and Burke, 2000; Jones et. al. 2011). This however, may relate to differentiating criteria of identity (Jenkins, 2008) in which the staff group the child as innocent and the mother as one deserving the prison. It can be noticed that this kind of differentiation places the staff in the patron status and guides them in how they look at the separation process and decision.

5.2.2. Reflection on the potential abuse

Findings also show that staff hold questions about the protection of children from Prison excesses. This view related more with the actual or perceived excesses prison may present for one to stay with their children while serving prison time. Talking about separation, the staff interviewed had concerns about the routines of the prison for example the roll-calls that happen every morning which also makes the children to wake up as early as 05:00 am. To the staff, this was considered not to be good for children thus they needed protection from such routines.

The child adopts routines like the mothers’ like fearing the prison officer. For example there is this Fallen (Counting) very early in the morning; as prisoners run, the children also run out of fear […]You see that when you say that now, we are doing ‘fallen’, early in the morning,

---

3 Biina is small suburb on the outskirts of Kampala City
even the children will have to wake up in that cold! These children need a day care centre where they can be free (Sharline, Prison Staff)

Data also revealed that the process of separating the child from its mother also provides a moment of reflection on the potential abuse that a child may face if s/he continued staying in prison. Excerpts from interviews with selected staff indicated that inside prison, there was a likelihood of sexual and psychological abuse to be inflicted on to the children. The psychological and/or mental abuse was associated mainly with the strong but foul language that may be used by the prisoners. This was also related to the prison routine and command that in many cases either condition children to wake up early and/or keep them frightened given the controlling environment that the prison presents.

Whereas it was noted not to be a common occurrence and/or any evidence adduced to this effect, staff interviewed held a view that sexual violence had the potential of happening especially on the boy child. There was an expressed claim that such has happened in some other prisons where especially women imprisoned for quite a long time tend to molest or fondle the sexual parts of the child (particularly the boy) to gain sexual satisfaction. The process and decision to separate the children thus is portrayed as protecting them from the potential of such abuse. This is corroborated in the following illustration

*Because for example, if the child is one year and is a boy even the prisoners can molest him. Although since I came here, I have not received any boy child at this prison but cases have occurred there in some prison* (Sharline, Prison Staff)

**Triggers emotional difficulties**

Yet the same time, the separation particularly when it had already occurred and involved the children having to visit their mothers is said to trigger emotional difficulties both for the mother and the child. For the children difficulty manifests through crying especially at any suspicion of intent that those who had brought them to visit the mothers was tending to leave them in prison.

… *On Saturdays, children come and stay for the whole day with their mothers. But when they see the vehicle that brought them leaving, they start crying. Thinking that they are being left... the child does not want to be in the prison.* (Sharline, Prison Staff)

On the other hand, the imprisoned mothers turned emotional at seeing their children leave, even though they were just returning to the day-care centre close to but also affiliated to the prison. Faced with such scenarios, separation is viewed not as a one moment event but something that keeps reoccurring over time. This poses a dilemma for the prison staff to balance between allowing the mother to see the children and letting the wish for those children not interested in coming back to the prison setting to take precedence. Thus, separation is not a one moment event but one which the mothers and their children have to continuously deal with over time. According to the staff interviewed, this can be reflected in the emotional reactions that both the mothers and the children express particular at times of visitation after the legal separation has long been done. This was described to involve opposing emotions on either side. Whereas some children cried in resisting any decision to be left in prison upon visitation, some mothers on the other hand resisted their children to be taken away. However, to many, it was revealed that they would get reassured particularly when the children turn up in better conditions.
Borrowing from mental models’ literature, one notices that how mother constructs the notion of trust particularly in relation the other groups and caring for the child mediates their reaction to the process of separation in view of who takes care of the child when the moment finally arrives. Given mental models are the assumptions that shape what we choose to pay attention to, trust which may be judged on a continuum will drive how the mother contributes about who to take care of the child (Baker and Saputelli, 2011) as perceived by some of the staff interviewed.

5.2.3. Concern about child wellbeing

The emerging data from the key informant interviews indicated that separation in the opinion of the staff engaged in the study represented a concern about securing the child’s wellbeing. Wellbeing was viewed in relation to what the staff’s perceived life of the situation is supposed to be for every child. This was viewed in relation to enjoyment of rights, pursuant to culture and education. For instance, the staff interviewed indicated that separation is done to enable children have an education that can help to improve on their future wellbeing given that prisons lacked the necessary facilities to support educational concerns for the child.

*Of course, we tell them right from the beginning that when the child reaches three years they have to leave (go out of the prisons because the child has the right to education but such services are not available here.* (Diana, Prison Staff)

In relation to rights, it was noted that children of imprisoned parents like any other child need to learn their culture and language for example. Such was also identified as one of the concerns that Prisons can hardly deliver on.

*Mostly, we consider the child must study, know the clan, norms and behaviours of their culture and the language. The child is not an inmate and thus the separation is meant to protect this innocence in the child and enable those Children to be free from incarceration* (Sharline, Prison Staff)

As can be observed separation was in a seen as favouring the children to learn more about their language and culture. Despite facing resistance from the imprisoned mothers not letting off their children, to the staff, consenting to the decision to have the children separated represented a moment of realisation or recognition (an acknowledgment) that the prison was not good for the children.

*And by the time the mother gives the consent, they have realised and recognised that the environment inside prison is not good for the child* (Sharline, Prison Staff)

However, one may challenge the voluntariness in consenting since the imprisoned mother incapacitated and can hardly do anything to stop the separation. Furthermore, the process and decision, is perceived to evoke an evaluation of trust issues for the care of the child. Trust in this case is considered more significant particularly where the mother has to choose who to take care of the child. This is illustrated in the excerpt below

*It does not matter how responsible or resource equipped. It is the mother to decide where the child goes in the end. For example, there was a child where both the father and mother are in prison. Both relatives and NGOs wanted to take care of the child. Whereas the mother acknowledged that the NGO had the resources and would definitely take good care of the child,*
she trusted more the relatives and so consented to give the child to the relatives (Diana, Prison staff)

It is evident that inherent in the views of some of the prison staff relating to separation of children from living alongside their imprisoned mothers inside prison, the concern or interest about the wellbeing of such children is paramount.

5.2.4. Course of the law

This related to the prison services being the custodian of the law; both national and international law relating to imprisonment of mothers with their children living alongside them. As a result, the staff interviewed indicated that the process and the subsequent decision to separate the children from living alongside their imprisoned mothers as a mandate required under the law. To the staff, this separation is an expected event where the mothers are prepared right from the point of reception. It was noted that once the mothers where brought in with children and/or give birth inside the prisons, they are also informed that there will be time when the children will be taken away after they reached a certain age as required under the law (reference to the Uganda Prisons Act, 2006).

