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Abstract

A qualitative study of the experiences and observations of 4 art therapists and 2 program directors who facilitated Camp Suzanne, a week-long art-based therapeutic program for incarcerated mothers and their children in a federal prison in California. Research on psychotherapy, art therapy, and family therapy in prison environments, with a focus on parent-child dyads, Attachment Theory, and various techniques for creating sustainable therapy with separated family units, including tele-mental health and evidence-based military protocols, informed the interviews. The research participants were interviewed individually and created art regarding the subjects of Attachment Theory with incarcerated-mother-child dyads and longevity considerations for the program. Emergent themes in the data included the impact of art-making on attachment and a variety of observable attachment styles, as well as obstacles to both attachment and longevity of Camp Suzanne. Some of the obstacles addressed include systemic challenges, continuity of care, location concerns, external support (for facilitators and for incarcerated-mother-child dyads), as well as preparatory support (psychoeducation). Various implications of these obstacles are discussed.
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Introduction

The following is a brief introduction on the topic of family art therapy with mothers in correctional facilities investigated through the lens of Attachment Theory, and, also considers long-term sustainability of such programs.

The Study Topic

Incarcerated mothers face many challenges while in prison but, often, some of their most pressing concerns relate to their families, as Few-Demo & Arditti (2013) illuminate when highlighting some of the complicated familial relationship challenges in prison settings to be: working through feelings of remorse, longing to feel connected, navigating awkward relationships with their children’s caregivers, as well as handling upset children expressing emotional distance. Of these concerns, mothers’ relationships with their children, also known as mother-child dyads, seem to be especially pressing (Allen, Flaherty & Ely, 2010; Arditti & Few, 2008; Baldwin, 2017; Schubert, Duininck & Shlafer, 2016). Attachment theory addresses mother-child dyads and feelings of secure versus insecure attachments which can be directly linked to mother-child communication, physical accessibility, and response sensitivity (Murray & Murray, 2010). While these elements affecting attachment are concerns for all mothers, they are exponentially challenging for a mother behind prison bars. Family art therapy has been shown to help strengthen mother-child attachment bonds because of its ability to build communication, maturation, affect regulation and ego strength, as well as reinforce appropriate parent child roles (Shore, 2000; 2014), however, there are currently no studies available addressing its potential impact on incarcerated mothers and their mother-child dyads (incarcerated-mother-child dyads).

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of a family-centered arts based
therapeutic treatment program developed for incarcerated mothers and their children at the Federal Correctional Institution in Dublin, CA from the perspective of the art therapists and program facilitators. In particular, focus will be on exploring observed attachment between mother and child dyads and ways in which programming could be expanded upon in order to create more long-term sustainability. The program, in which art therapists, incarcerated mothers and their children participate, is titled Camp Suzanne and is based out of the Center For Restorative Justice Works (CRJW) in North Hollywood, CA. The mission of Camp Suzanne is to assist families in strengthening familial bonds through art therapy informed projects, camp activities and extended visitation. The intended role of the art therapists is to collaborate with program facilitators to develop art therapy informed projects that promote opportunities for participating families to form more secure attachment, develop positive communication skills, and offer opportunities for mothers to process experiences with their children.

More specifically, through qualitative case study exploration using semi-structured interviews and art-making directives with the art therapists and program directors of Camp Suzanne, the research questions that are being investigated are: 1) the impact of art making as a means to support secure attachment between the mother-child dyad when the mother is incarcerated and 2) more sustainable and long-term methods of offering programming to this population, including the consideration of digital technology.

**Significance of the Study**

While there is ample research available to support the parent-child attachment benefits of art therapy (Shore, 2000; 2014), as well as a plethora of research regarding family talk therapy in prison settings (Few-Demo & Arditti, 2013; Datchi, Barretti & Thompson, 2016; Imber-Black, 2010; Sexton, 2016) and art therapy in prison settings (Delshadian, 2003; Erickson & Young,
2010; Gussak, 2004; Hewish, 2015; Teasdale, 1997), there is currently no direct research available regarding family-centered art therapy with incarcerated populations. This research study aims to address this dearth, acting as an initial exploration into a more in-depth understanding of how family art therapy can affect mother-child dyads in a prison setting through the lens of attachment theory, while also providing a basis to inspire further research on the subject.

Not only is there “a natural tendency for artistic and creative expression in prison settings” (Gussak, 2004, p. 245), but according to Broek and Bernstein (2011), art also has the advantage of “facilitating processing at a nonverbal, unconscious level” (p. 326) which can help art therapy bypass clients’ defenses and go deeper more quickly. Additionally, Shore (2000; 2014) discussed family art therapy’s ability to build communication, maturation, affect regulation and ego strength, as well as reinforce appropriate parent child roles in non-incarcerated family units, all of which are aspects that can support secure mother-child attachments. It is anticipated that family art therapy with incarcerated populations will have similar results, including but not limited to the strengthening of incarcerated-mother-child dyads’ attachments. It is also anticipated that, through this research, new potential solutions for creating more sustainable, long-term therapeutic interventions, such as implementing new technologies or protocols for arts-based therapeutic programs in prison settings, may be revealed which could lead to even stronger, more secure incarcerated-mother-child attachments and future success. All of these findings could additionally help inform future clinicians, especially art therapists, who may be considering effective interventions when working with incarcerated mothers.
Background of the Study Topic

As of 2007, a reported “1.7 million children had a parent in state or federal prison in the United States, an increase of 80% since 1991” (as cited in Poehlmann, Dallaire, Loper, & Shear, 2010, p. 575). Moreover, Poehlmann et al. (2010) point out that the exact number of children whose parents are incarcerated is unknown due to the lack of efforts to systematically obtain this information from schools, correction facilities, child welfare systems, or other systems of the like. The implications of this information extends widely and includes how the parent-child relationship is affected, efforts made with programming and discovered limitations thus far. Literature currently in existence discusses these impacts on the parent-child relationship. The barriers to a healthy parent-child relationship when the parent is incarcerated are complicated, but also structural. Murray & Murray (2010) note “visits are difficult, communication about parental absence can be suppressed or distorted, and parents are held, against their will, in a situation in which active and responsive parenting is almost impossible to perform” (p. 296).

There is ample research that points to the significance of keeping the family system in mind when focusing on incarcerated individuals, especially with consideration of the importance of interpersonal dynamics (Datchi et al., 2016; Erickson and Young, 2010; Few-Demo & Arditti, 2013). In addition, research through the lens of attachment theory specifically hones in on how separation between parent and child can directly impact attachment security. According to a study conducted by Poehlmann in 2005, “63% of the children had insecure attachment representations of their incarcerated mothers and a similar proportion had insecure attachment representations of their current caregivers” (as cited in Murray & Murray, 2010, p. 292). Attachment theory addresses mother-child dyads and feelings of secure versus insecure attachments which can be directly linked to mother-child communication, physical accessibility,
and response sensitivity (Murray & Murray, 2010). While these elements affecting attachment are concerns for all mothers, they are exponentially challenging for a mother behind prison bars for reasons beyond her control.

With this in mind, it is evident that the issues that directly impact incarcerated parents and their children is specific and requires programming that addresses the needs of that parent-child relationship. Within our research, we focus in on the fragile and intricate needs between mother and child, in particular when the mother is incarcerated. While programming exists that keeps the family in mind, there appears to be a lack in services that provides sustainable opportunities for attention to working on secure attachment between mother and child. As such, programming is considered within our research, including alternative formatting to services provided, such as art therapy and digital technology with telemental health.

**Camp Suzanne.** Camp Suzanne, the primary focus of this research, was a week-long program for incarcerated mothers and their children, organized through the Center for Restorative Justice Work (CRJW). While the CRJW and staff facilitators were based in Southern California (Los Angeles County), Camp Suzanne was held in Northern California at the Federal Correctional Institution in Dublin for 12 children from San Diego, Los Angeles, Fresno, and San Francisco, ranging in age from 9 to 17 years old. There were 5 sets of siblings and 2 single children, which equated to 7 mothers, 19 total individuals being served. After being transported by Camp Suzanne to Dublin, the children and CRJW staff settled into a nearby university campus, where they had been offered free room and board. On the night of the children’s arrival, the 4 facilitating art therapists met with the children to introduce themselves and give them an idea of what to expect for the week. Then, every morning for the next five days, the children were transported by van to arrive at the prison around 10:00 am, where they
would meet their mothers and the facilitators to engage in the day’s art activities. The art directives were carefully planned, taking into consideration the prison environment, the population, legality issues, appropriate and acceptable materials, limiting the number of participants to a ratio the facilitators could responsibly handle, and providing directives which would naturally facilitate potential needs of the mothers and children. Children then shared lunch with their mothers at the prison, then, around 1:30 or 2:00 pm, they would be transported out of the prison facility and return to camp. At camp, they participated in a variety of physically engaging activities such as swimming or playing at the park, with counselor supervision. Concurrently, every afternoon, the 4 art therapy facilitators met while the children were at camp, to process and plan for the next day.
Literature Review

Introduction

The following literature review explores different perspectives of psychotherapy, art therapy, and family therapy in a prison setting, focusing on parent-child dyads, attachment theory, and various techniques for creating sustainable therapy with separated family units, all in an effort to explore the impact of a one week mother and child art therapy-based program in a prison setting. A review of general literature investigates family psychotherapy with incarcerated populations, while art therapy literature delves into art therapy and family art therapy in forensic settings. The parent-child dyad as well as attachment issues and theories are then examined through the lens of art therapy and reviewed in further detail with the goal of gaining a more holistic understanding of art therapy and its particular benefits to incarcerated women, additional art therapy literature is explored. Then, in an effort to address the unique struggles surrounding family and mother-child art therapy in a prison setting, options for sustainability are considered. For example, evidence-based family therapy with separated military families is examined to better understand the navigation of therapy with family units whose members are unable to consistently interact in person. Technology and its implementation in telemental health, forensic settings, and art therapy is additionally addressed.

Attachment Theory and Art Therapy with Incarcerated Populations

Family Therapy in a Prison Setting with Families Impacted by Incarceration. For the purposes of this research, family therapy is loosely defined as therapeutic interventions conducted with two or more members of a family unit. Family therapy can help improve communication, decrease destructive patterns of behavior, address past traumas, and provide support for the interpersonal relationships in the family.
Datchi, Barretti, and Thompson (2016) discuss the significance of providing opportunities for incarcerated individuals to maintain their family relationships. They emphasize how the prisoner’s reentry success is contingent upon the continuance during incarceration of the individual’s family roles and identities prior to being imprisoned. Sexton (2016) also posits that the impacts on relationship caused by incarceration could generate the risk factors that challenge and interfere with recovery.

Sexton (2016) notes that only recently has there begun to be a shift in viewing the incarcerated adult through the lens of family psychology with attention to parental incarceration. Datchi et al. (2016) point to a program run through the Community Education Centers (CEC), “a nationwide provider of reentry and educational services in correctional settings”, which involves the Family Services (FS) department to incorporate family in the intervention and rehabilitation process of prisoners (p. 95). This program facilitates Family Night once a week where the residents of the correctional facilities and their relatives have the opportunity to share dinner together, play with their children, help them with homework, and engage in other activities together (Datchi et al., 2016). The goal of this program is to provide the chance for residents to “practice parenting and other interpersonal skills and to maintain, restore, or foster the family rituals that involvement in criminal justice systems and criminal lifestyles have precluded” (Datchi et al., 2016, p. 96). Datchi et al. (2016) also emphasize the importance of family programming at correctional facilities that include a focus on providing therapy services to “address mental health concerns related to loss, grief, anger, confusion, and trust in the family system” which could include “members of the family of origin and/or the family of choice (e.g., close friends, community mentors, significant others)” (p. 97). It is also of significance to note that in research by Fretz, Heilbrum, & Brown, CEC residents demonstrated notably lower rates
of rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration in comparison with incarcerated individuals who were in the New Jersey Department of Corrections at 6, 9, and 12 months after release (Datchi et al., 2016, p. 96).

**Art Therapy in a Prison Setting.** In the same way that incorporating family therapy interventions for incarcerated individuals has been a more recent trend in the prison system, so, too, has is art therapy’s introduction in the prison system relatively new. While not exactly art therapy, Gussak (2004) explains, creating art and being creatively expressive are “natural instinctual impulses for many prison inmates” (p. 245).

To begin with, without provocation, prison populations often show an innate affinity towards creativity, which can prove useful when engaging inmate-clients in art therapy. Gussak (2004, 2006), a PhD and Board Certified Art Therapist with over 30 years experience of engaging US prison inmates in art therapy, attests to this when explaining the, “natural tendency for artistic and creative expression in prison settings… allows for the sublimation of libidinal and aggressive impulses and provides a means for escape” (2004, p. 245). Erickson and Young (2010) of the Department of Counselor Education at the University of Central Florida also corroborate these findings when illustrating how “incarcerated clients are ideal candidates for art therapy interventions because... even without encouragement, creativity emerges in the form of drawings, tattoos, carvings, and crafts” (p. 38). Art is also valued because it is “one of the few legitimate profit-making enterprises in incarcerated settings… [where items such as] portraits, crafts, and greeting cards” (pp. 38-39) can be sold or used for bartering.

The exact methods and modalities of how art therapy is conducted in forensic settings varies from therapist to therapist and setting to setting, yet there are some underlying commonalities. Van de Broek, Keulen-de Vos and Bernstein (2011), who conducted a
randomized controlled study of art therapies with incarcerated clients in the Netherlands, singled out art therapy as using “art methods such as drawing, painting, working with clay, wood or stone… [with the goal of] creating an art object in which patients’ internal processes are externalized into a concrete form” (p. 325). They also describe one of the aims of art therapy being “to trigger spontaneous thoughts, feelings, and behaviour in interactions with others, via the use of certain media” (p. 330). Erickson and Young (2010) seem to echo this statement when they write about art therapy not being about creating accomplished artworks, but the focus being on “a discussion of the process of creating and on the feelings that arise while working on the exercise” (p. 38). They additionally posit that “creative activities allow inmates to experience autonomy, self-expression, and self-exploration and provide them with opportunities to express emotions in an institutional setting that is rigid and controlling” (p. 39) while protecting them from the threat of being viewed as weak by staff or inmate peers. Teasdale (2008), an art therapist working with personality disordered offenders in the UK’s prison system, defines art therapy beyond the art materials and expresses it as “a process which requires careful ground-rules to be set, mutual commitments to be negotiated, interpersonal roles and outcome objectives to be understood, and challenging and compassionate assessments to be fed back” (p. 32). He explains that forensic art therapy “should be able to gather evidence in order to discuss the antecedent factors that led to their [the person incarcerated] dangerous behavior” (p. 34) and “to motivate him or her to create and sustain profound change in personal attitude” (pp. 33-34). However, as a simple way to initially describe art therapy to prison staff and inmates, he offers that it has the “potential to become a cryptic diary time which combines both symbol and metaphor… [and] is uniquely equipped to provide a physical record which aids discussion” (p. 34).
While Gussak (2004, 2006) and Van de Broek, Keulen-de Vos and Bernstein (2011) found quantifiable evidence of art therapy’s benefits, there were many benefits which couldn’t be quantified. For example, according to Gussak (2004), some advantages of art therapy included taking advantage of the creativity inherent in the prison society, allowing diversion and escape; promoting inadvertent unconscious disclosure, even while the client is not compelled to discuss therapeutic issues verbally, which might leave him/her vulnerable; and bypassing rigid defenses, including pervasive dishonesty. (p. 246)

He goes on to describe how the simple act of making art can result in difficult-to-access complex materials being expressed (2004), as well as its ability to “instill a sense of self-worth and identity” (2006, p. 189). Gussak (2006) additionally points out that art therapy has the potential to “alleviate mental health issues that are exacerbated in such an unhealthy [forensic] environment, such as major depression and schizophrenia” (p. 246). Hewish (2015) considers his extensive 25-year history of creative work in the UK prison systems with Geese UK and Rideout (Creative Arts for Rehabilitation) and posits that

the arguments for using arts in prison has been made again and again; that they have the power to engage the disengaged, they are a safe outlet for unexpressed thoughts and feelings, they allow for consideration of ‘other’, they provide a place to develop and practise transferable skills, they challenge personal orthodoxy and facilitate the development of new narratives, and they allow participants to experiment and take risks. (p. 214)

Using personal testimony, he recounts the positive impact of the arts that he’s witnessed within the prison community, such as an inmate confessing to a potential paradigm shift in “[beginning to] see myself in a different way” (p. 213). Delshadian (2003), an art therapist who’s spent years
working in Western Europe’s largest women’s prison, Holloway Prison, explains how art therapy can provide an opportunity for healing. She describes how art therapy can create a type of asylum from imprisonment, emotionally and physically, for inmates (2003). Additionally, the criminalized act of destruction and pushing boundaries, when safely achieved in art therapy, can be a metaphorical way to work towards safe and healthy differentiation (Delshadian, 2003). Delshadian (2003) also describes how “individuals whose core difficulties lie in acting rather than thinking, are particularly responsive” (p. 73) to the nonverbal aspect of art therapy. A few case studies of female arsonists are discussed by Delshadian and their processes of sublimation through the art product, its creation and sometimes destruction, are illuminated (2003).