At reception we also inform the mothers in advance that they will have their children separated. We ask the mothers if they have someone who can take care of the child (ren) after they make one and a half years. So, we need to link them up with the welfare officer who is to get in contact with the family of the prisoner... even if they do not have the next of kin, we at least ask them to tell us the historical links of the inmate in order to trace for the guardian. It is only when there is none that we start to take the children to the day-care centre when they make one and a half years (Diana, Prison staff)

The child is supposed to be in prison for 18\textsuperscript{4} months but since that medical person (reference to some report by a medical doctor but was not shown the said report) said that a child is supposed to breast feed up to 24 month... we are considering it; though it is not yet in the prisons Act. So, the Act needs to be amended. It is after this that the child can officially stay in Prisons for more than 18 months. (Sharline, Prison staff)

From the above illustrations, it can be noticed that separating the child from the mother brings to the limelight the efforts of communication, negotiation and innovations. In this process of getting to the outcome as the staff try to create meaning of the situation shows groups as open to new ideas in their interaction. This alludes to comments that “identifying self, or others, is a matter of meaning, generated from interactions involving agreement and disagreement, convention and innovation, communication and negotiation” (Jenkins, 2008, p. 17) in recognition of the respective role to play. This could also feature in terms that takes place in social identity as members try to enhance the image social comparison of their own aspirations, opinions and abilities of the in-group and others that matter (Festinger, 1954). Depending on how the interactions unfold may determine how the staff perceive the process and decision to separate the child from its mother.

Separation reveals the mother’s vulnerability to participate in decision that affect the child: The process and the decision were also thought of as revealing of the vulnerability that imprisoned mothers face in participating in decision making regarding to what happens to their children. In the interviews with the selected staff, it was noted that whereas consent to give out

\begin{footnote}
4 The mandated period of an infant or child to stay in prison according to the Uganda Prisons Act 2006-59
\end{footnote}
the child by the imprisoned mother must be gained, it could merely be a representation of obedience to the law where they can hardly do anything to stop the process even if they wanted.

Their is something little because they are prisoners and vulnerable. Like when you are a prisoner, our rules are our rule! As a prisoner she has to abide with the rules, and if the child reaches the age when they are supposed to be released from prison, the mothers have little or more so nothing they can do to stop the separation [...]. The only contribution may be, is to give the contact details of the relatives everything else for example contacting the relatives is left for us (Diana, Prison Staff).

Somehow, however, it becomes characteristic of the process that it involves agreements, setting conditions, witnessing and authorisation. In this regard, courts pass conditions upon which those to take care of the child are supposed to follow, and at the same time securing consent/agreement from both the mothers and the new caretakers particularly when they are non-relatives. This is in form of signing a consent agreement. Understanding the findings in this case have to take into consideration of the situation because can greatly impact on social behaviour (Haney and Zimbardo, 1998). It is at this time that the Prisons play the role of witness in this case to the consent agreement to pass on authority for someone else to take care of the child.

As Prison, this a time to get a court document allowing an organisation for example Family of Africa [is an NGO] to take care of the child… it is a consent agreement between the imprisoned mother and the organisation (Family of Africa). Here the court and the prison authority act as witnesses.... The court order gives authorisation for someone to formally take care of the child and also specifies what the care taker should observe (Diana, Prison staff)

Thinking about the separation process introduces debates on why the Courts do not think about alternatives to imprisonment for mothers with little children and/or the expectant mothers than sending such cases to prison, as indicated by some of the staff interviewed. This was implied in the statements shared by the some of the staff interviewed in the excerpts below;

Let the laws reduce the number of pregnant mothers in prison. If there can be an alternative, why would you give prisons the burden of caring for a mother who is seven months pregnant. I can tell you that fathers usually take off when they realise that the wife has been imprisoned (Sharline, Prison staff)

From the above presentation, it can be noted that in the face of separation, cooperation groups surface. This is so as some of the staff interviewed also take issue with decisions that send mothers with their little children and/or in some cases expectant mothers to prison. Interviews with the mothers had revealed a similar concern. This could be so because the anticipated challenge in context of having a child reside in prison may pose to the shared interest in effectively performing their respective roles. For staff the interest could majorly be in guarding society against offenders of the law yet for the mothers have a greater interest their perceived position about motherhood and being behind bars threaten the positive picture because of the limitation therein. Such interest as has been noted in identity theories (Jenkins, 2008) resounding pressures as implied in mental models (Jones et al., 2011; Shahzad, 2012) will definitely impact on how the staff view the separation of children from their mothers.

The challenge however is to make conclusions derived along the presentation made above. Despite evident negativity that having a child in prison with the mother may have on achieving
the respective interest is not absolutely straightforward to determine which direction the separation process takes. There were notable reservations from the staff interviewed that separating the child from the mother as having a level of flexibility. This is especially related to exceptions in relation to the strict application of the law. It was for example observed that on special occasions, children have been allowed to stay in prisons for more than the mandated time. Whereas under the Uganda Prisons Act 2006, an infant or child is mandated to stay in prison until they make 18 months, there were notable cases where children have not been separated even when they made the recommended age limit under the law. One of the staff had the following to illustrate:

*The child is supposed to be in prison for 18 months but since that medical person (reference to some report by a medical doctor) said that a child is supposed to breastfeed up to 24 months… we are considering it; though it is not yet in the prisons Act. So, the Act needs to be amended; it is after this that the child can officially stay in Prisons for more than 18 months.* (Sharline, Prison Staff)

Another staff reiterated that:

*Only on special occasions, we admit children even of three years but we advise the mothers that such children are not allowed in prison…. For example one prisoner was brought in here and was the sole provider for her children so she explained her situation, she was from Jinja and then the prison followed up her issue and decided that her children be brought to prison and they were taken to a school in Binya Even on admission, it is not allowed to bring in children who are above two years.* (Diana, Prison staff)

From the above, one can notice a negotiation that occurs between a sense of agency from the side of the prison staff in relation to the structural provisions of the law. This negotiation applies not only when separation is due as it emerged that, there are special instances where children way above the mandated age can also join their mothers under special consideration. This deviation would then contest the view that organisations have rule which guide the behaviour of members and groups in an organisation. According to Hayes and Allinson (1998), this would necessitate changes in the existing laws since members are not acting explicitly according to them.