However, there are also obstacles to conducting art therapy in correctional settings. Gussak (2004) has encountered “rigid defenses, manifested through silence, lies and aggressive acts, [which] are used for basic survival… [as well as] increased illiteracy, organicity and inability to verbally communicate [which] make it difficult for prison inmates to give voice to the mental, emotional and/or physical problems they experience” (Gussak, 2004, p. 245). Teasdale (2008) writes of the complications of non-disclosure agreements and the “resistance to disclosing psychosocial and criminogenic factors [being] evident in evaluations of the arts as education and recreational services within forensic settings” (p. 33). The omission of this salient information can create gaps in the understanding of the enormity of the benefits created by art therapy in forensic settings.

**Family Art Therapy in a Prison Setting.** While traditional family therapy and also art therapy with incarcerated populations were both examined in a good amount of depth for this literature review, and, both aspects showed promising benefits, there was no research in the available peer-reviewed literature that specifically addressed family art therapy in a prison
setting. Even if research articles had a small amount of information that alluded to how art therapy could potentially benefit the familial concerns of some inmates, the articles did not address art therapy conducted with family units, incarcerated-mother-child dyads, nor did they view the research through the lens of Attachment Theory. This dearth illuminates an area of research that has yet to be explored in much depth, and, potentially helps to justify this particular research study’s necessity.

**Art Therapy with Incarcerated Women.** Though the above information regarding family therapy and art therapy in a prison setting are basically true for all incarcerated populations, there are some unique differences and issues women deal with. Articles focusing on conducting art therapy specifically with women in forensic settings have additional insight to offer.

Some basic differences between female inmates and their male counterparts and/or the population of women at-large, can help illuminate issues uniquely relevant to women in the prison system. Erickson and Young (2010) explain that, while the percentage of women incarcerated is low compared to men, their population is growing. Gussak (2009) alludes to the “inclination to ‘masculinize’ the female criminal” (p. 6) in the US prison system, yet points out that “female inmates have different issues than male inmates, and diverse techniques need to be developed to address gender differences” (p. 6). Erickson and Young (2010) go on to spell out in more detail that

female inmates differ from men in their physical, emotional, and social needs and require a different treatment approach. One difference between incarcerated men and women is that a higher percentage of women have both a mental health diagnosis and a substance abuse disorder. ...Many females began using drugs at an early age, often on a daily basis,
because of a life-disrupting, traumatic experience that occurred when they were in middle or high school; frequently, they did not complete high school. The majority have a history of trauma (sexual, emotional, and/or physical abuse as children and adults), which is linked to long-term substance abuse. (p. 40)

Merriam (1998), a Canadian art therapist who has worked in the Kensington Prison for Women, also speaks of the overwhelming percentage of incarcerated women who have a significant history of physical and sexual abuse, including incest, rape, and assault from an intimate partner, especially when compared to women in the general population. Similar to Erickson and Young, she (1998) also lists some of the daily challenges to treatment with women in prison being their experiences of “severe emotional effects from sexual abuse and from other major disruptions which include parental death at an early age, foster-care placement, residential placement, living on the streets, prostitution, suicide attempts, self-injury and substance abuse” (p. 158). Gussak (2009) takes women’s trauma-filled history one step further when he connects it to many of their criminal actions: “Women are more likely to offend in response to domestic violence or sexual abuse, trauma or drug dependence. They may be provoked to violence by a loved one or simply for feeling disenfranchised” (p. 6).

Female offenders’ connections to family system issues have also been identified in multiple articles. Erickson and Young (2010) point out that “most female inmates are unemployed, single mothers” (p. 40), and, when “compared with men, women have stronger attachments to their children; have more separation anxiety; and express more concerns about their parental responsibilities, child care, and parenting issues” (p. 40). Gussak (2009) quotes Negy, Woods, and Carlson (1997, p. 225) when linking the high number of women’s mental health diagnoses to their emotional health being more stressed by “the struggle to maintain intact
families, the effort to sustain the parental role and care for children, and the need to deal with unresolved conflictual marriages or relationships… all from the confines of prison” (Gussak, 2009, p. 6). Gussak (2009) also highlights women’s tendency towards creating a familial environment in prisons based on their inclination towards working in groups as opposed to individually, and their open need for “affiliation and support” (p. 6). He also quotes Day and Onorato (1997, p. 134) when indicating an observable pattern of women playing “mother, sister and aunts… within the group… Sometimes several ‘families’ combine to form a large extended family… [they] treat their cell or dormitory like a home” (p. 6). When discussing treatment in group art therapy with female forensic patients, Erickson and Young (2010), credit some of the healing process being linked to creating a space for the mending of interpersonal relationships, especially those related to family systems. In almost every instance of female forensic art therapy, being mindful of the incarcerated women’s familial and interpersonal relationships seems to be highlighted as an undeniably important aspect.

Additionally, art therapy can provide a uniquely appropriate and effective tool for addressing the issues faced by incarcerated women while promoting rehabilitation and healing. Overall, Merriam (1998) espouses on the qualities of art therapy which differentiate it from talk therapy. She posits that “the focus on the image” (p. 158) can make art therapy seems [sic] less intrusive [than talk therapy] for some women. The art image is a personal statement that provides a focus for discussion and exploration, yet it also provides distance from the strong feelings evoked. This has proven to be especially helpful with the women [inmates experiencing]… dissociated feelings and… withdrawn and resistant to art therapy. Art therapy allowed them to process and integrate
information, to contain it in the artwork, thus gaining distance, as well as [the conditions] to nurture and self-soothe.” (p. 158)

Merriam (1998) further explains that “the benefits of art therapy with women who have been traumatized result from providing a protected environment for lowering defenses, releasing tension, and gaining insight” (p. 158). Art therapy can also create a voice for the female inmates who may have “lost their ability to verbalize their emotions because of trauma… [which] makes art therapy particularly beneficial to women with a history of trauma, because an inability to describe and discuss trauma creates tremendous obstacles for therapeutic intervention” (Merriam, p. 159). Erickson and Young (2010) additionally address group art therapy’s ability to facilitate some of the familial and interpersonal aspects incarcerated women deal with when revealing that:

Besides helping to express and thereby reduce negative feelings, the creative arts may aid clients by helping them to focus on their own sense of self-direction and autonomy. Because many of their issues are interpersonally based, such as relationship issues, child care and parenting issues, addiction issues, and family of origin issues, group setting with those facing similar difficulties seems to be the ideal vehicle for delivering an expressive arts treatment. Creativity allows for needed expression and feedback and can help individuals imagine a constructive future (Gibbons, 1997). In the prison culture, a variety of elements exist that can lead to calm, creativity, and catharsis or to discord and violence. The use of creativity can help encourage the positive and focus on future issues of reentry (Gibbons, 1997). (p. 41)

Regardless of the issues facing incarcerated women, art therapy has proven to be an effective means of treatment in forensic settings.
Challenges of Incarcerated Mothers. While incarcerated women have their own set of challenges to face, when they also happen to be mothers, new layers of complicated challenges surface. Incarcerated mothers experience particular obstacles resulting from the inability to connect to their children on a basic, physical level, but also in a way that has emotional, mental, spiritual implications. One mother described the feeling of being separated from her children to be “‘pain to the point of numbness’ (Ursula, 48)” (Baldwin, 2017, p. 52). Allen, Flaherty, & Ely (2010) note that for some, it is too difficult to bear visitations by their children, at times forgoing the opportunity because they are only to spend time with their children via a glass partition. They also point to the “deep shame, remorse, and sadness for the mistakes they have made” that the women express, contributing to why some choose not to see their children while in prison (Allen et al., 2010, p. 166).

Few-Demo & Arditti (2013) indicate the complicated relational challenges that incarcerated mothers have to face, including: working through feelings of remorse, longing to feel connected, dealing with upset children who are expressing emotional distance, and navigating the awkward relationship with the children’s caregivers. They discuss the boundary ambiguity that takes place with both incarcerated mothers and with their children, suggesting for practitioners to incorporate boundary work with the family system in mind (Few-Demo & Arditti, 2013).

Further limitations are caused by a lack of communication between child protective services and mothers in prison (Allen et al., 2010). A case plan is developed stating what is required of the parent, but the success of the plan is often impeded upon by the inability of case workers to follow through in keeping in contact with the incarcerated mothers (Allen et al., 2010). In their study, Allen et al. (2010) note how the majority of the women interviewed
expressed feelings of “profound powerlessness” in not having a voice within the system (p. 165). These mothers are marginalized within multiples systems, including: gender, class, and other systemic barriers, while also dealing with stigma and shame, rendering them as a highly vulnerable population (Allen et al., 2010).

**Children with Incarcerated Parents.** Geller, Cooper, Garfinkel, Schwartz-Soicher, and Mincy’s study argues that the impacts of parental imprisonment on children extends beyond dealing with the parent’s absence (as cited in Dawson, Brookes, Carter, Larman, & Jackson, 2013). Dawson et al. (2013) note how having a parent in prison also affects the child’s relationships with friends and their community. The stigma attached with parental incarceration “can be accompanied by stereotyping and discrimination that causes stress, lowers children’s self-esteem and confidence and can potentially affect mental and physical health” (Dawson et al., 2013, p. 4). Nesmith & Ruhland (2008) postulate that without support, “children’s responses to trauma, like fear, anxiety, sadness and grief” can translate into reactive behaviors, such as “physical and verbal aggression, withdrawal, hyper vigilance, or sexualized behavior” (p. 1120). Other concerns for children with incarcerated parents include role reversal, where it was noted in a study conducted using family drawings that any contact with the incarcerated parent was linked with greater role reversal (Dallaire, Ciccone, Wilson, 2012). Dallaire et al. (2012) explain that role reversal “involves depicting the mother (or mother figure) as having less authority in the relationship than the child or the mother as vulnerable herself” (p. 176).

Dawson et al. (2013) advocate for an approach that encourages open conversation with the child to explore any questions about prisons, work through any feelings about stigma, and to create an open space where the child can express their desires regarding contact with their parent.
**Attachment Considerations in the Parent-Child Dyad.** There are many lenses through which to view the topic of Attachment Theory, but because Erickson and Young (2010) point out that “most female inmates… have stronger attachments to their children [than their male counterparts, as well as] ...more separation anxiety” (p. 40), it would be germane to consider the incarcerated mother’s dyad with her child. Winnicott, a foundational thinker on Attachment Theory, is famous for arguing that there’s “no such thing as a baby (without a mother), implying that treatment of babies must inevitably relate to the power inherent in the caregiving relationship because the infant cannot exist without this” (Shore, 2000, p. 15), but Shore also adds that this parent-child dynamic ends up in psychotherapy when patients of all ages use their therapist for help maturing and separating (Shore, 2000). Therefore, better understanding of parent-child attachment theory should be of assistance when working with any age group, incarcerated or not.

The theory of attachment originates in infancy as an internalized survival mechanism developed to maintain a sense of safety through relationship with an attachment figure, usually a mother, but sometimes a father or other caregiver (Sheller, 2007). Attachment Theory adds that, depending on the health of this parent-child relationship, an individual’s mental health, feeling of personal security, and ability to maintain close relationships can be affected throughout their life (Goldner & Scharf, 2011). Attachment styles can be detected numerous ways but are often illuminated by how well a child handles the stress of their primary caregiver’s removal (Gavron, 2013). In a basic sense, it is considered a secure attachment when a child can self-soothe, even if they are initially upset with their caregiver’s removal. On the other hand, there are various levels of insecure attachment seen when the caregiver leaves, such as ambivalent: the child is unable to
self-soothe, avoidant: the child avoids and has no emotional reaction, or disoriented: the child is inconsistent or seems depressed or confused (Shore, 2000, 2014).

An incarcerated mother may have one or more children of various ages, but because of incarceration’s disruption of their attachment dyads, there is a strong possibility of insecure attachments forming. For example, by school age, a child exhibiting disruptive or problematic behavior, learning disabilities, and/or social problems are often found to have “emotional problems related to relationship with parents” (Gavron, 2013, p. 13), problems which Attachment Theory addresses. Further, Shore explains that the parent-child attachment theory can affect the brain, in essence, unifying or separating left hemisphere and right. She argues that, when a person experiences early relational trauma, the structure of the right brain, which relies on relational experiences for development, can become diminished and impoverish the individual’s ability to self-soothe, regulate their emotions, build empathy, form self-awareness, and can often lead to disruptive behavioral patterns (Shore, 2014). Additionally, the left side of the brain, which plays a significant role in cold logic, competition, mathematical calculation, narrow attention, and aggression, can overcompensate (Shore, 2014).

Parental incarceration is a particularly threatening form of separation that has implications on the child’s ability to form secure attachment (Murray & Murray, 2010). According to Murray & Murray (2010):

Availability depends on children believing that there are open lines of communication with the attachment figure, that there is physical accessibility, and that the attachment figure will respond sensitively if called upon to help (Ainsworth, 1990). All three aspects of availability might be challenged by parental incarceration, in which visits are difficult, communication about parental absence can be suppressed or distorted, and parents are
held, against their will, in a situation in which active and responsive parenting is almost impossible to perform. (p. 295)

**Attachment Theory-Based Family Art Therapy with Parent-Child Dyads.** The parent-child attachments can often hold clues to children’s behavioral problems as well as be a possible predictor for children’s future development (Gavron, 2013), and, have the potential to be repaired through the therapeutic use of art (Gavron & Mayseless, 2015; Shore, 2000). ..., because anyone at any age can get defensive or shut down when directly confronted, the use of metaphorical art is especially helpful in communicating attachment dynamics through abstract metaphor (Sheller, 2007). Additionally, verbal questionnaires may be too intimidating and difficult, thus art “may serve as a bridge between expression through play and imagination… and the verbal expression that characterizes adult communications” (Gavron, 2013, p. 13).

Allan Shore, an “expert on neurologically based attachment, affect regulation, and the role of therapy in providing repair” (Shore, 2014, p. 91), concluded from his studies that nonverbal therapies, such as art therapy, were especially well suited in repairing an insecure attachment because of their ability to access affect. Winnicott, too, viewed creativity as an indication of health and wellbeing, but, he additionally believed that children’s wellbeing would improve in treatment if their parents were involved (Shore, 2000). Building on the concept of healing through parent-child relationships, Shore used art as a means of communication between child and parent to help set in motion experiences of affect regulation, maturation, ego strength, parental reinforcement (the stronger the parent, the more securely the child can safely attach), and support (Shore, 2000; Shore 2014). The art can also function as a transitional object, heralding “the beginning of healthy separation and the possibility for the true self (Shore, 2000,
Longevity and Sustainability Considerations

Therapy Considerations for Separated Family Units. Considering some of the obstacles to conducting family therapy when working with incarcerated individuals, some alternative ideas offered potential solutions to creating more sustainable, effective, and long-lasting therapy.

Evidence-Based Military Solution. One large obstacle faced by family units who have one or more incarcerated family member is their physical separation, which is an issue faced by families separated by military duty as well. Because of the United States military’s reliance on evidence-based and peer-reviewed research in creating and analyzing their therapeutic interventions, looking into their long-distance-family therapy interventions could have useful implications for creating sustainable, successful long-distance-family art therapy solutions as well.

Lowe et al. (2012) point out that the “prolonged absence of the active duty member” (p. 17) can be “extremely stressful on families and children” (p. 17). “Extended separations… may also affect psychological health for the at-home spouse and children” (p. 48) according to Lester et al. (2012). Lowe et al. (2012) additionally discuss the potential problems surrounding family reintegration, which could be similar the those incarcerated individuals facing reentry. “Children often communicate through behavior because they lack the communication skills necessary to verbalize their feelings” (p. 18), a dilemma uniquely suited to art therapy interventions. Lester et al. (2012) also point to military children being “vulnerable to emotional and behavior disruptions, including heightened anxiety and academic difficulties” (p. 48).
Beardslee et al. (2013) offer an evidence-based solution that’s been successfully implemented since its inception in 2008 with “military families confronting the challenges of prolonged war” and physical separation, called FOCUS, aka Families OverComing Under Stress (p. 394). “FOCUS, developed by a UCLA-Harvard team, was disseminated through a large-scale demonstration project funded by the United States Bureau of Navy Medicine and Surgery (BUMED)” (p. 339) and is heavily based on the need to address the stressors caused by “parental absence” (Beardslee et al., 2011, p. 339), which are issues incarcerated parents face as well. Explicating on the importance of the parent-child dynamic, which would include the incarcerated-mother-child dyad, Beardslee (2013) writes about the “intrapsychic challenges that young children face, the importance of the relationship with caregivers, and factors that affect the parent-child relationship, especially with regard to children’s exposure to stressful and traumatic events” (p. 341). In fact, women separated from their families for military reasons have been singled out as experiencing “additional unique challenges reintegrating and… tend to suppress their personal needs in their attempts to quickly resume caregiving for their ‘abandoned’ families” (Beardslee et al., 2013, p. 403), issues which incarcerated mothers may also face (Gussak, 2009). Taking this all into consideration, FOCUS was designed and has been successfully implemented as a scalable family-centered prevention model to increase long-term resilience (Beardslee et al. 2011; Beardslee et al. 2013).

Beardslee et al. (2011; 2013) have separated the underlying FOCUS elements into four basic categories, “essential across all adaptations: (1) Family Psychological Health Check-in; (2) family-specific psychoeducation; (3) family narrative timeline; and (4) family-level resilience skills (e.g., problem solving)” (2013, p. 394), a format that might be considered when working in family art therapy programs with incarcerated family units as well. More specifically, the
Family Psychological Health Check-in is a web-based assessment using “standardized psychological health and family functioning measures that are completed by all family members” (p. 396) when treatment begins, 1 month in, then again at 6 and 12 months (Beardslee et al., 2013; Lester et al., 2012). It is designed to provide information to the family and therapist for treatment planning and to administer the appropriate Family-Specific Psychoeducation (Beardslee et al., 2013; Lester et al., 2012). The Family Narrative Timeline is then co-created by the family and therapist in different configurations, beginning with parent-only and children-only, building to a unified-family narrative, concentrating on challenging periods but redefining them as times of resilience (Beardslee et al., 2013; Lester et al., 2012), a task which could be easily translated into art therapy directives. Beardslee et al. (2013) additionally explains the importance of the family narrative in the dimensions of “family communication, family organization, and family belief structures” (p. 342) as well as constructing a “shared… narrative that points towards the future” (p. 342). And, finally, the Family-Level Skills are further broken into 5 specific skills: (1) Emotional Regulation; (2) Problem Solving; (3) Communication; (4) Managing Deployment, Trauma, or Loss Reminders; (5) Establishing Readiness and Goal Setting (Beardslee et al., 2013). Though these skills would need some alteration for a different population, conceptually, their basic skill development could still translate to a family therapy initiative with incarcerated populations and their family members.

After seeing the need for more nuanced treatment in certain cases, FOCUS created additional adaptations (Beardslee et al., 2013), which could also apply to families with one or more incarcerated members. For example, family units with very young children need different types of online assessment tools and psychoeducation about developmental levels and expectations than those with only adolescent aged children. Additional needs were observed in
the availability of the family-centered service to those “who[, like families with incarcerated individuals,] may not have direct access to mental health or family support facilities” (p. 404), which has led to the development of “innovative technologies” and platforms (p. 404). Most of the technologies developed are web- and smartphone-based applications since the general US population has access to one or both of these devices and can use them at their leisure, in a wide variety of locations (Beardslee et al., 2013).

**Technology, aka Telemental Health in Prison Systems.** Just as FOCUS adapted to include technology and web-based interventions, these telemental health interventions are also potentially useful ways to access the incarcerated prison population since the platforms they exist on are conceivably more available than direct human interactions with family members or therapists. According to Lee et al. (2017),

> compared to traditional face-to-face counseling, web-based or other mobile health (‘mHealth’) psychosocial interventions may be more scalable as a result of cost efficiencies and accessibility (Carroll and Rounsaville, 2010; Marsch and Dallery, 2012)... [though] few studies have assessed computer and Internet literacy and the feasibility of these interventions in CJS [criminal justice system] populations (Alemagno et al., 2009; Chaple et al., 2013; Ford and Vitelli, 1992; Walters et al., 2014). (p. 2)

Jewkes and Reisdorf, Diggs, Lubas, and De Leo (2015) point out that “the field of counseling has met... [the rapid technology updates and] changes... by providing technology-based services such as telephone, text messaging, email, video conferencing, online assessments and online journaling” (p. 4).
Technology and Art Therapy. As the reaches and accessibility of technology increase, so do their implications in the field of art therapy, which could potentially impact the delivery of family art therapy in a prison setting to make it more long-term and sustainable.

Pre Year 2000 Considerations. Many articles from before the year 2000 were beginning to see ways to incorporate technology into art therapists’ therapeutic tool boxes yet also addressed a few cautions (Gussak & Nyce, 1999; McLeod, 1999; McNiff, 1999; Parker-Bell, 1999). Gussak and Nyce (1999) argued that “computer technology can provide a transactional space in the art therapy process” (p. 194), though they warned of the “strong commitment to eclecticism [in the field of art therapy which] poses a considerable challenge to the design and development community” (p. 194), as well as privacy issues related to developers and designers “use[ing] informants (end users) or data from informants” (Gussak & Nyce, 1999, p. 194). Through no fault of the users, Gussak and Nyce (1999) also illuminate the possibility of a technology program not working properly and the scenario’s potential to elicit feelings of misplaced personal inadequacy, frustration, or responsibility which could affect treatment adversely. McLeod (1999) complained of the “coldness and separation associated with putting a machine between the client and the art” (p. 201) in addition to the arguably expensive price of technology, but pointed out “the empowerment for clients who find natural dimensional media limiting” (p. 201). McNiff (1999) argued that “the virtual studio will never replace what I do in my studio group where we paint and make objects with conventional art media” (p. 198) and that if the technologies “do not focus in any way on the creative process of making and perceiving imagery, then perhaps they are outside the realm of art therapy” (p. 197). McNiff (1999), however, also made the point that exclusion of an alternative venue for art therapy could be limiting and that “the practice of art therapy in diverse artmaking facilities will ultimately enable
our [art therapy] discipline to fully realize its art-based medicines and powers” (p. 198). Parker-Bell (1999) admitted to many art therapists’ “fears that computer art programs will ‘seduce’ our clients into a virtual reality separate from the physical reality of pastels, paint, and clay (Gerity, Henley, Howie, & Kramer, 1996)” (p. 180) as well as the “possible misuse and addiction to computer games or the Internet” (p. 180). Incidentally, she also wrote of her own experience using digital computer artmaking to create an embodied image, which she described as “art charged with meaning that is arrived at, but not always readily understood, through the process of its creation” (p. 180), which gave her hope for her clients being able to do the same. Additionally, Parker-Bell pointed out computers’ suitability to address certain clients’ unique needs such as those “unable to use traditional materials in a manner sufficient to communicate their thoughts and feelings” (p. 181) or those with “physically imposed communication limitations” (p. 181) before going on to list a variety of programs she’s employed therapeutically with art.

**Post Year 2000 Considerations.** Later articles begin to experiment with integrating more computer and web-based technologies into art therapy practices since the current trends show the general population increasingly embracing technology (Diggs, Lubas, & De Leo, 2015; Evans, 2012; Thong, 2007). Diggs, Lubas, and De Leo (2015) highlight that “many of today’s youth find it difficult to live without new technologies such as high-powered computers, mobile phones, digital assistants and MP3 players” (p. 4) and go onto to provide an extensive list of collage-making softwares, their costs (in 2015), special features, pros, cons, if music/video add-ons are available, and their different exporting options. Evans (2012) also provides two lists of creative art making softwares, grouped into those programs which have been used in a clinic setting and those which have been used non-therapeutically but may have therapeutic utilities.
Using three case examples, Thong (2007) illustrates the implementation of computer programs in art therapy to facilitate the creative processes of drawing, painting and sculpting. “Computer art shares many characteristics with traditional art making tools” (p. 58), Thong (2007) points out, which can allow for the same types of therapeutic interventions implemented in art therapy sessions using traditional art mediums. Because of her extensive knowledge of computer-aided artmaking, Thong (2007) was also able to become a supportive ally for her clients on their technology-based creative journeys. Thong (2007) and Evans (2012) both call for art therapists to keep up to date and educated on emerging technologies which can facilitate the art therapy process, especially as technology becomes more affordable and user-friendly. But, as McLeod (1999) illuminated, “any computer with a mouse, old or new, can become a medium for art therapy” (p. 202) with a “compatible program and a willing client” (p. 202). Parker-Bell (1999) additionally added that “no matter what the tool, artwork has the potential of becoming ‘alive’ in the heart and mind of the artist, given a safe setting and therapeutic support” (p. 180) but also reminds the art therapist that “no art tool -including the computer -suits all needs or situations, but most can be used well in a therapeutic context if the therapist knows the properties and potentials they hold “ (p. 184).

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, family art therapy in a forensic setting seems to be a viable and potent form of therapeutic intervention, especially when viewed through the lens of attachment theory, mother-child dyads, available technologies and evidence-based strategies for long-term family resilience. The general literature on family therapy with incarcerated populations, coupled with the effectiveness of art therapy in forensic settings, combine to illustrate how potentially successful family art therapy in a prison setting could be. Additionally, the lack of articles and
information researching family art therapy in a prison setting highlights the need for such work. Addressing the unique issues faced by families impacted by incarceration, the exploration of parent and child dyads and attachment theory further illuminate the importance of tending to the secure attachment of parents to their children for ongoing wellbeing for each individual of the family unit. Narrowing the scope to women in prison, the overarching importance of family and their proclivity towards identifying as part of a family unit, even with other prisoners in the prison, is seen in the therapeutic space. Additionally, the unique needs and desires of female as opposed to male inmates points to the importance of therapeutically working towards family reunification, especially with women who are mothers. The evidence-based intervention strategies used for family therapy with separated military families facing similar stressors to families separated by incarceration, give suggestions for ways to implement more sustainable therapy practices, such as an initial check-in assessment for each family member, appropriate psychoeducation and a unified family timeline. The advances in technology also offer new ways to connect families that were otherwise previously impossibly separated. And, those same technologies, as well as other creative softwares, have been used successfully for years nows in art therapy practices. Tying all these myriad factors together, examining ways to assess family members’ expectations, stages of development, mental health, attachment issues, etc.; managing expectations and finding moments of resilience in a family timeline potentially created artistically; and mindfully implementing technologies as available, necessary and useful, could all prove successful in conducting sustainable, long-term family therapy in a prison setting.
Research Approach

This research utilizes a qualitative case study approach, including semi-structured interviews and arts-based research such as art-making directives. Cresswell (2014) explains that qualitative research is not designed to use measurable variables but to collect data “in the participants’ setting; analyzing the data intuitively, building from particulars to general themes” (p. 246) and eventually making inductive interpretations of the data. A case study digs deep into a certain case, usually a “program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals,… bounded by time and activity” (p. 14). Thus, a qualitative case study uses qualitative methods to interpret non-measurable gathered data taken from a specific case. According to Galletta (2012), the semi-structured interview is designed to gather data in a qualitative study, and, the tentative questions used for guidance should be structured enough to sufficiently address a variety of issues regarding the research issue, yet remain flexible and open-ended enough to allow for “participants to offer new meanings to the topic of study” (p. 2). As for arts-based research, Carolan (2001) warns that “the object of research in art therapy is not art in and of itself; it is art in relationship to therapy” (p. 203), and, aims to focus on “those attributes of art that are unique in the landscape of therapy” (p. 203). Carolan (2001) goes on to point out that scientific research is an inherently creative process of inquiry and discovery, not unlike the process of creating art. Art has the ability to expand non-linearly, beyond strict cognitive logic, and can facilitate moves past what is already know and into the land of new discoveries (2001). Carolan additionally argues that “it is not science we must move beyond; it is the concept that all that is real is that which can be confirmed through our senses” (p. 203), and that arts-based research can be found in “postpositivism, constructivism, critical theory, participatory research, and other models of ontology, epistemology, and methodology” (p. 203). It is the researchers’ aim that by including
art-making within the interview process, further insight will be offered into the experience of Camp Suzanne, particularly as it relates to attachment between the mother-child dyads and the future longevity of the program.
Methods

This section will outline the methods utilized to carry out this research study. Terms found within the research will be defined. Then, information pertaining to how the sampling was chosen, data was gathered and analyzed will be presented.

Definition of Terms

Attachment. Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary (n.d.) defines attachment as “the state of being personally attached” and also “the physical connection by which one thing is attached to another.” In this study, the term is used to refer to the attachment between child and caregiver (i.e. mother) from the perspective of Attachment Theory.

Attachment Theory. A psychological theory that originates in infancy as an internalized survival mechanism developed to maintain a sense of safety through relationship with an attachment figure, usually a mother or other primary caregiver (Sheller, 2007); the security of the mother/caregiver-child relationship can have long-lasting impact. Depending on the health and security of the mother/caregiver-child relationship, an individual’s mental health, feeling of personal security and ability to maintain close relationships can be affected throughout their life (Goldner & Scharf, 2011). Shore (2000) explains that the parent-child attachment dynamic ends up in psychotherapy when clients of all ages use their therapist for help maturing and separating.

Attunement. To attune is defined by Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary (n.d.) as “to bring into harmony” and “to make aware or responsive.” For the purpose of this research, attunement is connected to the concept of Attachment Theory and refers to how an individual becomes aware of and then responds to another. In this study, it is usually speaking of how a caregiver/mother recognizes and then reacts, or attunes, to their child’s emotional state. A well
attuned caregiver will be able to decipher their child’s emotional cues and respond appropriately, in accordance with what the child may be needing emotionally but not necessarily verbalizing.

**Camp Suzanne.** A week long family-centered arts based therapeutic treatment program, aka “camp,” developed for incarcerated mothers and their children at the Federal Correctional Institution in Dublin, CA sponsored by the Center for Restorative Justice Works (CRJW). For the purposes of this research study, the concentration will be on the camp experience in July of 2017.

**Digital Technology.** Technology-based platforms used in mental health fields such as, but not limited to: internet-based video conferencing programs (Skype, FaceTime, Google Hangouts, etc.), digital camera/photography, telephones, text messages, email, online assessments, online art-making programs (Photoshop, Illustrator, Procreate, etc.), online journaling, online counseling, mental health Apps (Headspace: Meditation, Relieve Depression PRO, Moodfit, etc.), art therapy Apps (Color Therapy Adult Coloring, Mandala Coloring Book, etc.), etc.

**Dyad.** Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary (n.d.) defines dyad as a pair, or, “two individuals… maintaining a sociologically significant relationship.” In this research, the dyad is usually referring to the mother-child relationship (unless otherwise stated).