5.3. **How staff and Mothers participate in the Separation process and decision**

Among the three questions that the current study sought to answer was the interest in how participants play a part in the separation of the child from the mother. Thus, in this part of the chapter, the study presents findings that depicted active involvement of the mothers and staff in the separation from the point of view those interviewed. As a way of bringing out the context, results in this section are presented using direct extracts from the interview interaction to provide illustrations on instances where data indicated an influence from the mothers as well as the staff on the separation.

The illustrations highlight several instances, and at various levels where participation takes place to inform the direction of the separation process and the subsequent decision. From a theoretical point of view, the findings that depict participation in the context of group identity cannot be interpreted without the consideration of the law that guide interaction between two

---

5 Reference to the 2006 Prisons Act which provides for 18 months
groups. Baring that in mind, the participation is observed to manifest at instance including: Initiation of the separation process; identification and confirming of a relative to whom the child is to be given, instance where there are two parties all interested in the caring role of the child; when there are no relatives or those available refuse to take care of the child; during assessment of the alternative care arrangement. These manifested in the interactions between the researcher and the participants as illustrated below.

5.3.1. Initiating the separation

Researcher
Have you ever thought about your child being separated from you?

Participant
Yes, I have [ever thought] because now I know when they make two years, they are not allowed to stay here with us... and all the children who have made three years are taken away

Researcher
Is there someone you talked to regarding your thoughts about the separation?

Participant
Yes, I talked to my friends

When the time reaches and the child is to go out, you talk to the prison officer especially if you have someone to take care of the baby. But there are procedures to be followed [...] The officer takes her time to ask prisoners if they have someone with whom they can give the child to, and if there is none – then the ‘Bazungu’ [the White people] take them (the children).

Researcher
Who decides to separate the child?

Participant
It is the mother to decide who is to take the child. Whether you want the aunt or mum or other relatives to have the child. But if you want neither of them, the Officer in Charge (OC) does not give away that child. (Kyazike, Imprisoned mother)

The officers come to the ward and find out amongst us the children who are about one and a half years and/or two years. You are just told that your child has grown and in case you have relatives, they should come and take the child and/or the child is taken to day care...You first see the ‘katikiro’ (ward leader) whom you explain to for example that you want the child to be taken away because you can no longer handle since you lack proper food specific for the baby... It is the ‘katikiro’ to go and talk to the prison authority who may come later and inform you that they have agreed to take the child. (Lunyolo, Imprisoned Mother)

5.3.2. Proposing, Identifying and confirming a relative

Interview data revealed participation in proposing for example the relatives with whom the imprisoned mothers would like their children to be separated to. In doing so it was noted that when it is approached the expected time for separation to occur, mothers if they have a relative in mind propose the name of such relative. This sometimes happens if the prison staff who are also mindful of the age limit with which an infant is supposed to stay with its mother as provided under the law, recognises that such a particular is approaching reminds the respective mother to propose a relative with whom the responsibility to care for the child can be passed
onto. This can be illustrated in the following exchange during the interview conversation with one of the imprisoned mothers at Prison A;

Researcher:  
Have you ever thought about separation from the child you are living with?

Participant:  
Yes, I have (ever thought about separation) because now I know that when they make two years, they are not allowed to stay here with us... And all the children who have made three years are taken away...

...The officers come to the ward and finds out amongst us, the children who are about one and a half years and/or two years. You are just told that your child has grown and in case you have relatives, they should come and take the child and/or the child is taken to day care (Babirye, Imprisoned Mother)

5.3.3. When there are no relatives to take up the child

From the interactions, it is noted that upon indication of no relative to take care the child by a mother, the prison authorities/staff start looking for a potential caregiver who could be an individual or organisations. At finding anyone willing, consent is sought from the mother in the event that the child is to be given out to be cared for by someone else.

If the family [relatives of the child] says that they do not want the child, we start looking for an NGO or individual to foster the child but we also give an order [to the one with whom we have fostered the child] according to what the orders of the Commissioner General of Prisons to always bring the Child to visit the mother at least once in a week. Here is Prison, we have three visitation days... we work close with the mother who has to consent with us... since she is the one who has to choose where the child should be given (Sharline, Prison Staff)

However, whereas consent is there, findings also indicated that particularly the mother has very little to contribute. In interactions with the selected staff in this study, it was noted that as prisoners, mothers may only contribute in terms of proposing the relative to take care of the child. It is the staff to make the contacts in which the relative who is proposed is requested to come to the prison. To the mothers, apart from proposing caretakers and perhaps identifying potential relative when he or she honour the prison request, they merely have to abide by the law. Bt to also conclude from this perspective is to ignore instances where the choice of the mother seen as key in the separation as it be observed in the sub section that follows.

5.3.4. When faced with two interested parties for the same child

The study shows that in such situations, the mother’s voice is key in deciding about which party takes the child. There were instances that indicated that the mother’s concerns about culture, language and family took precedence. This can happen in instance where two well-intentioned potential caregivers (these could be individuals or organisations) may express interest to accept responsibility to care for the child to be separated. One of the two participants whose children had just been separated a few weeks prior to the interviews, illustrated this point.

One time a visitor – a ‘muzungu’ man (white man) … he works with an organisation which supports the prison came and talked to the OC (Officer in Charge). The man talked to the OC and then to us. For my friend [reference to Namukose –a co-participant in a joint interview],
she decided that her child be taken to her relatives but for me who had my relatives very far, the ‘Muzungu’ man said that if I allowed, he could stay with the child and would take him to hospital, school and feed him and when I come out of prison, I can go and see my child and take him back to myself (Mukebezi, Imprisoned Mother).

Interviewer

For you (Namukose), why did you decide not to give your child to the ‘Muzungu’ man?

Participants

I wanted my child to know his siblings and grow with them so he can be known among the relatives, learn the culture and language. Because for me, if they bring here other children, I cry a lot [because they do not speak their mother’s language] (Namukose, Imprisoned Mother).

Another participant also reiterated that;

It is the mother to decide who is to take the child. Whether you want the aunt or mum or other relatives to have the child. But if you want neither of them, the Officer in Charge (OC) does not give away that child to those people (Kabuo, Imprisoned Mother)

5.3.5. Assessing the conditions of the alternative care arrangement

Assessment which mainly involve the Prison staff and in this case the welfare officer attached to the respective prison. It was noted in this study that the child can only be separated if the welfare officer indicates that the conditions are good for the child to be released. None the less the information relating to conditions of the care arrangement and environment has to be relayed back to the imprisoned mother in a way of seeking approval. Although, this only seemed to be done when the care arrangement involved non-relatives.

Interviewer

What happened when the ‘Muzungu’ [white] man accepted to take care of your child?