**Family Art Therapy.** Art therapy interventions conducted with the family and/or family systems models taken into consideration

**Family Therapy.** Therapeutic interventions conducted with two or more members of a family unit
Incarcerated. Merriam-Webster (n.d.) simply defines incarcerated as “confined in jail or prison.” For the purposes of this research, incarcerated is referring to the state of being “confined in jail or prison” because of a criminal conviction (n.d.).

Incarcerated-Mother-Child Dyad. The mother in the mother-child dyad is currently incarcerated

Insecure Attachment. The relationship between child and caregiver is not secure (Shore 2000; 2014). Insecure attachments can be separated into three types: 1) Ambivalent, where the child becomes upset and unable to self-soothe when their caregiver is removed, 2) Avoidant, where the child avoids their caregiver and does not have any emotional reaction when their caregiver is removed, 3) Disoriented, where the child is inconsistent in how they relate to their caregiver, possibly vacillating between Ambivalent and Avoidant reactions, seeming confused and/or presenting as being depressed (2000; 2014).

Long-Distance-Family. Family units which are physically separated by a distance which is essentially insurmountable on a daily basis but there may be brief reunions at spaced intervals, i.e. military families separated by deployment or family units separated because one or more member is incarcerated

Latent Content. Content found in the data that was unintended and is discovered after the data was created. For this study, latent content will be referring to the latent content found in the art data unless otherwise indicated. It bears significance because of its potential connection to the subconscious and its ability to circumvent straight logic and make new connections and discoveries (Carolan, 2001).

Mother-Child Dyad. The dyad relationship between mother and child.
Reentry. Merriam-Webster defines reentry “as the action of reentering” and defines reenter as “to enter (something) again” and “to return to and enter.” For the purpose of this research, reentry refers to an incarcerated individual’s process of leaving prison and the adjustments required to reenter society (Few-Demo & Arditti, 2013).

Response Sensitivity. The level of sensitive attunement in a mother/parent’s responsiveness to her child

Secure Attachment. The relationship between child and caregiver is secure, which can be observed when a child may become upset when their caregiver is removed, but is able to self-soothe (Shore 2000; 2014).

Tele-mental Health. Mental health services provided through digital technologies (see “Digital Technology” for examples)

Transitional Object. An object which functions as a psychologically supportive device that comforts an individual transitioning from a state of dependence towards independence (Ainsworth, 1969). From an Attachment Theory perspective, the transitional object can act as a sort of stand-in for the parent/caregiver for the child, like a child’s teddy bear or safety blanket which gives the child courage to face their fears alone (1969). For the purposes of this research, the art made during family art therapy will act as transitional objects unless otherwise noted.

Design of Study

The following describes how the study will yield the desired information regarding attachment in incarcerated-mother-child dyads using therapeutic art-making as well as long-term sustainability of programs like Camp Suzanne. It will include a description of the research design of the study and the study’s focus as informed by the review of corresponding literature.
**Sampling.** Subjects were selected based on their participation as art therapists or program facilitators during the programming of Camp Suzanne at the Institution of Corrections in Dublin, CA in July 2017 sponsored by the Center for Restorative Justice Works (CRJW). The subjects were all female adults over the age of 18 whom were one of the following: registered Art Therapists, Licensed Marriage and Family Therapists within the state of California, and/or Center for Restorative Justice Works coordinators employed by CRJW at the time of the camp. CRJW gave researchers permission to contact subjects and provided email addresses. In this first correspondence the researchers: 1) introduced themselves and their status as Loyola Marymount graduate students conducting her Master’s research project, 2) gave a brief description of the proposed research study- to understand the impact of an arts based therapeutic treatment program developed for incarcerated mothers and their children at the Federal Correctional Institution in Dublin CA from the perspective of the art therapists and program facilitators, and 3) requested to interview participants during an approximately 30 minute semi-structured interview that includes art-making at a time and location convenient for the participant. Participants were informed of their voluntary involvement and were notified that they would be allowed to choose whether information gathered will be kept confidential.

**Gathering of Data.** Researchers conducted interviews face-to-face individually at a time and location convenient to the subject with a faculty representative on site should any challenges occur. Interviews were approximately 30 minutes in length, semi-structured in nature using a list of interview questions to guide the interview process and included an art-making directive. The procedures were aimed to gather data on the participants’ observations and experiences of art-making’s impact on attachment in incarcerated-mother-child dyads during their time at Camp Suzanne during July of 2017. It also gathered their input on potential ways to make Camp
Suzanne and other programs like it more long-term and sustainable given some of the telemental health options revealed by the literature. During the interview, the researchers gathered data through audio recording, art-making, and observation notes taken during the interview sessions. Following the completion of the interviews, researchers compiled the data collected to prepare for analysis.
Results

Presentation of Data

The data presented below was gathered via audio recordings of unstructured interviews with six participants who were each involved in supporting Camp Suzanne. Artwork completed during the interviews was also gathered and included in the data to add a further layer of understanding to the participant experience of the program.

The data obtained from the audio recordings was transcribed and briefly summarized into sections organized by interview question, which will be listed and followed by each participant’s response in chronological order of when interviewed. Each participant’s art response will be included with the written summary of their verbal response. During the interview, participants were asked to state what their role in the program:

Maria: Executive Director of Center for Restorative Justice (now former) and individual who originally identified need for Camp Suzanne

Clarice: Camp Suzanne Coordinator (of structure and logistics)

Amanda: Facilitator/Art Therapist

Jennifer: Director of Camp Suzanne Art Therapy Programming and “point person”

Jackie: Facilitator/Art Therapist

Carley: Facilitator/Art Therapist

Interview Question 1. Using the materials provided, please illustrate/create art about your overall experience of Camp Suzanne using imagery, symbols, words, etc.
Maria.

*Figure 1A.* Maria’s first art response. This image shows Maria’s response to the first interview question, drawn in marker.

Maria’s initial response to the prompt was a discussion about how many of the mothers in the Camp Suzanne program were concerned about deportation. She also noted that the children were happy on the journey over to see their mothers and observed their tears when they arrived. She depicted this with the imagery she utilized in her art response, i.e. the automobile, hearts, tears. Maria worked on her art as she described what she witnessed. Maria also commented on how on the journey back from the prison, the children expressed a lot of sadness. She went on to state that she witnessed restorative justice between mother and child during Camp Suzanne. Maria also emphasized the importance of one on one time together between mother and child, without having the caregiver the child lives with at home present, which is unique about the program.
Clarice.

Figure 1B. Clarice’s first art response. This image shows Clarice’s response to the first interview question, drawn in oil pastel.

Clarice was observed to work on her art response while also verbally communicating her intent behind her images. Clarice noted how there were a lot of emotions expressed. Clarice stated that there “was a lot of love and emotion,” which she shared that the heart in her image represents. She noted how she witnessed the children getting angry and wanting to fight. Clarice explained how the different faces the imagery she created represented the range of emotions that she observed being expressed. She shared that she used the yellow above the smiley face in her image to convey the hopefulness that she felt after camp. Clarice highlighted the idea of connections: between the children, between the children and their mothers, restored connections, best friendships formed between the children, which she used the two overlapping circles in her artwork to convey. She spoke to the creativity she observed at Camp Suzanne as well, detailing some of the art projects that took place. Clarice expressed that the “collection of colors” at the bottom of her image “represents all the creativity that she saw and felt throughout the week.”
Amanda.

Figure 1C. Amanda’s first art response. This image shows Amanda’s response to the first interview question, drawn in oil pastel.

Amanda worked on her art response and then verbally shared her experience and the meaning of her image. Amanda shared that in her imagery, she started with a mandala, a circle that she identified as helping her focus in. She pointed to how this led to the image of the connection between mother and child and how it stood out as a “mystical relationship.” She noted how the need to be together and connect appeared to overcome the challenges that perhaps they had experienced, expressing that those challenges were represented in her art by the darkness of color that she utilized. She also emphasized how she observed the mothers to be completely motivated by their children. Additionally, Amanda expressed her experience of countertransference in feeling empathy while also trying to find hopefulness within herself. She shared that the experience was “painfully beautiful,” yet the children brought a lightness, which she pointed out in her artwork. Amanda also indicated that underlying systems played a role as well, such as the mothers’ previous relationships with partners and domestic violence. Amanda also named some of the challenges that the children experienced with being able to express their
emotions which would present itself outwardly as behavioral issues.

Jennifer.

Figure 1D. Jennifer's first art response. This image shows Jennifer’s response to the first interview question, drawn in oil pastel.

Jennifer worked on her art response and then shared the significance of her imagery. Jennifer used her artwork to frame and share her ideas about her experience with Camp Suzanne. For instance, Jennifer indicated that although this was her second year coordinating the art therapy portion of Camp Suzanne, she still felt some anxiety about unknowns, which she used red to communicate in her piece. She mentioned that she felt that there was more structure to the program this year, which she stated that she emphasized during planning, also using squares to convey in her art. Jennifer also noted that Camp Suzanne’s overall environment was emotional and that the children tended to act out at the beginning. She shared how behavior management planning became a consideration and one child almost had to be asked to leave the program, but after some intervention was later able to thank Jennifer and a facilitator for believing in him. Jennifer shared that the blossoms in her art represent the “really touching interactions [she experienced] with the kids and with the women.” She noted how the dark blue in her work pointed to the heaviness of the program, that there was a weight to the systemic impact. Jennifer
shared how one mother stated “that in prison, they teach you to be a prisoner, but in this program she felt that we were teaching her how to be human again.”

Jackie.

![Jackie's first art response](image)

Figure 1E. Jackie’s first art response. This image shows Jackie’s response to the first interview question, drawn in oil pastel and marker.

Jackie worked on her art response as she verbally expressed her experience with Camp Suzanne. She stated that her experience with Camp Suzanne was rich and layered. She noted that she used overlapping layers of holistic circles to depict this as each individual involved came into the program as whole individuals. She pointed to the different experiences of the mothers, the children, the facilitators. Jackie shared that the art had a big role, which she indicated with the middle larger circle in her art response. She also noted the different phases of engagement in the program: early, middle, and final. The multiple colors she chose to use also related to the variety of people, art, and experiences gained during Camp Suzanne.
Carley.

*Figure 1F.* Jackie’s first art response. This image shows Jackie’s response to the first interview question, drawn in oil pastel.

Carley indicated that her first response to the art was to depict a heart, which she stated reflects how moving the entire experience was for her. She also pointed to how understanding the systems at play and how the systems could support the work being done was a theme that came up for her. She noted how there were things outside of their control and that couldn’t be planned for. Carley also shared that once the mother and child were in the room, an organic process was evident, but noted all that it took to get to that space, such as clearing security, walking through many doors. Carley pointed to how special it was for her to watch the art do its job. She noted how it served many purposes: to soothe, how it “kept hands busy so that mouths could move,” and to hold the space.

**Interview Question 2.** Defining attachment as the bond between the caregiver and their child, please create imagery about the mother-child dyad attachments you observed during Camp Suzanne?
Maria.

Figure 2A. Maria’s second art response. This image shows Maria’s response to the second interview question, drawn in marker.

Maria utilized the art to highlight the ideas she was touching upon as she verbally responded. Maria chose to use text in her art, writing down themes, which was welcomed by the researchers. Maria noted that most of the time, the relationships between the mother and child are broken, but once together, that goes away. She shared that there is still pain and a lot of questions. Maria also stated that after the five days of Camp Suzanne, she observed reconciliation and understanding. She pointed to the fear that the children have and how they wonder what their mother’s life is like. Regarding the role of art within the program, Maria indicated that some of the mothers and/or children complained about there being too much art and wanting more open time for just talking. Maria shared that, however, she observed that the art helped to initiate conversation and a good practice in coming to an agreement, in working on the art together. She emphasized the uniqueness of the prison environment and how this should be taken into consideration.
Clarice.

Figure 2B. Clarice’s second art response. This image shows Clarice’s response to the second interview question, drawn in oil pastels.

Clarice worked on her art piece and then expressed how she represented different forms of attachment that she observed. Using her art, she discussed the range of connectedness that she witnessed between the mother-child dyads, using the pairs of faces to depict “facing away, facing forward, and then facing each other.” Clarice noted how different the interactions she observed were. She used the example of a mother at the camp who had two children there: the relationship with one child seemed very connected, while the relationship with the other seemed ignored. Clarice pointed to how the art played a role in the process of attachment where for the mothers and children were strongly attached, the art aided, and for those who displayed uncertain attachment, the art seemed to assist in giving the mother and child something to do. Clarice also indicated how specific art projects served different purposes. For example, Clarice noted how the bracelet-making activity helped to create a transitional object for the children. She also shared how they had Camp Suzanne shirts, which everyone signed and which was very special for the children to have their mothers sign. Clarice shared how one mother signed her son’s shirt, “my heartbeat, my purpose” and how proud the son was.
Amanda.

*Figure 2C.* Amanda’s second art response. This image shows Amanda’s response to the second interview question, drawn in oil pastels.

Amanda first made her artwork and then shared about how she was thinking about a specific mother and child dyad that she observed at Camp Suzanne when responding to this prompt. She discussed how she witnessed significant moments within this dyad during the artmaking. She stated how the mother and child were able to express their hopes for one another. For instance, when working on an art piece together that represented what building or space they would like to contribute to a community (which later would become a camp-wide project), the mother and child worked on a college. Amanda pointed out how this served as a great opportunity for the child to express what she wanted for her future. Amanda also shared how she noticed the mother letting the child take the lead and how the art facilitated communication. Amanda shared how she emphasized the hair in her piece because the mother and child were touching each other’s hair frequently.

Amanda indicated how there were also difficult interactions that she observed between mothers and their children during camp as well, such as some children expressing their frustration with their mother’s absence. She shared how she felt that the goodbyes at the end of
camp seemed to be the hardest part and how she observed one child to possibly express symptoms of depression. Amanda then noted how this has led her to think about what could be done in the future to support follow up with the families.

Jennifer.

*Figure 2D.* Jennifer’s second art response. This image shows Jennifer’s response to the second interview question, drawn in oil pastels.

Jennifer worked on her art and utilized her imagery to describe what she observed in the attachment interactions between mother and child. Each image represents a different attachment form that she observed. She noted that at the beginning of the Camp Suzanne week, there was a clear separation observed between mother and child (upper left-hand image), as well as a noticeable discomfort and awkwardness in how to act. She stated for some mother and child dyads it was the opposite, where one mother seemed “enmeshed” with her child, which she represented with the swirled image of pink and purple on the right-hand side. Jennifer expressed an attachment dynamic that she observed where there was separation and the child was standoffish with the mother (lower left-hand image). Jennifer created a hand (bottom right-hand image) to convey the idea of “a lot of moms wanting to envelop their child,” noting that many of the mothers had not seen their child for a long time and their child was now in a different life
phase than when they left for prison. She indicated that there were different phases of attachment expressed throughout the week, where at the beginning it was the “honeymoon phase,” with a lot of observed physical contact, i.e. kissing and hugging. Jennifer noted that by the second or third day, sadness over the upcoming separation set in, where some of the children expressed this through anger. She shared that by the end of the week, there seemed to be more of an ease observed.

Jackie.

Figure 2E. Jackie’s second art response. This image shows Jackie’s response to the second interview question, drawn in oil pastels and markers.

Jackie highlighted the different attachment interactions that took place during Camp Suzanne: between the mothers and children, facilitators and children, caregivers and children. She noted that some of the children did not have a relationship with their mother and were appearing to still get to know each other. She also pointed to how the art acted as a way for mother and child to find some sort of attachment by working on art pieces together. Jackie highlighted how she observed the mothers demonstrating their desire to be mothers toward their children and how some of the children reacted against this, as some may have had a stronger relationship with their caregivers. She pointed to an interaction she had with a mother and child
who were having difficulty connecting. Jackie shared how she was able to act as mediator of sorts to support the child in expressing themself to then encourage the child to seek their mother. As Jackie spoke about her observations, she worked on her art and shared the significance of the symbols she utilized. She pointed to the flower being “about blossoming and delicateness” with the vine representing “growth and how it blossomed over the time [they] were there and [how] it was a way of growing for all of [them].” She expressed that the heart depicts “love and strength” observed within attachment formations between mother and child and stated that the sun indicates the warmth of attachment.

_**Carley.**_

![Carley's Art](image)

_Figure 2F._ Carley’s second art response. This image shows Carley’s response to the second interview question, drawn in oil pastels.

Carley touched on what she observed within the attachment dynamic to be an exploration amongst both the mothers as well as the children of being little and being big and navigating those roles. Carley pointed to this interplay and how she felt that it showed up in her artwork, stating, “now that I look at [the art], I just drew all these nipples.” Carley also pointed to the role that the art played with attachment. For instance the making of pillows and bracelets serving as
transitional objects and a way for the children to carry the experience with their mother with them. She also spoke to the symbolic and ritualistic function that pillows held of being tucked in, which allowed the children to be little in a way that both the children and parents needed.

**Interview Question 3.** Considering the current structure of Camp Suzanne. Please create imagery about the future of Camp Suzanne. (PAUSE) Consider current obstacles and ways to circumnavigate them in the future? Perhaps considering technology, program structure, transitional objects, extended family members, management of expectations, etc.?

*Maria.*

![Maria’s third art response](image)

*Figure 3A.* Maria’s third art response. This image shows Maria’s response to the third interview question, drawn in markers.

Maria utilized the majority of her response time to respond verbally. Maria expressed that one of the major limitations to the program was the cap placed upon how many families the program could be offered to. She stated that priority was given to mothers who were at risk for deportation, as the camp could potentially be their last time seeing their children. Maria shared that she has hopes for Camp Suzanne to grow, which she referred to in her art, but that there was also limited funding. She also highlighted that the context of the prison environment posed multiple challenges, including restrictions to the variety of art materials allowed and the constant
presence of prison guards. Maria noted an example of how if a child did not want to talk to their mother, the guard would say that they had to. In addition, Maria stated that there is no designated area for a therapeutic space and that during camp, they were using an exercise room. Maria also named the distance and transportation as a challenge, noting how the children were from all over California and most were far from the prison location in Dublin, posing a challenge for how to follow up with the children and their mothers post-camp, which she also highlighted in her artwork.

_Clarice._

Figure 3B. Clarice’s third art response. This image shows Clarice’s response to the third interview question, drawn in oil pastels.

Clarice stressed the challenge of gathering financial support for Camp Suzanne. She identified this as a barrier to coordinating the program. Clarice named how the the controversial nature of the issues involved with serving this population, including immigration and the prison system, made it difficult to receive funding. Clarice stated how that she was limited by mainly gearing her funding campaign to faith-based organizations surrounding the prison site. She shared how this was especially difficult to achieve because of distance and the communication challenges that this created. She noted that herself along with other coordinators worked with
what resources they had. Clarice illustrated the frustration of trying to get more financial support for the program through the use of jagged lines around a money symbol. Clarice pointed to the limitations caused by lack of funding, such as only being able to hire camp counselors on a volunteer basis, who were also not as trained as would have been preferred. She pointed to how the impacts of this need could be seen in instances where behavioral issues would arise with the children and there was not enough proper support provided. Clarice depicted the frustration that was experienced in dealing with trouble-making behavior from the children through her use of wavy lines. Clarice also suggested that the prison setting was a further challenge, which she illustrated with the prison fence in her art piece.

Clarice expressed ideas for improvement to Camp Suzanne, including creating a mentorship program where the children who participated in the camp would have the opportunity to return as counselors. She shared that the children in Camp Suzanne had expressed this desire to come back to support the program and continue their involvement. Clarice also discussed how it might be beneficial to provide follow-up services after the camp to the children and mothers to process all that they experienced at camp, perhaps utilizing technology, such as Skype. She also expressed her hope to offer the program to more families and more frequently than once per year, which she utilized the counting tallies in her art to convey this expansion.
Amanda.

Figure 3C. Amanda’s third art response. This image shows Amanda’s response to the third interview question, drawn in oil pastels.

Amanda pointed to a need for attention on the before and after of camp. For instance, addressing the issue of caregivers and what support or resources are needed. Also, thinking about what the children might need leading up to camp. Amanda stressed the importance of aftercare and creating more opportunities in that area of the program. She pointed to the format of the camp for the children where it could possibly be helpful for them to have more downtime after seeing their mothers rather than having so many structured activities. She also shared the need for more basic resources, noting that some of the children needed access to deodorant. Additionally, being prepared for various circumstances, such as what to do if the children aren’t feeling well. Amanda noted that it would be beneficial to support both the children and mothers in preparing for what is to come and providing the space to address any questions or concerns.
Jennifer.

Figure 3D. Jennifer’s third art response. This image shows Jennifer’s response to the third interview question, drawn in oil pastels.

Jennifer made her art piece and then utilized her artwork to describe her response to the prompt. Jennifer stated that she felt that Camp Suzanne has a lot of potential for growth, which she indicated in her art with the upward movement of the arrow. She highlighted in her art, with the circle as the bottom left-hand corner, how as of now, the program is an isolated event. Jennifer named different obstacles to Camp Suzanne including: money, support, distance, the difficulty of the work being done, and the nature of it being a high needs population. She also pointed to the need for more education and training for those involved with providing services within the program. She offered suggestions such as making Camp Suzanne a more mutually beneficial program, for example, partnering with Loyola Marymount University to create a teaching opportunity for students. She also offered the idea of possibly creating a chain of mentorship. Jennifer also named further obstacles to the program having to do with navigating the prison system. For instance, she noted how she felt the guards being present throughout the program posed a challenge for the mothers who might not have felt safe being constantly watched by someone who could take away their privileges. Jennifer also emphasized that she
felt there was a need for more time dedicated to the mothers, getting to know them, gaining more information, and giving the mothers an opportunity to state what they would like from the program. She also indicated the need for more debriefing and reflection time within the program structure.

*Jackie.*

*Figure 3E.* Jackie’s third art response. This image shows Jackie’s response to the third interview question, drawn in oil pastels.

Jackie emphasized the need to support the outside roles of the caregivers who support the children while their mothers are serving their sentence. She offered as an idea for improvement to the Camp Suzanne program to, in the future, include finding ways to connect the entire family unit. Jackie also suggested for there to be a continuation of research efforts and for the data to be utilized to further improve the program “so that we can validify the project and keep it continuously going and not going [...] just in that facility.”
Carley.

Figure 3F. Carley’s third art response. This image shows Carley’s response to the third interview question, drawn in oil pastels.

Carley was noted to work on her art and then verbally respond to the prompt. She described her art as it related to her verbal response. Carley highlighted the importance of there to be space after each camp day for reflection, a time for preparation, as well as dealing with “the emotional residue of the day.” She also noted that a possible improvement to Camp Suzanne would be in looking at how to provide preparation for the counselors. For instance, what to expect with the children behaviorally and whose role is what. She mentioned that potentially this could look like holding a workshop for counselors prior to camp. Carley also noted how it would potentially be helpful to explore ways of keeping families connected utilizing technology. Carley indicated how this might be beneficial to incorporate into the program for continuity of care, to provide services before and after camp, to include caregivers, and dedicate treatment for the mothers as well. Carley also shared about what she feels are barriers to support for the program, including bureaucracy, saturation of need, a system that is overwhelmed. Carley highlighted this in her art piece, naming that she depicted a boundary (what appears to be the
barbed top of a prison fence), that there is an inside and an outside and “how do you penetrate that.” Carley pointed to the round loops of the barbed wire and stated her wondering of how to “get in there and make it more round.” She also connected the saturation of color in her piece to the aforementioned saturation of need.

**Analysis of Data**

Using semi-structured interviews and art-making directives with the art therapists and program directors of Camp Suzanne, a week-long family-centered art based program developed for incarcerated mothers and their children, this qualitative case study explored the observed attachments between incarcerated-mother-child dyads and potentials for more sustainable, effective and long-term programming.

Data was collected during 30-minute semi-structured individual interviews including art making with six different participants. The interview consisted of three 10 minute sections where each of the 6 participants was individually asked to respond verbally and through art making to the following: 1) overall experience, 2) specific observations of attachment, and 3) opinions on the future of Camp Suzanne, including perceived obstacles and suggestions.

Data gathered was analyzed by revisiting and assessing audio recordings, art-making and observation notes to compare and contrast emergent themes. Participants’ interviews were transcribed in a typed format, screened for language, content, and consistent themes. The participants’ art was analyzed individually and then compared to each other to look for commonalities in materials, form, color, texture, line quality, size, subject matter, latent content and lastly triangulated with transcribed interview material. Researchers compiled a preliminary list of emergent themes from data through in-depth discussion with each other. The data was then reviewed multiple times and filtered through the original research questions proposed which
explored: 1) the impact of art making as a means to support secure attachment between the mother-child dyad when the mother is incarcerated and 2) more sustainable and long-term methods of offering programming to this population, including the consideration of digital technology. However, with the intention of this research also aiding future research and development in support of Camp Suzanne, some additional emergent themes which did not directly relate to the initial research question, have also been included.

Analyzing the data related to attachment, the emergent themes are as follows: a) Art Making + Diverse Range of Attachment Styles, b) Evolution of Attachment Styles, and, c) Obstacles to Incarcerated-Mother-Child Dyad Attachment. When reviewing data related to program longevity, the emergent themes discovered, include: a) Continuity of Care, b) Counselors, c) Money, d) Location, e) Caregivers Back Home, f) Prison System, g) Number of Participants, h) Tele-Mental Health, and i) Student Assistance.

**Attachment.** When analyzing data pertaining to the first research question; what was the impact of art making as a means to support secure attachment between the mother-child dyad when the mother is incarcerated, interviewees witnessed a multitude of data related to the incarcerated-mother-child dyads’ art making and its effects on attachment. Attachment, defined for this research as a survival mechanism developed to maintain a sense of safety through relationship with an attachment figure, usually a mother or other primary caregiver (Sheller, 2007), was observed though physical, verbal, and expressive interactions of incarcerated-mother-child dyads during Camp Suzanne. They also explained some of the obstacles to incarcerated-mother-child attachment they witnessed over the course of the week, from systemic to communication and navigating their children’s new stage of life development.

*Art-making and Diverse Range of Attachment Styles.* Analysis of data indicated that
interviewees observed a diverse range of attachment styles between the mother-child dyad where the mother is incarcerated. For example, while Maria utilized words in her art response to convey her thoughts (Figure 2A), she identified that some of the mothers and children “complain[ed] about doing this [art making],” explaining that “they want[ed] to talk,” she was also able to identify that “it’s a great opportunity, with the art, to start a conversation, to get to know each other... it’s a good way to get together and agree.” And, according to Clarice, during the week of art making at Camp Suzanne, “all different kinds of attachment” styles were observed. Clarice observed and created art during her interview using lines as silhouettes of faces (Figure 2B) to convey the literal body postures as metaphors for attachment styles, explaining that some dyads were “facing away, facing forward, and then facing each other.” She also offered some general examples such as “some children felt very disconnected... [while] some mother child pairs didn’t feel so disconnected and detached, but also not a really strong connection, a lot of uncertainty and fear... [however others] were really, really connected.” Jennifer created art similar to Clarice’s, using series of line patterns to depict a range of interactions she witnessed between mother and child, from separation, to enmeshment (Figure 2D). As she explained that “at the beginning of the week, there [were] all these sort of separate groupings and within those groupings, in most cases, a very clear separation between the mom and child, [a] kind of discomfort in how to act, kind of this awkwardness, but, ...at the opposite end of the spectrum, there [were others]” who were more comfortable with each other. Carley spoke about a pillow-making art directive that seemed to hold a powerful metaphor for attachment in their union of separate pieces and tying of knots together, while also speaking to the “whole construct of just being tucked in, that ritual that these pillows seemed to hold.” Carley further explained how the children “knew that mom’s couldn’t take them back with them.
but there was a lot of like co-creating these pillows and having time together, watching a movie and laying together with the pillows that really let the kids be little in the ways that they’re mom’s needed them to be and probably in the ways they needed to be as well.” Clarice also shared how the children really enjoyed bracelet-making and how important the symbol of the bracelet became. She explained how the mothers weren’t able to keep the bracelets, but attachment elements could be seen in how special it was for the children “to be able to wear something their mom made for them outside.” Carley additionally indicated how the bracelets served as transitional objects to support attachment and how the “kids were making them for everyone and wanted to trade them.”

To explain their overall observations on attachment, some of the participants described specific case examples. For example, Jennifer used a story about “this one family where she could not keep her hands off her child, in an appropriate way” as a way to describe a more healthy mother-child dyad attachment. Another one of the participants, Amanda, drew an image of a female figure (Figure 2C) and told a story of “the bond [one child had] with his mother [that] was there in a second and they were …bonding in such a beautiful way so quickly.” Amanda highlighted the attention she paid to the the linework of the hair in her image to describe the physical interaction of a mother braiding her daughter’s hair as they conversed about their desires for the daughter’s future. She noted this as another example of secure mother-child dyad attachment. However, there was also the unbalanced story told by Clarice of “one mom [who] had two children [at Camp Suzanne] and her relationship with one of them seemed very connected and the other seemed kind of ignored.” Maria also described that some “relationships are broken, there’s a lot of pain, a lot of questions [because] the children… don’t understand” why their mothers are in prison, what she did to be imprisoned. And, Jackie observed that, in the
beginning, “there were some children who really didn’t have relationships with their mother[s].”

**Evolution of Attachment Styles.** Along with observations of a diverse range of initial attachment styles, research participants also observed these styles to evolve over the week of Camp Suzanne. While creating art that signified the different attachment interactions that she observed (Figure 2E), Jackie explained,

> there were children who really didn’t have relationships with their mother … and so it was really a process of a week and them getting to know each other and going through the process of engaging in this art, get to know each other through the art and relate to each other and find some form of attachment through the art.

Jennifer also used her art response to convey the different interactions that she witnessed (Figure 2D) as she described that,

> in the beginning, there’s a lot of guilt and sadness that they missed those years [while incarcerated] and [are] really longing for it and wanting that connection but the kids were no longer in that stage where they wanted that kind of attention. So, there was a little bit of discomfort and pushing away. And, typically, it’s like this wavelength where in the beginning there’d be this honeymoon [phase] and everybody would be hugging and kissing and was so excited to see each other... and then, by day 2 or 3, the sadness would sink in. … [thinking about] ‘this countdown until we’re separated again,’ ...some of the kids, they’d act out. It seemed that they were taking the opportunity to share their anger with their moms. And express being really angry so they’d push their moms away and not want to work with their moms and try to join other families or [go] swing outside. They wouldn’t listen to their mom or help with the project and then, by the end, in some cases there seemed to be more of an ease.
Maria described a similar evolution of attachment when she described the initial meeting being full of “a lot of pain, a lot of questions the children have they don’t understand ‘why you here, what you did?’.” Then, “after 5 days,” Maria stated, “I can see the first time they run to hug each other, even if they are 16. You see the love … You see love; you see tears. It’s impressive how you can see them screaming but they’re crying. After the 5 days, you can see there’s a reconciliation, understanding. You can see tears because the goodbye is not easy but you see hope.” Carley explained the process as being “fluid … big sisters became little sisters, little sisters become moms, moms became babies.”

Some participants, chose to explain the attachment development through case study examples, such as Amanda who described the attachment trajectory of one mother-child dyad as beginning with a daughter’s resistance to her mother’s attempts to engage with her:

It was a real visceral experience of that loss [of time together] and confronted with grief [over not having shared mother-daughter experiences] because she [the daughter] just kind of cried and had to leave the room a few times, but, by the end of it, literally in mom’s arms. This was happening with 13-year-old boys being held in mom’s arms [as well].

Clarice described a Russian family consisting of a mother and 2 sibling children who began the week without speaking, explaining that their attachment “felt very absent and disconnected but by the end [of the week] they were crying and hugging each other and seemed to be really enjoying each other’s company.” Jackie explained a few scenarios where the mother-child attachment seemed to be weak and insecure to begin with, and, even though the mothers were “trying her best,” they needed intervening external support but, from that point on, “you could just see [a shift in] their [mother-child] dynamics, how they were learning to relate to one
another and build some type of attachment.” There were other examples given that seemed to be more difficult to navigate such as Clarice explaining that “some children felt very disconnected, hadn’t known their moms most of their lives so throughout the week … [they] were really confused and they expressed that … ‘I don’t really know anything about my mom.’ And, it was hard for them [the children] to get to know them [or form a secure attachment] in such a short amount of time.”