Mukebezi

For the welfare person went and inspected the home of the ‘muzungu’ and took some pictures, which she came back with and showed me. She also told me that everything is fine. With [At seeing] this I accepted and allowed the child to be taken because my relatives were very far (Mukebezi, Imprisoned Mother).

At times however, assessment of the alternative care arrangement seemed to be conducted in retrospective. This is as illustrated in the excerpt below;

I knew that they would decide on my case very fast. But when I realised that it was going to take long, I decided. When the child had reached the age of leaving this place (Prison), I told the welfare person who called my relatives and they came and took the child. But the welfare officer went with them in order to see where the child is going to stay (Namukose, Imprisoned Mother)

From the mental model point of view, it is important to notice that participation as can be noticed in the above illustration is also negotiated within interests, anticipations and evaluation
of situation at present but also situated within the law. These are characteristic of mental models, (Jones, et al., 2011; Shahzan, 2012) and in how group and role identities play out (Stet and Burke, 2000; Jenkins 2008; Ramiah et al., 2013)
Chapter 6
Discussion and Conclusion

6.0. Introduction
This chapter wants to infer meaning in relation to the study findings presented in chapter five. The inference is presented in form of a discussion. Furthermore, the chapter makes conclusions and points out policy implication in relation to the separation process and decision. The chapter ends with showing the limitation associated with the current study and proposes areas that can be explored in the form of further research.

6.1. Discussion
From the ‘motherly care responsibility’ perspectives, the concerns about the incapacity to provide, independence and control in making provisions to their children inside prison as a mother. Some of the mothers interviewed indicated difficulties in making decisions on what to feed the children as they have to depend on the prison authority and some were concerned about the inability to give guidance to their children when separation occurs. This could be stemming from an internalised role of a mother in transforming a child into a well-rounded person who matters to the nation. The concerns about discipline, balancing a diet in nutrition terms and education on top of giving birth are all tools in the transformation endeavours of mothers. As it can be observed, the role of transforming has to be negotiated within the environment as the situation in prison seems to curtail them from doing so effectively. This concern may relate well with what has been found in earlier literature which indicates that “the ability to mother one’s children according to social expectations and personal desires depends ultimately on one’s access to the resources of time, money, health, and social support (Ferraro and Moe, 2003, p.14). It is nearly impossible to be a good mother when [one] is stuck behind bars” (Baird-Remba, 2013).

Unlike Martin Manby’s reflections that “when visiting their parent, many children eventually adapted to unfamiliar prison routines and security checks” (Jones et al., 2013, p. 608), findings from the prison staff interviewed indicated that for some children who had earlier on lived in prison but had since been separated showed a level of resistance on visiting their imprisoned mothers. The resistance was expressed in cries at any action interpreted with a likelihood leaving them in prison by those who had come with them. Anaraki and Boostani (2013), had earlier on indicated that the mother-child visit presented a number of difficulties. Poelmann et al., (2010) shows that children were negative or at least not positive about their visitation experiences. Maybe, children cry because of other difficulties. Probably because they find that the environment which they have visited do not favour the kind of interaction they have been experiencing on the outside. This could result in feeling unsafe, or because they will not have any possibility to play with their mothers which may make all these prison visits a just boring experience, or their mothers’ interest to explain does not correspond with their need for comfort, safety and play. These are not conclusions, but may be other non-mentioned/non-perceived reasons which are worthwhile researching on in order to improve the relation between mothers and children while still in prison and after separation and during visitations. This has happened elsewhere for instance in Scotland, some children had reported being upset, and visits to their dads to some of them turned out boring, tiresome and many cried because of the difficulties to comprehend difference in context between interactions inside and outside of
prison (Loureiro, 2010, p.24). The prison visits had been found horrendous and distressing for the children and consequently it was not usual that there were games and other play-stuff in prison visitor rooms (Loureiro, 2010, p.24).

At the same time visitation are revealed to offer an opportunity for the child to get answers to the mothers’ imagined questions about why they had stayed with them in prison. This seemed to relieve the mothers about explanations at post-prison time. Similar sentiments have been shown by Khamoosh (2014) while reporting for the British Broadcasting Service’ [BBC], “Afghan notebook: Life inside Badam-Bagh women's prison” in which one mother living with her five children inside prison had lamented that, "She was scared that her kids will one day ask her why they were deprived of their freedom. That they will be young boys and girls when she reaches the release date and knowsthey will ask her what their crimes were.”

The process and decision to separate the children raises complex view about coping with prison time. Children also emerge as carers of their own mothers especially in the stressful times and also instilling discipline in terms of refining behaviour when offended. In relation to stressful times, children become a key distraction particularly when are confronted with and overwhelmed by negative thoughts. But the children are also a motivation with regard to behaviour which helps mothers to avoid additional punishment, for instance, solitary confinement. From this perspective separation in a way represents a moment that takes away such opportunity.

Seen from a different angle, these findings seem to resound well with the findings by Ferraro and Moe, in which they observed that “a significant proportion of mothers negotiates their child rearing through obstacles that undermine their efforts to be good mothers, both on their own terms and in the eyes of the state, given that mothering is a central concern for imprisoned women” (2003 13-14). The consideration of the child in responding to offense may show mothers as caring and self-sacrificing as Ferraro and Moe (2003). Though not necessarily so children’s stay providing a fall-back position for a positive distraction from negative thoughts among some of the mothers interviewed in this study could be viewed a representation of some kind of ‘a self-interest’ from the mothers’ side as children in this case appear to be a valuable asset to some of the mothers when it comes to coping with the prison time.

Emanating from both the staff and the mothers, was the perspective of protecting children especially from the prison excesses. Findings also revealed that both the imprisoned mothers and the imprisoned staff looked at separating the children in terms of protecting children from potential abuse likely to happen if children continue staying in prison than be separated. Concerns about psychological torture that maybe as a result of interaction among prisoners who keep yelling and/or calling each other by crimes for which they have been imprisoned. The controlling nature of prison that creates fear and fright in the children but also disrupts their normal behaviour as children. Both mothers and the staff interviewed had for example commented about the prison routines which they noted forces children to wake up very early in the morning just like their mothers. Margolis (2002) in a Special Report on the Rights of Children Growing up in Prison, published by the Cambodian League for the Promotion and Defence of Human rights observed that, “with regards to the protection of children living in prisons, the primary concern is that of preserving their right to enjoy a life free of abuse, neglect or maltreatment” (2002, p. 35). However, this very assertion is threatened given the fear and fright with which the children are exposed to as the current study indicates. These may depict negatively about motherhood, and in this sense, separation may present a potential to salvage a positive picture (See Enos in Naylor, 2003). This is understandable considering the prestige
and social standing (Hannessy and West, 1999) associated with motherhood or in this case being a good mother. Like Ramiah, Hewstone & Schmid (2011, p. 50) have observed in the social identity theory, “individuals seem primarily motivated to protect their self-esteem, develop a certainty about their place in society, and achieve a positive and distinct social identity”. Evident in this is Festinger’s observation that group members are not just passive recipient of groups and based on their aspirations, will keep on appraising their abilities and definitely hold opinions that reflect how well they will perform their self or the societal ascribed roles of the group to which they belong (1954).

Decision to separate children to relatives or non-relatives. The findings revealed varying views about this. Some mothers were very concerned about giving their children to non-relatives for fear that the children would lose touch with the language, culture and siblings. Elsewhere, this may explain why most imprisoned mothers would prefer informal caring arrangements for their children while they continued serving their time in prison as observed in Anaraki and Boostani (2014). However, it must be remembered in this study that some of the mothers interviewed were only concerned about how their child was going to live on the outside no matter whether this happened with a relative or non-relative. To them, the most important thing is for the child to be able to get what they would otherwise not be able to provide while in prison: good health care and an education for example.

Analysis of interviews however, indicated little evidence around assessment of a relative caregivers than non-relatives who involve in lengthy process including going through the courts of law and the inspection of the home environment by the prison welfare officer. This can be problematic in terms of the care and wellbeing of the child once separation takes place. Whereas it gives chance for mother’s view to be taken into account and all the other advantages including connecting with siblings and culture, it is something that ought to be approached with caution not to end up jeopardising the same wellbeing of the child that separation may seek to enhance.

It was also interesting that whereas analysis of individual data sets had several concerns about inadequate facilities to support children’s stay in prison, neither the mothers nor the staff interviewed raised issues relating to improving the situation inside prison. This could be attributed to the purpose for which the prison exists which if explored further theoretically could relate to what Morgan referred to as a ‘psychic prison’ (1986, cited in Shahzad, 2012). This is primarily so, as one may keenly observe that the vision, mission, objectives and functions of Uganda Prison Services as postulated in the Uganda Prison Act, 2006, can hardly relate to children’s stay with their mothers in prison. This is not to deny the fact that under the same law both infants’ admission to and separation from staying in prison is provided in Section 59. However, it is also true that it least appears as a priority and the abstract manner in which it is presented is tempting for one to think of it as more less ‘a by-the-way’. This may reflect on the assertion that “Vision gradually over a period of time limits organization’s ability to capture multiple realities, [yet] it is pertinent to understand the process through which it over a period of time happens” (Shahzad 2012, p.209).

The reality now is that children are living in prison and perhaps before thinking of not admitting or separating them, there should be more safeguards against the excesses mentioned for the meantime they spend behind bars. But this could also be interpreted as a platform where the imprisoned mothers as well as the prison staff find the motivation to protect their self-esteem (Ramiah et al., 2011), which seems to confirm what Festinger (1954, p. 117) notes that, “whereas opinion and abilities of intergroup may seem different, their close functional tie
precipitates joint action that directs behaviour”. And would this not be a good platform to escape any criticism that may be directed towards the care of children living inside prison with their imprisoned mothers?

Like to emphasise the communication process through which the psychic prison may happen, findings also pointed out that right at reception or admission into prison, mothers are informed about the period with which separation will occur. Further efforts are also made to remind the members both staff and the mothers about a possible separation. This may be interpreted as communicating an organization’s vision (Shahzan, 2012). For example, taking into consideration, Sections (4) and (5) of the Prisons Act, 2006 provides for the objectives and functions of Uganda Prison Services, one notices a glaring silence on the reality facing the prisons that little children are living inside.

Whereas prisons may not be good a place for children to grow as many commentators have labelled it, the fact that children are still living there must be acknowledged and as such should prompt steps to improve the conditions for their stay, conditions for separation and conditions for continuing contact after separation from a child perspective. Otherwise this could lead to a situation where there is no keen regard to there potential of causing interactions that produce and reproduce the affirmation (Hayes and Allinson, 1998) that prison is not a good place for children which may derail any effort put forth to help those inside with their mothers. Therefore, such a finding should be taken with caution.

The assertion about a correction facility as supposed to be “for rehabilitation and protecting society by preventing further relapse into crime” (Klare, 1962) is also evident. Particularly so as the staff’s consider admission and stay of children in prison as an extra workload that should not be there in the first place and separation as relieving them from the burden of caring for young children and rather an opportunity for passing on the responsibility to someone else. The argument could be that this speaks to the ultimate purpose (Klare, 1962) of prison known to the staff as not a place for children but for those who in one way or the other, (may) have offended the law. For example, in the findings, staff interviewed, perceived separating the child as a way of protecting innocence in the child. This can be interpreted in line with Klare’s contention about a prison as being a “powerful psychological symbol […] a place where people who do bad things are kept apart and held in check”, (1962, p.14).

In the same way, this can be observed among the imprisoned mothers especially in interactions where they may be offended by others but rather decide to ignore than retaliate. The reasons provided leads back to their conception of good mothers and how they may identify with it. This reflects “the negotiation of meanings for situations and identities, and how they fit together to provide a situated context for interaction” (Stets and Burke, 2000, p.227), within the prison setting. This process may be aided further as the mothers use their experiences of the present and past on one hand and the prison staff reflecting on their training on the other, both
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6Section (4) of the Objective of the Prisons Service (1) The main objective of the Service is to contribute to the protection of all members of society by providing reasonable, safe, secure and humane custody and rehabilitation of offenders in accordance with universally accepted standards. (2) To achieve its objective, the Service shall— (a) professionalise and develop the staff; (b) ensure a meaningful and adequate remuneration to its staff; (c) ensure proper living conditions for staff and the prisoners.

7Section (5). Functions of the Service. The functions of the Service shall be— (a) to ensure that every person detained legally in a prison is kept in humane, safe custody, produced in court when required until lawfully discharged or removed from prison; (b) to facilitate the social rehabilitation and reintegration of prisoners through specific training and educational programmes; (c) to facilitate the re-integration of prisoners into their communities; (d) to ensure performance by prisoners of work reasonably necessary for the effective management of prisons; (e) to perform such other functions as the Minister, after consultation with the Prisons Authority, may from time to time assign to the Service.
harbouring their own anticipation create the different kind of models (perspectives) in which to relate to. From this angle, views relating to the process and decision to separate children from their mothers may resonate with the argument that “in role-based identities, some form of interaction and negotiation is usually involved as one performs a role (McCall and Simmons 1978, cited in Stets and Burke, 2000, p.227).