Additionally, Amanda described a community art project that was worked on by the mothers and children throughout the week which seemed to provide an opportunity for increased attachment in incarcerated-mother-child dyad as well as creating a sense of attachment to community. For example, Amanda explained that the mothers and children started with a self-symbol or puppet, then worked on a task as a dyad, to create an environment, and culminated with putting all the environments together. Amanda explained, “Our theme, what we were working towards was identifying hopes that you have for each other in the future and… in creating a community, what would you want in that community for your child to feel safe, to feel loved…” This gave children opportunities to reflect on what they value and would like for their future and for the mothers to get a chance to know their child in this way. Amanda noted, “There was a swimming pool, there was a pet store, there was a community art center, like, all these wonderful things.” Amanda detailed how there was one mother and daughter that stood out to her in how they “partnered in such a beautiful way.” Amanda observed how the mother was “so naturally able to let the child take the lead and kind of assist her.”

Clarice appeared to summarize that the overall attachment development of most dyads, “...improved in its own way. I think that the ones that were already pretty good obviously got better, but, I think that everyone benefited from the program.”
Obstacles to Incarcerated-Mother-Child Dyad Attachment. Although not directly related to the art-making experience, participants noted that there were significant barriers to attachment for this particular population. In a large number of the stories collected in the data, the research participants mentioned many obstacles that could potentially interfere with the formation of attachment in the incarcerated-mother-child dyads. These obstacles included systemic, political, and cultural issues relating to their behaviors, children’s psychosocial and physical development during their mother’s incarceration, and, not knowing how to navigate challenging communications.

Systemic Challenges. A few of the research participants mentioned external systemic and cultural issues which could create obstacles to attachment formation with incarcerated-mother-child dyads. For example, Jennifer described that some of the incarcerated mothers had possibly developed a “defensiveness” which could relate to the “prison environment” while Amanda was “reminded of [other] oppressive systems” some of the women had dealt with, such as “domestic violence” or “a man influence[ing] some of their behavior and that’s why they were there [in prison].” Other concerns which could have posed barriers to attachment included Maria’s explanation that at least “fifty percent” of the mothers were facing impending deportations. In these cases, the incarcerated-mother-child dyads may be faced with telling each other “a forever goodbye,” as Maria described it, at the end of the week. Maria also described problems stemming from the prison system, including guards which may force interaction and “say, ‘you better make sure that child talks to mom!’”. Excuse me, they never see mom and it’s too much for them. They need to release that stress, the emotions, whatever is going through that beautiful little heart. So, it’s the [prison] environment [causing the obstacle].” Amanda also described some of the children experiencing a different type of systemic obstacle when “slipping through
the cracks [at home, in school]. No one is really noticing a lot unless they’re acting out in a very big way.” Maria additionally listed off some cultural issues which could create obstacles in the building of attachment when describing that some of the children have formed assumptions about their mothers’ experiences in prison based off of television shows like “Orange is the New Black,” asking, “Do you have [a] girlfriend here? Do you make love here?”

*New Stages of Development.* Separately, some of these obstacles observed seemed to be due to the children’s new stages of physical and psychosocial development. For example, Carley observed a mother “try[ing] to grapple with… hav[ing] the language to process around [her son’s physical and psychosocial development] and grieve it” since she “hadn’t seen her son in 7 years. He’s an adolescent now, a big kid, like 6 foot big kid, so, that hug feels a lot different and the way you can be held and hold feels a lot different.” Jennifer also offered a similar scenario of children having physically developed into a new stage when describing that some of the daughters were experiencing their menstrual cycles during Camp Suzanne and their mothers had never been present to experience this before. And, on a related note, Jackie, Carley, Jennifer, and Amanda all described the potential obstacle to attachment created when mothers attempted to use antiquated mothering techniques they had used with their children before their incarceration. For example, Amanda described a challenging situation a mother faced when her daughter reacted negatively to her “telling her [daughter] how she should wear her hair or reprimanding her when [she, her mother, hadn’t] been there.” Jennifer also noticed that some mothers felt “a lot of guilt and sadness that they missed those years [while incarcerated] and really …wanted that connection [during Camp Suzanne] but the kids were no longer in that stage where they wanted that kind of attention. So there was a little bit of discomfort and pushing away.”
Communication. Many of the research participants also recounted the difficulty some of the incarcerated-mother-child dyads seemed to have when processing and communicating potentially emotional content. For instance, as seen in Figure 1B, Clarice created imagery of different faces to convey the range of emotions she observed, including sadness, hopefulness, anger, highlighting how she witnessed the children expressing their anger. Amanda, too, described that “there were a couple of children who were maybe outwardly expressing some frustration that they couldn’t quite name.” She described one daughter being so “confronted with grief” that “she just kind of cried and had to leave the room a few times.” Jackie seemed to corroborate this when pointing out that some of the mothers appeared to experience confusion about “not really knowing how to rectify” their children’s “push[ing] back.” And, Amanda gave an example of navigating another type of emotionally confusing situation when telling a story about a 10 year old “boy who was asking his mother how much longer she’d be in there [prison] and she hadn’t actually told him, so, she asked us [art therapist facilitators] for support in explaining to him: ‘I’m actually going to be here until you’re 21 years old.’” As Carley described from the children’s perspective, “the kids [are] also sort of navigating if… [it is] safe for it to be okay [to act young or little] because it’s hard to be little when you know you’re gonna have to be big [and adult again soon].”

Longevity of Camp Suzanne. To better understand the future sustainability and effectiveness of Camp Suzanne, the research participants’ views on its current state as well as their suggestions for its future were analyzed. The emergent themes that the research participants seemed to focus on were: 1) continuity of care, 2) Camp Suzanne counselors, 3) funding, 4) location, and 5) caregivers back home. The analysis went on to address issues in which little to no solutions were given by the interviewees, such as 6) the prison system and 7)
the number of Camp Suzanne participants. Lastly, novel suggestions for new approaches to Camp Suzanne were analyzed from the data collected, including 8) tele-mental health and 9) student assistance.

**Continuity of Care.** Regarding the idea of Camp Suzanne’s longevity, all of the research participants seemed to have an observation about the continuity of the Camp Suzanne participants’ care, which involved their pre and post support. As Amanda indicated, she seemed to have a better “understanding [of] the many layers that this [program] affects, impacts the women [and children],” when she considered their experiences of “before and after” Camp Suzanne. A few of the art pieces, such as those from Clarice (Figure 3B), Jennifer (Figure 3D), and Jackie (Figure 3E), had circles which could relate to a safe holding space for therapists to provide the clients of Camp Suzanne continued safe holding environments for support.

**Pre Support.** Concerning the pre support for Camp Suzanne, Amanda seemed to have the most comprehensive observations. She explained that some of “the mothers, leading up to this, they had a lot of questions about ‘how should I say this, should I do this, should I bring this up, should I talk about [this]?’” and concluded “that it would be really amazing for those mothers to have that [some preparatory psychoeducation guidance] leading up” to Camp Suzanne. Amanda also postured that, “for these kids, leading up to this experience,… [it might be helpful to consider] who was talking about it to them and did they have any questions that could be answered, did they really understand where they were going, what was happening?” From another perspective, Amanda also explained that there were concrete issues to consider regarding the prep for Camp Suzanne when she described that some of the children were not physically prepared and “didn’t have the right clothing, didn’t have deodorant.”

**Post Support.** Regarding post support for Camp Suzanne participants, all interviewees,
including Clarice, Jackie, Amanda, Maria, Jennifer, and Carley, weighed in on the positive impact post support could provide, both while attending Camp Suzanne and also after Camp Suzanne was over. Amanda explained the challenge of “being really sure that they have the resources after the day is over,” but that another concern was, at the end of the week, “leave[ing] them perhaps vulnerable from what they’d just experienced.” Clarice echoed this when explaining that “there’s a huge need for services for children and moms after camp” because “there’s a lot of emotions after that type of thing and I feel like they [the kids and moms] just didn’t have the opportunity to process them and learn how to deal with them and talk through them.” Jackie spoke about the future potential of offering the Camp Suzanne participants “tools to continue that attachment” that had occurred and possibly increased during the week. Maria also expressed a desire “to see Camp Suzanne growing towards a follow up with children,” literally spelling out “growing follow up with children” in red marker in her art, which can be seen in Figure 3A. However, she also explained that she didn’t see the point of including the mothers in the post care since “they are in prison, there’s no way that you can go to talk to the mom and, also, the mom may be deported soon.” Another element of post care support was illuminated when Amanda told the story of “one young woman, probably about 13, who we [the facilitators] were all worried about because it was coming out… that she was experiencing some depression” that couldn’t be fully addressed during Camp Suzanne. As Jennifer explained, in her future vision for Camp Suzanne, she hoped for the program to “become a cyclical process where we can stay connected and continue to work with the kids and the families during and after… [which could include] stay[ing] connected with these families so that when they leave prison [and return] to their homes and their communities, we can still continue to have them use whatever we’ve begun and grow with that on their own.”
**Transitioning Roles.** Another element of post support was mentioned by a few of the interviewees when they observed a desire and considered the potential for some of the children to eventually take on supportive roles in the future. For example, Clarice noticed that “some of the kids expressed that they’d want to be counselors for the camp one day… or mentors for younger children who attend the camp… [or] to be involved in some way with other children who are going through the same thing.” Jennifer also expressed a desire for Camp Suzanne participants to “maybe even potentially come back here and be the agent of change.” Even some of the art pieces, such as those from Clarice (Figure 3B) and Jennifer (Figure 3D) had arrow lines indicating a cyclical quality, which could further indicate the concept of returning roles.

**Counselors.** According to almost every research participant, some of the most pressing immediate concerns and suggestions for Camp Suzanne’s longevity revolved around the counselors, the adults who were the children’s caretakers when not making art in the prison. Clarice explained that the camp counselors were all volunteers, ….not [monetarily] compensated for the hard work they did, and, they also weren’t as trained as I’d liked them to have been… especially working with this population of children. There’s a variety of issues that could arise and definitely some behavior issues that were not handled in the best way just because of the staff training. And, they were volunteers so they probably didn’t want to, or expect to, deal with this much.

Jennifer, Carley, and Amanda also cited the lack of training and support for the counselors as an issue, especially when dealing with the children. For example, Amanda described “hearing from the directors, the camp [counselor] people responsible for them [the children] afterwards that their [the children’s] behavior was really out of control. …They would go to the pool and pick
fights with other kids at the pool.” She wondered if the children “having a little bit of processing
[time might help] because you know, the kids they went back [with the counselors] and their day
was really structured and I wonder if they could just use a little more down-time? They were
immediately home [at camp with the counselors] and making cookies and stuff. It was just like
boom boom boom… ‘Ok, now we’re gonna have the best summer camp experience of your life’
after this really emotional day. Jennifer reiterated that “there needs to be more training and
support when the kids are not at the prison.” Carley concurred that it would be useful to
“provide preparation to the camp counselors to prepare for …what might be seen behaviorally
[with the children], the emotional residue of the day.” Carley suggested that “it could be super
helpful to have a workshop with the camp counselors before we get started: on what are the
fantasies, what do they imagine this might look like, and how can we plan ahead if those things
are to come true?”

Funding. Clarice pointed out that one was the biggest obstacles she faced as an
organizing coordinator for Camp Suzanne was the cost, which seemed to be further illustrated by
the wavy outlined dollar sign she drew in acid green (Figure 3B), which she described as a color
which reminded her of being sick. She explained that “getting funding was difficult because it’s
a controversial topic for a lot of people. There’s the immigration piece, the prison piece, so, both
of those together made receiving funding hard.” She also detailed other limitations in her
fundraising, such as “the major funding for CRJW is faith-based so I couldn’t reach out to people
or organizations who’d given funding to their project, which was Get on the Bus [in Los
Angeles]. So, I was directed to focus on faith-based organization in the area [of Northern
California] that the prison was.” Even with the fundraising limitations, Camp Suzanne “was able
to get a lot of in-kind goods from different organizations, like, a lot of snacks from Trader Joe’s
and Whole Foods, and, the LA Galaxy donated a bunch of soccer stuff and soccer balls for the kids,” according to Clarice. However, Jennifer pointed out that “you need financial support [because Camp Suzanne staff are] taking breaks from lives and potential incomes.” Additionally, as Maria explained, she’d “like to see Camp Suzanne growing, [accommodating] more children because it’s really expensive. For 12 children we spent almost $25,000. For a non-profit agency, it’s very pricey. With that money, we can bring more children to visit mom in buses. I can pay 5 buses with 30 children in each bus [for the same price Camp Suzanne spent on 12 children].” Maria also described that, in her opinion, “the prices would be almost the same [to do Camp Suzanne closer to LA],” and to do so could help facilitate “a follow up” for the Camp Suzanne participants. Clarice suggested that in the future, maybe a “full-time job and maybe a team working” together to raise funds and organize could be helpful.

**Location.** Location, especially the children and organization’s proximity to the prison, seemed to be an issue on a few interviewees minds as well. For example, Clarice described one aspect of her fundraising that was especially troublesome was “liv[ing] in Southern California, so, contacting churches in ...areas up by Oakland, it’s hard to do that over phone or through the mail so that was difficult.” Jackie described the frustration of having to transport “children from the LA area” to a prison in Northern California when there are “children who are here and whose parents are here? And, other places where we could offer this same type of engagement [with the children and their incarcerated mothers in close proximity to each other]?” Jennifer’s drawing of long green arrow lines taking up a large portion of the paper in Figure 3D could also be connected to the large distance Camp Suzanne participants and facilitators had to travel, as could Maria’s drawing of the cars traveling to and from Dublin, which can be seen in Figure 1A. Maria also alluded to the fact that there would be more opportunity to do “a follow up, which
Camp Suzanne can’t “right now because Dublin [in Northern California] is far and the children are from all over, not just LA.” Maria explained that, “in the future, I hope Camp Suzanne can be done in LA, in Corona, because then it can be developed: a group where children from LA can get together once a month and therapists can follow up with how they are doing. That should [sic] be awesome.”

Caregivers Back Home. Taking the children’s caregivers back home into consideration was an issue that came up in a handful of research participants’ interviews. First, Maria highlighted how important the caregivers back home are to the children when she described some of the children “want[ing] to leave the facility because they miss grandma and grandma is [now playing the role of] mom.” Viewing the subject from another angle, Amanda expressed concern “about the caregivers who are caring for the children and what kind of support and resources they have.” Carley echoed this sentiment when asking “what would it look like to provide services before and after Camp Suzanne? To kids, to the caregivers of these kids, and to the moms?” And, Jackie explained that she “didn’t see much obstacle [during her time at Camp Suzanne], other than the outside roles that were not able to be integrated into this process… [such as] the outside caregivers and finding some way to connect with [them]… which is always difficult in a community-based setting: to get the whole family involved in some way.” Jackie’s cell-like embryonic art, with all its many layers, seen in Figure 3E, can also be viewed as the protective layers offered by all the different members of a family system which can come together to communally provide a safe holding space for mothers and children. Additionally, in a less direct manner, Amanda alluded to the caregivers’ when she spoke about some of the children not being prepared when they arrived to Northern California, for example, they “didn’t have the right clothing, didn’t have deodorant.”
Half of the interviewees expressed complaints and concerns regarding prison system issues, many of which seemed to be beyond the immediate scope of Camp Suzanne’s control. Clarice, for example, expressed her sadness for some of the children who’d been expecting to attend Camp Suzanne but weren’t able to when “their mom[‘s] violated the… prison rule: they need to have 12 months of [no] behavior issues in order to participate in the program,” and therefore were disqualified from participating, which arguably showed up in her art as a series of impenetrable-looking black bars topped with barbed wire (Figure 3B). Maria also described that, “if at the last minute, if the mom doesn’t behave, she loses that privilege [to see her children].” Carley further spoke of “the bureaucratic barriers… in the prison system [being] very politically charged” before giving a first-hand example. She described the hopeful excitement she and the Camp Suzanne team felt when they initially spoke with the prison’s warden, but, “then, finally, on the last day, we met the woman in charge of the mental health unit and… [she told them,] ‘You’ll never get a contract with the prison. We never work with outside contractors.’ It was one of those things like: you’re not walking the walk or talking the talk. So, how do you penetrate that? Her whole demeanor was so metaphoric, like you can’t get in there.” Carley added further to this discussion through her art response (Figure 1F) with her use of linework to convey barriers that “need to be penetrated.” Like Carley, Maria also described problematic encounters with prison guards in the therapeutic space, but she also expressed a different, more concrete set of prison system issues. For example, Maria spoke about the “rules and [that] you cannot bring all the materials and all the instruments that you would like.” Maria also described that the prison Camp Suzanne utilizes “a visiting room [but] in order to have more children we need to do it in an area where ladies do exercise… [but] the other women will complain: why are you taking away my privilege to exercise? The facility has to serve
everybody, not just one. They don’t do that [prioritize]. People coming from the outside, no one
goes inside, no one. The only place where you go is the visiting room… [which] can
accommodate 200 people, but to do the art, you guys need space…. [so the] families [are not] on
top of each other.”