However, the concerns about workloads may be having issues not adduced in this study about the staffing capacity in terms of numbers of personnel and skills, and also the way prisons have been designed specifically to handle the new reality of having children staying with their mothers in side prison. It may also reflect back on the extent to which the courts of law do not consider the issue of children when passing judgement about these mothers (Simmons, 2000). Therefore, it cannot just be taken on its face value.

6.2. Conclusion
The perspective from the mothers and staff interviewed reflect existence of cooperating views relating to the separation process and decision. This maybe resulting from the experiences as they both interact with different influences from inside and outside of the prison. Cooperating views are particularly reflected in relation to the interest of the child seem to arise from the perspectives of protection from prison excesses and also the wellbeing of the child. Nonetheless, findings also depicted self-interest in as far as how the imprisoned mothers and prison staff related with the process and decision children from their mothers. For example, mothers seemed to be concerned about performing motherly care responsibilities as Ferraro and Moe (2003) had reported, on one hand but also how in terms of the opportunities to cope with prison time on the other. Similarly, Prison staff also viewed the separation process and decision from the lenses of workloads and following what is required under the law. Both staff and mothers in this case are more concerned about how more effective they can perform their respective roles. But it can also be seen that both held perceived identity roles that carried with the expectation and meaning which have played a lot to influence their views about the topic of study. This may relate to the comment that “a mental model has the capacity to influence, or affect, how an individual makes judgements […]” (Rook 2013, p. 41). On the whole, this represents a configuration of perspectives all of which influence the ways in which the mothers and the staff interviewed related to separating children from their mothers. The implication could be wide, it may for example necessitates training both staff and mothers in paediatrics care (Robertson, 2012) but may also include employing additional personnel specifically to support the mothers.

As far as participation in the separation process and decision is concerned, it is evident that both the imprisoned mothers and the prison staff are involved. The limitation in making this more effective could however, be in recognised instances where the mother proposes the relative and only has to identify and confirm if the person turning up to take the child is the one suggested. There was not concrete evidence from data to corroborate on whether after identifying and before confirming the proposed relative, the mother gets an opportunity to be briefed about the living conditions in which the infant or child is going to leave, especially when it involves a relative. This is so crucial given the centrality, the wellbeing of the child is to the participants’ view about the process and decision to separate the child. ‘Shouldn’t such information particularly about the capacity of a relative to effectively care for the child be availed to inform the final decision?’ Otherwise, the decision may be made out of convenience to conform to the set age limit under the law. This could be a reflected on as the extraordinary power of institutional environments which Haney and Zimbardo (1998) invited the 21st Century to pay attention to.
From a theoretical point of view, mental models may well provide a lens for understanding the findings of the study. For instance, the mothers' concerns about the motherly responsibility being challenged given the limitations of the prisons, the concern about the protective issues for the child by both the imprisoned mothers and the prison staff, and the concern for the law from the prison staff's perspective. Also using social identity theory or identity theory provide an important lens to understand the mental constructions among the mothers and staff participating in the current study in relation to separating the children from their mothers. Both lenses are cognisant of the value pressures at present, the anticipations, and the roles being negotiated within the scope of the prison guide the several perspectives that mothers and staff hold in the current study. To the mothers, experiences before prison time also matter a lot in view of the mother group and motherhood.

Evidently, the participants on both sides can be said to have based their views on their identification with their corresponding roles and group categories either consciously or unconsciously. The different groups that could have been related to may have included prisoners, mothers, imprisoned mothers, mothers together with children in prison, on one side and a group of prison staff on the other. These groups and the associated roles definitely carry with them expectation, pressures, experiences and interactions in a contextualised environment of the prison which may have driven the participant to relate with the current study and finding herein.

However, it must be noted that, there are some aspects in the study that the theoretical frames of reference could hardly explain. For example, in instances where the child has not been separated even when they had made the mandated age of eighteen months under the law, seems to be considered as ‘a given’ among some mothers. Whereas it is a mental construction, it could also be a reflection of a lack of knowledge (ignorance) than necessarily being the influence of the prison environment. Under the Uganda Prisons Act 2006, the Commissioner General of Prison can only consider separation if there is satisfaction about an alternative care arrangement found for the child. The action to allow children stay longer in prison with their imprisoned mother beyond the legally mandated period could also be seen as revealing of prison staff and authority in general as agents of change. Although, this gets complicated especially in some instances, in which some of the staff interviewed seemed to question why the justice system would send a mother with an infant or expectant to prison. This line of questioning may relate, to what the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, had noted during the launch of the first ever “General Comment dealing with children incarcerated with their parents” in (2014), in which it asserted that children should not be incarcerated with their parents.

Nonetheless, the different perspectives herein, if reflected upon, may contribute information of contextual importance and relevancy, which may prompt what Senge points to as an open discussion to clarify comprehension (Senge, 1991) and possibly influence changes in policy towards the separation of children living in prison with their mothers. Or even, improvements that may allow the children to stay in prison with much ease, on part of the mother and the staff. This could further guide in streamlining the separation process and decision for instance in relation to assessing for alternative care arrangements before the decision to separate is actually taken but also before sending the mother with her child or expectant in some cases, to prison. Much as the Uganda Prisons Act 2006, just like in the UN Bangkok Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners, provides for separation of children from their mothers, there is a lot in abstract manner as has been already mentioned. For example, Section 59 of the
Uganda Prison Act, 2006, falls short at defining parameters on how the Commissioner General of Uganda Prisons Services achieves satisfaction about an alternative care arrangement in the event of separating a child from the mother.

The study raises concerns that could be of interest to Uganda’s Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MoGLSD) which is concerned with child protection issues particularly for policy making with regard to alternative care for the children as well as Early Childhood Development (ECD). This is so because the perspectives as highlighted have impact on ECD in terms of nutrition and stimulation given the formative age allowed but also the fact that the children at separation have to be placed somewhere, which may be a new environment for the child. The importance of ECD and paying attention to alternative care have been a key interest for the ministry’s policy priorities as far as issues of children are concern.

The study finding could also be of advantage to the ministry of Internal Affairs under whose docket the Uganda Prisons Services falls, to use the various perspectives in this study as lenses to identify gaps including in the law in relation to admission of children to stay with their mothers and the subsequent separation out of prisons. This can hopefully, go a long way to streamline the separation process with clear guidelines for example about assessing the conditions of the potential alternative care environment for the child before separation occurs. But also issues that can be considered in the decision to admit a mother and the child to prison, after considering alternatives present and/or improving on the inside prison environment as an option.