Number of Participants. At some point during their interviews, over half of the
interviewees made observations regarding the amount of children who participated in Camp
Suzanne. Amanda and Clarice both described wanting the Camp Suzanne program to access
more children, and, Clarice, who drew an encircled large collection of tally mark lines that
indicated a large amount (Figure 3B), described a specific future goal as being “to make it
available to more children and maybe not just once a year… [and] expanded to more prisons.”
Clarice also expressed conflict when explaining that she “hope[s], for the future, that kids who
have gone will be able to go again, if it’s possible for them. But, I do think it should be offered
to kids who haven’t had the opportunity. I struggle with that feeling. I think it’s really important
for it to be sustained by continuing to have these positive interactions with their moms.” Maria
seemed to have a slightly different take on the number of participants when she complained that
“therapy says no more than 16 children [which would be 4 kids per trained art therapist, but]... it
can be more. [It was a limitation] by the therapists.” Maria also described the frustration she
experienced when, right before camp began, one of the incarcerated mothers lost her privilege
because of behavior problems, and, two of the children weren’t able to come because of it and
were also not able to be replaced. In the end, only 12 children ended up attending Camp
Suzanne. And, as Carley, explained, “most of the kids were siblings; [there were] only 2 cases
where they were only children.” This meant that, of the 12 children who were able to attend, 2
were only children, but there were 5 pairs of siblings, which equates to 7 incarcerated mothers
getting services.

**Tele-Mental Health.** While only one interviewee, Carley, revealed having direct experience with tele-mental health and was able to give an informed point of view on the subject, a few of the other participants also had opinions about incorporating tele-mental health service into a program like Camp Suzanne. For example, Clarice described that “something like Skype would be wonderful [because] I know a lot of the kids talk to their moms on the phone but it would be so different to see their moms and see their face[s].” However, Clarice also cautioned that she doesn’t “know what the prison allows.” Carley, on the other hand, owns “a tele-health company and we connect people with therapists via screen. So there’s this fantasy I have of doing this work and helping families start the reconnection process and still do that from afar.” She explained that “we [already] have the technology to do… family therapy” with individuals not in the same physical space with each other and that “therapy this way is just as effective as it is if you’re in the room.” She went on to pontificate about using this technology to “provide services before and after Camp Suzanne [such as therapeutic therapy-oriented discharge]? To kids, to the caregivers of these kids, and to the moms [and dads].” Carley’s drawing (Figure 3F) showed a purple line being penetrated by blue loops which seemed to be pushing through the stiff line barriers and widening as they got deeper, which could connect to her view of how incorporating tele-mental health could deepen and widen the therapeutic experience. However, when speaking of tele-mental health, Maria expressed confusion about the process when she asked “how” it would be possible to follow up with children “from San Francisco, Fresno, San Diego, Los Angeles, [all spread out locations]? How?” She echoed this confusion when explaining that she couldn’t see any “way you can go to talk to the mom, and, also maybe they’re deported soon or not soon and you’re not going to go to Mexico to follow up with the mom.”
Student Assistance. Three of the six interviewees spoke about the possibility of utilizing MFT and LCSW graduate students to different degrees for assistance with Camp Suzanne. Jennifer considered the future potential of “maybe having more interns, maybe this becoming a learning opportunity” for graduate students since MFT and LCSW graduate students wouldn’t necessarily need much extra training to work with incarcerated mothers and their children, in or out of a prison setting. Jackie expressed that “being able to have [graduate] students come in and really look at the data so we can validify the project and keep it continuously going” could be a great aid. Separately, Maria explained that “it could be an opportunity if the university decides to really establish that opportunity for the students and collaborate with CRJW.” Jennifer’s art, peppered with tiny pink circles (Figure 3D), could relate to the inclusion of more physical bodies to support the efforts of Camp Suzanne, especially helpful and trained ones, such as graduate students in related fields.

Findings

The emergent themes of the data collected from the research participants were organized into two main themes relating to attachment and longevity at Camp Suzanne, which, also related to the available literature to varying degrees. In this section, the following findings are organized into the same emergent themes as the data analysis but compared and contrasted with the available literature.

Attachment. As can be noted from the data presentation and analysis sections of this research, the nature of attachment between mother and child in Camp Suzanne is unique. This uniqueness was an important consideration when looking at how art-making functioned within that dynamic as well as when considering what some of the obstacles to attachment might be.

The Impact of Art-making on Attachment. Through the analysis of the verbal and art
responses of the participants, the researchers were able to make connections to a similar theme found in the research of Shore (2000; 2014) of how art-making can be used to create avenues of connection and communication between child and parent where attachment might be insecure. Support of this theme can be found within multiple participant responses. As Maria noted in her interview, she observed that the art was able to support the mother and child to initiate conversation and to create opportunities for joint decision-making. Carley had similarly supported this sentiment in her statement that the art not only served to soothe and hold the space, but that the art “kept hands busy so that mouths could move.” The centrality of the role of art-making in Camp Suzanne was also highlighted in Jackie’s art response (Figure 1E), where she indicated that the middle, larger circle in her image represented the art. All of this data seems to support Gussak’s (2004) description of how the simple act of making art can result in difficult-to-access complex materials being expressed.

An important consideration to the context of art-making at Camp Suzanne is the uniqueness of the prison setting and the specific relationship between the mother-child dyad that has been separated by incarceration. Maria emphasized this in her interview when she stated that some of the mothers and/or children had complained about there being too much art-making and had expressed their desire for more open-ended time together. This point is further substantiated by Murray & Murray’s (2010) research that indicates the challenge that parental incarceration poses to attachment as well as to communication.

Obstacles. Discussion of this theme would be incomplete without mentioning the obstacles that incarcerated mothers and their children faced to attachment, which was significant to the analysis of this research. Connections to literature on this topic further support the
researchers’ findings. The following obstacles to attachment will be taken into consideration: systemic, new stages of life, and communication.

_Systemic._ Multiple participants expressed the role that systemic issues played in posing a major challenge to forming attachment in the mother child dyad. Amanda pointed specifically to how the “prison environment” led her to be “reminded of [other] oppressive systems” the women may have been faced with such as “domestic violence” or “a man influenc[ing] some of their behavior and that’s why they were there [in prison].” The research of Gussak (2009) supports Amanda’s remarks when he states, “Women are more likely to offend in response to domestic violence or sexual abuse, trauma or drug dependence. They may be provoked to violence by a loved one or simply for feeling disenfranchised” (p. 6).

Additionally, Gussak (2009) speaks to the stress-inducing challenges for incarcerated mothers in maintaining the parental role and responsibility from the restricted parameters of prison. Amanda noted how many of the children are “slipping through the cracks [at home, in school].” This points to the fractured connection between mother and child due to parental incarceration. As Maria noted, many of the children are left to wonder about their mothers experiences in prison and form assumptions derived from what they see portrayed in media. Allen (2010) names the “profound powerlessness” that mothers expressed at not having a voice within the system (p.165)

Although not included in the literature review, another potential challenge to attachment that may have been faced by at least “fifty percent” of families who participated in Camp Suzanne was imminent deportation and the possibility of the time together at camp leading to, as Maria described, “a forever goodbye.”

_New Stages of Life._ Another emergent theme in the data which connected to the
navigation of addressing and understanding the children’s new stages of development could be found in the literature related to FOCUS, the evidence-based military protocol for separated family units, explained in greater detail under Longevity’s Continuity of Care heading (Beardslee et al., 2013). Seeing the need for parents to be educated on their children’s evolving levels of development, FOCUS created a support system in which to, first, assess the unique family-specific needs, then provide the applicable psychoeducation based on the ages and developmental issues of the children. Many of the research participants noted the discrepancy that they witnessed in the mother and child interactions where there did not seem to be full acknowledgement that their children were no longer in the same life phase as when they last saw them. As Jennifer suggested in her response, there was some observed “discomfort and pushing away” as the mothers “wanted that connection but the kids were no longer in that stage where they wanted that kind of attention.”

Communication. A consistent theme that emerged in participant responses regarding obstacles to attachment were challenges with communication, especially when it came to dealing with emotional expression, an echo to what has been found in previous research. As noted in Lowe et al. (2012), “children often communicate through behavior because they lack the communication skills necessary to verbalize their feelings” (p. 18). This can be seen in the participants’ observations, where Amanda explained how there were a “couple of children who were maybe outwardly expressing some frustration that they couldn’t quite name.” Clarice also highlighted in her art response (Figure 1B) how some of the children were expressing anger and the difficulty that came with navigating how to support them. Dallaire et al. (2012) further state how in parent child dyads where the parent has been incarcerated, there appeared to be an increase in the possibility of role reversal where the mother (or mother figure) may be depicted
as “having less authority in the relationship than the child or the mother as vulnerable herself” (p. 176). Jackie noted this challenge in her observation of mothers in the program seeming to be confused about “not really knowing how to rectify” their children’s “push[ing] back.”

**Longevity.** Like the emergent themes found in the data relating to attachment, most of the emergent themes relating to the longevity of Camp Suzanne can also be linked to the existing information gathered in available literature. The few themes that were not readily available in the literature are also indicated below with a brief explanation of their inclusion.

**Continuity of Care.** Most of the research participants spoke of the need for continuity of care, for some type of pre and post support for the mothers and children at Camp Suzanne, which can also be seen in the literature and in the art with cyclical imagery (Figures 3B, 3C, 3D, 3E). Allen, Flaherty, & Ely (2010) noted that, for some, it is too difficult [for incarcerated mothers] to bear visitations by their children, pointing to a “deep shame, remorse, and sadness for the mistakes they have made” (p.166). The research participants described a similar phenomenon when, as Amanda put it, some of “the mothers, leading up to this, they had a lot of questions about ‘how should I say this, should I do this, should I bring this up, should I talk about [this]?’” and concluded “that it would be really amazing for those mothers to have that [some preparatory psychoeducation guidance] leading up” to Camp Suzanne. Amanda also postured that, “for these kids, leading up to this experience,… [it might be helpful to consider] who was talking about it to them and did they have any questions that could be answered, did they really understand where they were going, what was happening?” This phenomenon can arguably be seen illustrated in Figures 3B and 3D, by Clarice and Jennifer respectively, with arrow lines moving in a circle of continuous care.

Though not exactly the same, the researchers discerned a parallel process occurring in
both families experiencing incarceration and those in the military, since both family units are often forced to experience separations against their will. And, like the extended absence of the incarcerated mothers, Lowe et al. (2012) explained that the “prolonged absence of the active duty member” (p.17) can be “extremely stressful on families and children” (p.17). In response, FOCUS, aka Families OverComing Under Stress, was developed using evidence-based practices to address the stressors caused by “parental absence” (Beardslee et al., 2011, p.339), which these researchers also view as a central issue faced by families separated by incarceration. And, like the research participants’ expressed need for continuity of care for incarcerated-mother-child dyads, FOCUS, also addresses the need for pre and post support for all involved family members (Beardslee et al., 2011, 2013). For example, according to Beardslee et al. (2013), FOCUS’ protocol is adaptable and focuses on four main categories of intervention, but the first is a Family Psychological Health Check-in, which is a web-based assessment using “standardized psychological health and family function measures that are completed by all family members [participating in therapy]” (Beardslee et al., 2013, p. 396) when treatment begins, 1 month in, then again at 6 and 12 months (Beardslee et al., 2013, Lester et al., 2012). The latent content of Carley’s art in Figure 3F, with its spaced out penetrations of a line barrier, could relate to the concept of spaced out post-care, as well.

While the FOCUS program uses months as intervals to post care services, some of the data revealed a potential immediate and ongoing need for supportive follow-up care for Camp Suzanne individuals as well, which can also be found in the literature. For example, Amanda explained the challenge of “being really sure that they have the resource after the day is over,” but that another concern was, at the end of the week, “leave[ing] them perhaps vulnerable from what they’d just experienced.” Clarice echoed this when explaining that “there’s a huge need for
services for children and moms after camp” because “there’s a lot of emotions after that type of thing and I feel like they [the kids and moms] just didn’t have the opportunity to process them and learn how to deal with them and talk through them.” In the literature, Erickson and Young (2010) point out that “most female inmates… have stronger attachments to their children; have more separation anxiety; and express more concerns about their parental responsibilities, child care, and parenting issues” (p. 40), which the researchers view as applicable to the post care needs of the incarcerated mothers at Camp Suzanne. Additionally, Dawson et al. (2013) make the argument that, for the children, the stigma attached to parental incarceration “can be accompanied by stereotyping and discrimination that causes stress, lowers children’s self-esteem and confidence and can potentially affect mental and physical health” (p. 4). And, Nesmith & Ruhland (2008) argue the importance of supporting “children’s responses to trauma, like fear, anxiety, sadness and grief” (p. 1120).

Counselors. While many of the research participants spoke of their concerns involving the counselors, their main issues seemed to be surrounding the counselor’s training and ability to handle and understand the children’s complex emotional states while visiting their incarcerated mothers. While the literature does not address the roles of counselors, specifically, it does support the claim that children with incarcerated parents face a unique set of hurdles, which can lead to acting out in ways that, on the surface, could easily be misinterpreted. For example, Amanda spoke of the counselors complaining about the children’s behavior being “really out of control. …They would go to the pool and pick fights with other kids at the pool.” However, Nesmith & Ruhland (2008) postulate that without support, “children [with incarcerated parents]’s responses to trauma, like fear, anxiety, sadness and grief” (p.1120) can translate into reactive behaviors, such as “physical and verbal aggression, withdrawal, hyper vigilance or
sexualized behavior” (p. 1120). When faced with such reactive behaviors, the research participants seemed to suggest that the counselors were not equipped to support the children to handle this behavior.

**Funding.** Though the emergent theme of funding issues was analyzed in the data, it did not readily translate to the available literature, however it was included for purposes relating to future recommendations for Camp Suzanne’s longevity, which will be addressed in the following section.

**Location.** The main emergent theme that seemed to be addressed regarding location involved the distance the children and Camp Suzanne team members had to travel to get to the prison, which seemed to be an obstacle to sustainable longevity. Many research participants postulated and created art (Figures 1A, 3D) about the increased potential for therapeutic engagement if Camp Suzanne were to be conducted in a prison facility closer to the inmates’ children and the staff of Camp Suzanne. If the location were closer, the proximity could naturally lead to an increased number of opportunities for incarcerated mothers and their children to spend time together. Datchi et al. (2016) also highlighted the significance of families with incarcerated member getting together on a frequent basis. In the Family Night program, Datchi et al. (2016) describe the importance of meeting on a consistent weekly basis to “practice parenting and other interpersonal skills and to maintain, restore, or foster the family rituals that involvement in criminal justice systems and criminal lifestyles have precluded” (p. 96). Datchi et al. (2016) also noted that, in research conducted by Fretz, Heilbrum, & Brown, incarcerated residents who participated in these weekly Family Night programs demonstrated notably lower rates of rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration in comparison with incarcerated individuals who were in the New Jersey Department of Corrections and not involved in such programs (p.
The researchers regard the correlation of family time spent together with an increase in positive therapeutic outcomes, as supporting the research participants’ observations on Camp Suzanne’s potential to be more effective, sustainable, and have more longevity if the prison location were closer to the non-incarcerated family members. For example, if all aspects were closer in proximity to one another, incarcerated-mother-child dyads would have more opportunity to interact, and, therefore, would arguably have more time to heal and “practice” (Datchi et al., 2016, p. 96) being a family.