In addition, the study can guide on how to plan the post-separation period for the child. To echo what Armstrong et al. (1997), has contended in Fielding, that there are no credible ‘general claims to authoritative knowledge’, (1999, p.526) and whereas the purpose of this study was not premised on making recommendations on how separation should be streamlined. And whereas both staff and mothers interviewed, did not necessarily make a case for improvement particular to the prison environment or to improve the separation process and decision. The findings carry informative views to reflect on in practice, particularly given the abstract nature in which separation of children from their mothers has been presented in legal documents – reference can be made to the Uganda Prisons Act 2006 Section 59, and also noticeable in the United Nations Standard Rules (the Bangkok Rules) for the Treatment of Women Prisoners Rule 49 - 52. The perspective underscored reflect several bases of vulnerability for the child that have implication for social work practice with children in the face of separation. This may also require a heightened level of sensitivity that allows coordinated response to the multiple vulnerabilities that are present in the situation of separating children from their mothers.

6.3. Limitations and recommendations for further studies
To begin with, it must be appreciated that it took a lot of effort, patience, cooperation and sacrifices to complete the process that delivered the results presented I this study. This notwithstanding, it has to be acknowledged that the study had its own limitations for instance; The study does not bring to the fore how the particular differences for example in terms of the expected stay in prison and also the imprisonment situation for instance those mothers on remand, committal or convicted, relate with the separation process and decision. A vast categorisation of participants particularly the imprisoned mothers would have contributed more flesh and context to the study findings than a general presentation. A comparison of the different views about the separation process and decision relating to the children in prison alongside their imprisoned mothers along the different categories is suggested. As it can be observed in the study, the findings seem to be presented not in disaggregated character yet the
view held even in their slight difference still come from unique individuals. The commonality for mothers interviewed may only be traced in the fact that they are imprisoned and have to live with their children inside the prison, and for the case of the staff, because they are both officers of the prison.

Whereas it is noted that in qualitative studies, issues of numbers may not be of priority in relation to the results presented; it is underscored in this study that more numbers particularly for the prison staff interviewed could have provided much more diverse or may convergent opinions to boost the knowledge base to which the study stands to contribute to. It was also not possible to talk to the social workers attached to the women’s children but also maybe because each of the prisons had only one personnel and getting to have them to participate could have been inconvenience given the tight schedule before them. Nonetheless, who knows, their views could have revealed a different angle to relate with the process and decision to separate children living in prison alongside their imprisoned mothers. In further studies, a comparison of views between prisons staff for example the social workers and the prison wardens could help illuminate this undoubtedly. Further comparison could also between the mothers living in prison with their children and those without to explore and understand the difference in their views but also the points of convergence as far as separating children living alongside their imprisoned parents is concerned.

The current study also adds to a list of those studies in which everybody seems enthusiastic talking ABOUT children in prison but not WITH children in prison. Probably this could be resulting from the assumptions and perceptions about their ability to participate in decision-making in general (Leeson, 2007). Further research could consider exploring the later.

The study would have contributed further knowledge if there was a deeper consideration of the gender of the child living alongside their imprisoned mothers to compare how the mothers related with the separation taking account of the sex bias of the child. Also whereas in Uganda, there is no ground to have the imprisoned fathers live along with their children inside prisons, there is a thinking that in places where this is allowed, it would be interesting to conduct studies that can compare the different perspectives in which took to relate to the process and decision to separate the children living alongside their imprisoned parents aggregated by gender. The Uganda Prisons Act, 2006, which is a policy guiding document for the Uganda Prisons Services on accommodates female prisoners to live with not any child but rather infants.

Noting from the restrictions, in which the current study had to carried out including, not being able to record audios from the interview conversation. Studies where such limitation do not exist, could explore using narrative analysis as it could bring the salient issues of the emotions of the emotions that has not been possible in this study. Certainly, narrative analysis may provide an opportunity to capture those unsaid voices and emotions and possibly yield new dimensions about the phenomenon of view the process and decision to separate the children from their mothers.
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Appendix 1: Interview guide for the imprisoned mothers

What is the meaning of motherhood generally?
What does it mean to be a mother while in prison?
What factors in the prison environment influence the;
1. Meaning of motherhood in prison?
2. Perception of motherhood in prison?
3. Practice of motherhood in prison?

Being in prison are their opportunities created for motherhood?
What changes are there if one ceases to be mothers/ if the children have been removed from prison?
How would an imprisoned mothers be treated in case the children are not there?
With having the children how do they treat them in prison?
• Have children come as an advantage, a cost or a consequence?
How does being a mother change their status in prison compared to the other inmates?
If the child goes away what does it mean;
• Physiologically to the mother
• Emotionally to the mother
Which opportunities are going to be cut to the mother by the child being taken away?
How mothers get involved in the separation process?
Appendix 2: The Guiding themes for prison staff

The criteria and process of admission of the mother with her children into prison

What procedures are followed in the process of effecting a separation?

- What is the mood like
- Who is involved (and how their role in the separation process affect the final decision/What does it imply in face of the decision to be made)?
- Who takes the final decision?
- How do mothers feel
- How do mothers contribute to the process and eventual decision

Is there a specified period with which the child can be allowed to stay with the mother?

- What happens after that period elapses?
- How and with how much freedom can prison staff use the resources at their disposal including knowledge and time in the process of separation?

What difficulties are involved? Staff’s views about the separation process.

What happens to your role after the decision has been taken and the child is no longer with the mother inside prison?

The available guiding documents?
Appendix 3: Informed Consent Form

Please consider this information carefully before deciding whether to participate in this research.

Name of researcher: Kato Francis

Study topic: “Separation of Children Living Alongside their imprisoned Mothers inside Prison: Views about Separating the children from their Mothers”, to be conducted within Uganda Prisons (A and B Women Prisons).

This research project is conducted as a partial fulfilment for the award of a Master’s of Science Degree in International Social Work and Human Rights at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

Purpose of the research: To gain a deeper understanding of the separation process and decision from the perspectives of the imprisoned mothers and the prison staff.

What the participant will do in this research: You will be engaged in a conversation while responding to questions that I (the researcher) will ask based on how well you understand the issues brought forward. However, you should not feel pressured to respond to all the questions and/or any of the questions that you do not feel like or you have no information about. You are free to ask for clarification on any question not clear to you. To ensure that everything is captured in the way you understand it, I may also ask you to clarify on some of the responses as well, but it is not a must that you should.