**Caregivers Back Home.** While the week of Camp Suzanne focused on the incarcerated-mother-child dyad, some of the research participants alluded to the importance of the children’s caregivers back home. Amanda postured that, “for these kids, leading up to this experience,… [it might be helpful to consider] who was talking about it to them,” such as their caregivers back home. And, as Jackie explained as she drew her cell-like, multi-layered embryonic art (Figure 3E), the main obstacle to longevity she observed were “the outside roles that were not able to be integrated into this process… [such as] the outside caregivers and finding some way to connect with [them].” Datchi et al. (2016), seemed to comply when they stated that, while providing a weekly family therapy service for incarcerated individuals, it was important for the services to include work surrounding the “family system… [such as] members of the family of origin and/or the family of choice (e.g., close friends, community mentors, significant others [such as their children’s caregivers])” (p. 97). Further, Gussak (2009) linked the mental health concerns of incarcerated women to “the struggle to maintain intact families, the effort to sustain the parental role and care for the children [by their caregivers back home], and the need to deal with unresolved conflictual marriages or relationships [such as those with their children’s caregiver/s]” (p. 6). Few-Demo & Arditti (2013) also indicated the importance of considering
the complicated relational challenges incarcerated mothers face, such navigating potentially awkward relationships with their children’s caregivers.

**Prison System.** While the emergent theme of systemic prison system barriers was addressed by the research participants, and, the literature addressed barriers in the prison environment, the barriers highlighted by both sources seemed to be different. For example, though Carley, Clarice, and Maria all spoke of systemic prison issues regarding prison protocol, prison employee interference, and, as Carley explained, “the bureaucratic barriers… in the prison system [were] very politically charged,” the literature didn’t seem to specifically address these concerns. Instead, most of the literature spoke about emotional barriers to therapy that the incarcerated individuals faced, such as Gussak’s (2004) encounters of “rigid defenses, manifested through silence, lies and aggressive acts, [which] are used for basic survival” (p. 245).

**Number of Participants.** Though the emergent theme of the number of Camp Suzanne participants was analyzed in the data, it did not readily translate to the available literature, however it was included for purposes relating to future recommendations for Camp Suzanne’s longevity, which will be addressed in the following section.

**Tele-mental Health.** Though tele-mental health and its incorporation into art therapy was addressed in depth in the literature review, the data analyzed seemed to only provided a limited amount of insight and none of it seemed to directly address art therapy. Additionally, the insights that were gained from the emergent theme of tele-mental health seemed to both parallel and contrast the literature.

Clarice described that “something like Skype would be wonderful [because] I know a lot of the kids talk to their moms on the phone but it would be so different to see their moms and see
their face[s].” And, Carley explained that her tele-mental health company provides family therapy services for individuals not in the same physical space with each other and that it “is just as effective as it is if you’re in the room.” However, Camp Suzanne being an arts-based program, the researchers view McLeod’s older 1999 study of art therapy administered through technology to be of note since McLeod complained of the “coldness and separation associated with putting a machine between the client and the art” (p. 201) in addition to the arguably expensive price of technology, two considerations that could continue to be relevant to some, especially in a prison setting. However, more recent articles show a growing trend towards integrating more computer and web-based technologies into art therapy practices (Diggs et al., 2015; De Leo, 2015; Evans, 2012; Thong, 2007), because, as Diggs et al. (2015) highlight, “many of today’s youth find it difficult to live without new technologies such as high-powered computers, mobile phones, digital assistants and MP3 players” (p. 4).

In the data, Maria addressed confusion about “how” it might be possible to follow up with children “from San Francisco, Fresno, San Diego, Los Angeles, [all spread out locations]? How?” or their mothers who may be “deported soon or not soon and you’re not going to go to Mexico to follow up with the mom.” Carley seemed to answer this when pontificating about using web-based technology to “provide services before and after Camp Suzanne… to kids, to the caregivers of these kids, and to the moms [and dads].” Similarly, Beardslee et al. (2013) describe developing and incorporating “innovative technologies” (p. 404), such as online assessment tools and psychoeducation regarding children’s developmental levels, on web-based platforms as primary but also follow-up continuity of care tools for those “who may not have direct access to mental health or family support facilities” (p. 404).

However, while telemental health could provide services to some individuals who may
not otherwise be able to access them, Clarice also cautioned that she doesn’t “know what the prison allows,” which could be related to her impenetrable-looking black bars topped with barbed wire (Figure 3B). Lee et al. (2017) came to a similar conclusion when comparing tele-mental health to “traditional face-to-face counseling” (p. 2), finding it to be “more scalable as a result of cost efficiencies and accessibility” (p. 2), while also pointing out that “few studies have assessed computer and Internet literacy and the feasibility of these interventions in CJS [Criminal Justice System] populations” (p. 2).

**Student Assistance.** Though the emergent theme of student assistance was analyzed in the data, it did not readily translate to the available literature, however it was included for purposes relating to future recommendations for Camp Suzanne’s longevity, which will be addressed in the following section.
Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examined Camp Suzanne, a week-long program that consisted of therapeutic art experiences for incarcerated mothers and their children, focusing on the impacts of art-making on attachment as well as considerations for sustainability and longevity of the program. Through the gathering and analysis of responses by participants who were either involved as facilitator/art therapists or served as coordinators, the researchers discovered multiple insights that will hopefully function to directly support the future of Camp Suzanne, illuminating the program’s strengths, as well as where possible improvements could be made.

The findings revealed that art-making during Camp Suzanne was expressed to serve many functions within attachment interactions between the mothers and their children. The research participants shared how the art-making experiences created opportunities for communication, joint-decision making, provided soothing, held the space, and offered transitional objects. However, a significant point was highlighted in that there needs to be consideration of and sensitivity to the context of the prison environment in which this program takes place, allowing for flexibility and space if the mothers and children, as Maria indicated, just “want to talk.” Additionally, a consistent theme within this study was the importance of paying attention to the concurrent obstacles to attachment faced by incarcerated mothers and their children. The obstacles emphasized within this research include systemic issues, such as dealing with the constrictions of the prison setting; lapse of time where the mother and child have not seen each, leading to challenges adjusting to the children’s new stages of life; and communication, where difficulty with emotional expression led to children’s “push[ing] back” and mothers having to figure out how to navigate this.
The findings also revealed many emergent themes relating to the longevity and sustainability of Camp Suzanne, most of which highlighted what the research participants viewed as present barriers needing to be addressed, as well as some suggestions for future implementation. The need for some form of continuity of care for the mothers and children that extended beyond the week of Camp Suzanne was a theme that emerged from all the research participants, indicating that addressing this issue could create more long-term success. The literature on FOCUS, the evidence-based military protocol for separated family units, provided an example of an organizational format for providing continuity of care over an extended period of time, which could possibly be adapted into pre- and post-care in a manner and time-frame suitable for the needs of Camp Suzanne’s mothers and children. Additionally, FOCUS uses web-based platforms to deliver some of its services, which correlates to Carley and Clarice’s suggestion and the available literature’s options for incorporating tele-mental health into Camp Suzanne’s pre- and post-care, however, further research would need to be done regarding the bureaucratic rules and regulations of the prison system concerning web-based interventions. Not only could it be helpful to research the prison system’s stance on tele-mental health services, but to address the navigation of other systemic and bureaucratic barriers in the prison system that surfaced in the data, it might also be useful to look into other creative therapeutic services currently being successfully adapted in the prison system, such as California Lawyers for the Arts’ 40 years of prison-based art services, California’s Arts in Corrections, or The Prison Arts Coalition’s long list of California providers. The need for adequately prepared camp counselors at Camp Suzanne was another area of concern for many of the research participants, which could benefit from more research. The concept of continuity of care’s pre-support might potentially be applied to preparing counselors for the week of Camp Suzanne, as could the research
participant’s suggestions to incorporate graduate school students, some whom could possibly fill the role of counselor. Additionally, incorporating graduate school students from Marriage Family Therapy, Art Therapy, and Clinical Social Work programs could also help support the staff of therapists as well as facilitate art therapy services, which, in turn, could allow for a greater number of mothers and children to participate in Camp Suzanne. Graduate students in other departments, such as Finance, Business, or even the Writing Department, might also be considered for recruitment to help with fundraising, budgeting, grant writing, etc., as a need for support in the area of funding was another aspect that emerged in the data. More research to broaden the search for fundraising and personnel support, as well as possibly increase Camp Suzanne’s visibility, might also be considered through reaching out to related organizations, such as: American Art Therapy Association (ATAA), California Marriage Family Therapy (CAMFT), Southern California Art Therapy Association, Northern California Art Therapy Association (NorCATA), California Lawyers for the Arts, or even non-profit arts-based programs such as LA-based Art of Elysium, etc. However, Camp Suzanne’s current spread-out state was an additional hurdle that most research participant’s addressed as problematic. Future research addressing the exact obstacles, whether they are political, bureaucratic, organizational, or something else entirely, to hosting Camp Suzanne in a prison closer to the children and facilitators could be immensely helpful for Camp Suzanne’s successful longevity. With more funding, more facilitators, better budgeting of resources, and a prison in closer proximity, a larger number of families with incarcerated mothers could, in theory, be provided with services through Camp Suzanne, which would address another emergent theme of desiring more incarcerated-mother-child dyads to get services through Camp Suzanne. This, in turn, could create more opportunity for some of the research participants’ hopes that some of the participants
might return and become, as Jennifer stated, “the agent of change” through, as Clarice explained, “be[coming] counselors for the camp one day… or mentors for younger children who attend the camp… [or] to be involved in some way with other children who are going through the same thing.” Speaking from another perspective on community involvement, Jackie highlighted that integrating “the outside caregivers and finding some way to connect with [them]” would be another element to research in the future as a way to support the longevity of Camp Suzanne, especially considering the caregivers’ influential roles as sources of information, gatekeepers, and support systems who also have direct access and attachment to the children. This desire for already-knowledgeable external support for the family units could arguably parallel some of the research participants’ desire for external support from trained graduate student assistants.

In conclusion, the data revealed that Camp Suzanne is a program that has shown to support healthy attachment in incarcerated-mother-child dyads through therapeutic art interventions, while also having room for future growth. Though the data and literature showed promising potential for Camp Suzanne, some obstacles that emerged in the data helped lead to calls for future research in aspects related to supporting greater attachment, as well as research related to Camp Suzanne’s future longevity. Further research into which obstacles are concretely limiting, such as political laws or bureaucratic prison rules, versus which obstacles may be circumnavigated to a degree, such as funding or budgeting issues, could be helpful for prioritizing future research as well as what order to implement the research participants’ and the available literatures’ suggestions.
Reference List


doi:10.1080/07421656.1999.10129484


doi:10.1300/j015v21n01_04


doi:10.1177/1078345809356526


doi:10.1080/10509674.2016.1159641


doi:10.1080/07421656.2014.903827


doi:10.1080/07421656.2007.10129583
November 30, 2017

To Whom It May Concern,

I have received information on the content of Noelle Palm and Kaylee Falcon’s research intentions for their Master’s Research Project. I understand she wishes to explore the impact of Camp Suzanne- a weeklong art therapy program for incarcerated women and their children, from the perspective of the camp coordinators and facilitating art therapists.

If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Lupe Rivera

Lupe Rivera, M.A., CNP
Executive Director
Appendix B

LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent Form

Date of Preparation: November 29, 2017

Loyola Marymount University

1) I hereby authorize Noelle Palm and Kaylee Falcon to include me in the following research study: Attachment & Therapeutic Art-making with Incarcerated Mothers: A Case Study.

2) I have been asked to participate on a research project which is designed to explore the impacts of Camp Suzanne and therapeutic art-making on the attachment between incarcerated mothers and their children and which will last for approximately six months.

3) It has been explained to me that the reason for my inclusion in this project is based on my participation as an art therapist or program facilitator during the programming of Camp Suzanne at the Institution of Corrections in Dublin, CA in July 2017.

4) I understand that if I am a subject, I will participate in an interview which will involve art-making facilitated by researchers Noelle Palm and Kaylee Falcon. The interview will be semi-structured and will involve audio recording. The researchers will collect and analyze the data. Data will be transcribed and stored digitally on a password protected laptop. All audiotapes, photos and transcripts will be destroyed when the analysis is completed. Participation is voluntary and all participants have the right to terminate the interview and focus groups at any time. Participants may decline to answer any questions throughout the interview process or within the provided questionnaire. A summary of the results will be available to participants upon request. These procedures have been explained to me by principal investigators, Noelle Palm and Kaylee Falcon.

5) I understand that I will be audiotaped in the process of these research procedures. It has been explained to me that these tapes will be used for teaching and/or research purposes only and that my identity will not be disclosed. I have been assured that the tapes will be destroyed after their use in this research project is completed. I understand that I have the right to review the tapes made as part of the study to determine whether they should be edited or erased in whole or in part.

6) I understand that potential risks involved in participating in the study described above may include discomfort, inconvenience, embarrassment, nervousness, and invasion of privacy for the Licensed Marriage Family Therapy therapists and Program Facilitators, which will hopefully be minimized by conducting interviews individually, at times chosen for their convenience by subjects, and in safe locations chosen by subjects.
7) I also understand that the possible benefits of the study are increased awareness of the successful and less successful aspects of their roles in an arts based therapeutic program in a correctional facility, which could be used to inform future programming decisions. Benefits could also include subjects gathering a greater understanding of working with incarcerated mothers, mother child dyads, and attachment issues.

8) I understand that Noelle Palm and Kaylee Falcon can answer any questions I may have at any time concerning details of the procedures performed as part of this study via the research mentor Dr. Jessica Bianchi reached at jbianchi@lmu.edu.

9) If the study design or the use of the information is to be changed, I will be so informed and my consent re-obtained.

10) I understand that I have the right to refuse to participate in, or to withdraw from this research at any time without prejudice to (e.g., my future medical care at LMU.)

11) I understand that circumstances may arise which might cause the investigator to terminate my participation before the completion of the study.

12) I understand that no information that identifies me will be released without my separate consent except as specifically required by law.

13) I understand that I have the right to refuse to answer any question that I may not wish to answer.

14) I understand that if I have any further questions, comments, or concerns about the study or the informed consent process, I may contact David Moffet, Ph.D. Chair, Institutional Review Board, 1 LMU Drive, Suite 3000, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles CA 90045-2659 at david.moffet@lmu.edu.

Subject's Signature ________________________________________ Date ____________

Witness ________________________________________________    Date ____________
Appendix C

LOYOLA MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY

Experimental Subjects Bill of Rights

Pursuant to California Health and Safety Code §24172, I understand that I have the following rights as a participant in a research study:

1. I will be informed of the nature and purpose of the experiment.

2. I will be given an explanation of the procedures to be followed in the medical experiment, and any drug or device to be utilized.

3. I will be given a description of any attendant discomforts and risks to be reasonably expected from the study.

4. I will be given an explanation of any benefits to be expected from the study, if applicable.

5. I will be given a disclosure of any appropriate alternative procedures, drugs or devices that might be advantageous and their relative risks and benefits.

6. I will be informed of the avenues of medical treatment, if any, available after the study is completed if complications should arise.

7. I will be given an opportunity to ask any questions concerning the study or the procedures involved.

8. I will be instructed that consent to participate in the research study may be withdrawn at any time and that I may discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

9. I will be given a copy of the signed and dated written consent form.

10. I will be given the opportunity to decide to consent or not to consent to the study without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, coercion, or undue influence on my decision.