Time required: Participation will take approximately 60 minutes to complete.

Risks: There are no anticipated risks associated with your voluntary participating in this study. Although some question may create anxiety, but I hope this can be manageable. The effects of participating should be comparable to those benefits you would experience other than sitting in an interview for 60 minutes.

Benefits: There are no financial benefits to compensate for participation in this study. At the end of the study, I will provide a thorough explanation of the study findings and of my aim and research questions. I will also describe the potential implications of the results of the study both to social work and human rights practice. If you wish, you can send a message to [Kato Francis at the following email: frankic3@gmail.com or by mobile to: +256703864058], and I can send you a copy of any manuscripts based on the research (or summaries of my results) if you need it.

Confidentiality: Your participation in this study will remain confidential, and your identity will not be stored with your data. Your responses will be assigned a code number. The raw data will be destroyed after a period of time as granted the University of Gothenburg guidelines once all the data have been collected and analysed and submitted the final copy of the thesis report. The data collected will only be used in this study unless someone else uses it in citation but acknowledging the present study.

Participation and withdrawal: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time without penalty or seeking any permission, including refusal to participate at all. You may withdraw by informing me that you no longer wish to participate (no questions will be asked). You have the right to decline to answer any questions, or terminate the interview without giving an explanation.

Whom to contact about your rights in this research: For questions, concerns, suggestions, or complaints that have not been or cannot be addressed by me, or to report research-related harm, please contact the my supervisor: Manuela Sjostrom (PhD) by e-mail: Manuela.Sjostrom@socwork.gu.se or the Coordinator of the MSWHR: Ing-Marie Johansson@socwork.gu.se, Tel+ 46 31 786 1889, Fax+46 31 786 1888 or Head of Department of Social work and Social Administration of Makerere University: Dr. Eddy Walakira – email: ewalakira@gmail.com mobile: +256 70 149 0330, or the Assistant to the Director of Correction Services – Uganda Prisons: Madam Aliyo Natukunda by mobile: +256 77 241 7252

Agreement: The nature and purpose of this research have been sufficiently explained and I agree to participate in this study. I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time without incurring any penalty or seeking any permission.

☐ Tick box if agreement is verbal and any circumstance the participant cannot write to confirm agreement or understanding

Signature: ___________________________ Name (print): ___________________________ Date _______________
Appendix 4: Application for grant of permission to conduct Master thesis research

The Commissioner General
Uganda Prisons

Dear Sir,

Re: Request for permission to conduct Master’s Thesis research in Uganda Women’s Prison

I am writing in reference to the above stated subject. My name is Francis Kato, a student at the University of Gothenburg, pursuing a Masters in International Social Work and Human rights in the Department of Social Work, now in my Second year.

As a requirement for the award of a master’s degree for the above mentioned program, I am writing a thesis, entitled “children living alongside their imprisoned mothers: views about separating children away from their mothers”.

During this process I look forward to interact with imprisoned mothers looking after their children inside prison but also some professional stuff working with the imprisoned mothers through interview.

Your positive response towards this request will go a long way in helping me achieve not only the award of the master’s degree but hope that the findings will also help build a better professional understanding of the studied topic.

Many thanks for your cooperation. I can be contacted by email: kattofr6@gmail.com, mobile +256-703-864058.

Sincerely,

Francis Kato

For further information, you can contact my supervisor:

Enclosed
Manuela Sjöström PhD – student supervisor
Department for social work
University of Gothenburg
PO Box 720
SE 405 30 Göteborg
+46 31 786 4631 (work)
+703 741 803 (mobile)
Manuela.Sjostrom@socwork.gu.se (email).
Appendix 5: Decision denying the research to conduct research among women prisoner living with their children in prisons in Uganda

11th September, 2014

Kato Francis,
Social Work Department
Gothenburg University
P.O Box 720, SE-405 30
Gothenburg, Sweden

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT MASTER’S THESIS RESEARCH IN UGANDA WOMEN’S PRISONS

Your undated letter in respect of the above subject matter was received. However, due to security concerns, permission cannot be granted. Any inconveniences caused are regretted.

Naatakunda Aliyu
For: COMMISSIONER GENERAL OF PRISONS
Appendix 6: Letter of Appeal to conduct research in Uganda Prison Services

Kate Francis
Gothenburg University, Sweden
C/o Department of Social Work,
Makerere University, Kampala
P.O. Box 7063 Kampala, Uganda
12th September, 2014

The Commissioner General of Prisons
Uganda Prisons Headquarters
Kampala, Uganda
P.O. Box 7182

RE: Appeal for the denial to conduct my Master’s Thesis Research in Uganda Prison. Case #41621-14/210/01

Dear Sir,

I am writing this letter to appeal the decision which was taken on behalf of the Commissioner General of Uganda Prisons. My Case # is 41621-14/210/01 and the date I received the decision notice was 11th September 2014, indicating that I have been denied permission to conduct a research for my master’s thesis about children living alongside their imprisoned mothers in Uganda prisons. The reason cited is that “It is due to security concerns, thus permission cannot be granted”.

A copy of my notice is attached to this letter.

I can honestly affirm to you that my research interests pose no threats to the security concerns of Uganda Prisons. I am interested in gaining information on how mothers living with their children while serving time inside prison and the prison staff working with aforementioned mothers, think about the decision to separate the children from their mothers. The information gained will be used for academic purposes, and to help me as a professional to a better and deeper understanding of the separation experience in view of the focus of the study.

I have here attached supportive documents including a letter from my Supervisor indicating that I am a student at the department of social work of Gothenburg University, and the research is intended to build my deeper understanding of the topic under study. My Supervisor can be contacted if there are any questions. I cannot answer or if there are any follow-ups on this issue. Her contact can be accessed at the letter attached. O can be reached on mobile: 0703364058 or email contact@university.com. Otherwise, I can visit your office physically to check any updates regarding my appeal.

Thank you so much for your time consideration.

Sincerely,

Kate Francis
Apendix 7: Letter of grant of permission to conduct research with female prisoners

10th November, 2014

The Officers in Charge,
U.G. Prison Kigo W
U.G. Prison Luzira W.

PERMISSION TO ENTER YOUR UNITS

Permission is hereby granted to Kato Francis, a student from Gothenburg University, Sweden to visit and conduct his Master's Thesis Research in your units as scheduled below:


Please, ensure strict compliance to our prisons rules and regulations.

Naatukunda Aliyo
FOR: COMMISSIONER GENERAL OF PRISONS

Copied to: The Regional Prisons Commander,
Kampala Extra.

Kato Francis,
Department of Social work - Gothenburg University