



Australian Government

Australian Institute of Criminology

Trends & issues in crime and criminal justice

No. 683

Abstract | Family visits for people in Australian correctional centres stopped during the COVID-19 pandemic. Video visitation was introduced in most jurisdictions as an alternative option. This paper presents the findings from the first multi-jurisdictional study to explore the experiences and impacts of video visits between fathers in prison and their children. Findings show that there are significant benefits to video visitation for fathers, children and children's carers, and corrective services. However, video visits are most beneficial as a complement, not alternative, to contact visits. There are opportunities to develop support for fathers and carers by focusing on visit quality.

Video visitation in Australian prisons: Perspectives on father-child contact

Dr Natalia Hanley, Dr Elisabeth Duursma, Professor Amy Conley Wright, Dr Helen Simpson and Laura Metcalfe

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, correctional centres across Australia enacted emergency public health measures to reduce the risk of disease transmission. These measures included cessation of professional and social contact visits with people in correctional centres, who typically have poorer health than the public on a range of measures that may correlate with the severity of COVID-19 outcomes (Payne & Hanley 2020). The unprecedented public health changes created the potential for conflict among the overarching objectives of corrective services to create a 'safe, secure and humane custodial environment' (Productivity Commission 2023). Visitation is a core strategy for achieving both safe and humane custodial settings (McCarthy & Adams 2017). Facilitating the connection between people in correctional centres and their families and friends in the community has a range of positive effects for everyone (Folk et al. 2019). Consequently, video visitation was developed and disseminated in Australian correctional centres. This paper highlights the benefits and challenges of video visitation from the perspectives of corrective services in six Australian jurisdictions, New South Wales fathers in prison, caregivers of children with a father in prison, and two support services.



CRIMINOLOGY
RESEARCH GRANT

Celebrating
50 years

Parents in prison

The data on the number of parents in prison is poor quality and not routinely made publicly available. Estimates suggest that around half of the men in prison are parents (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2015). Separation from family, and in particular children, is a major concern for most people in correctional centres. Given that the number of adult prisoners in Australia is currently approaching 42,000, with males (93%) making up the large majority of the Australian prison population (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2023), family separation affects a significant number of people. Existing research on parents in prison is largely US-based, and highlights mother–child separation. As the large majority of parents in prison are men, it is important to consider how the father–child relationship is maintained via family contact options.

Family visitation has broad and deep benefits for different groups: it can help people in prison to cope with separation (Casey-Acevedo & Bakken 2002), may improve family relationships and mental health, and appears to result in less disruptive behaviour in correctional centres (De Claire & Dixon 2017; Harris & Landreth 1997; McLeod & Bonsu 2018; Shlafer & Poehlmann 2010). Moreover, the positive effects linked to visitation last over time: family visits are associated with reduced recidivism, higher rates of reunification of family household post-release (Wilson & Koons-Witt 2021), and better social adjustment during imprisonment and after release (Casey-Acevedo & Bakken 2002). Visitation may somewhat buffer negative impacts for children with a parent in prison (Hayes et al. 2018; Schubert et al. 2016). However, fathers in prison and their children require significant support to maintain a positive relationship through separation (Bartlett & Trotter 2019).

Video visitation

The use of video visitation in correctional centres dramatically increased following the introduction of COVID-19 restrictions and subsequent suspension of in-person visits worldwide. In Australia, research suggests that most families with an incarcerated parent had some form of contact, primarily via phone or videoconferencing, during lockdown restrictions; however, the quality and accessibility of this contact has been critiqued (Minson & Flynn 2021). A survey of 84 caregivers of children with an incarcerated parent in Australia found that 60 percent reported problems maintaining contact during lockdown restrictions (Minson & Flynn 2021). Accessibility issues have arisen in contexts where facilities implemented ad-hoc lockdowns where all visitations were suspended. The majority of the survey participants considered the quality and accessibility of visits pre-COVID-19 restrictions to be good despite frequent reports of long distances between homes and prison facilities. During COVID-19 restrictions, however, caregivers reported that children had less contact with their parent, which had detrimental impacts on their wellbeing and the wellbeing of their incarcerated parent. Specifically, while uptake in video visits was described positively as a communication mode allowing parents to read a story to their child or participate in a bedtime routine, the overall consistency and availability of contact was less frequent and secure. This finding has been replicated in studies investigating video visitation across the world. This may be partially attributable to the advent of video visitation largely occurring in tandem with visiting restrictions imposed in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. This has led, in some jurisdictions, to the haphazard adoption of video visitation practices.

There is emerging evidence that video visits can be inferior to contact visits for some children, though benefits remain. Minson and Flynn (2021) explored the implications of COVID-19-related impacts on children with an incarcerated parent in Australia and the United Kingdom via surveys and interviews with families. The authors reported that the lack of face-to-face contact was found to be particularly difficult for pre-verbal and non-verbal children and removal of physical contact was detrimental for young children and children with disability. However, the reduced time and cost involved in video visits, the privacy afforded by video visits, and the capacity for incarcerated parents to engage with children in their everyday routines, including bedtime, were reported by families and caregivers as positive aspects of video visitation.

Problems with video visits are often attributed to lack of access to video visits at prison facilities, lack of support at home (with technology and education or training on how to use video visits), prison policies and implementation practices that restrict visiting times or initiate unexpected lockdowns, and poor quality control of video visit or conferencing applications. The challenges faced by families engaging in video visitation have led some researchers to condemn the transition to video visitation as detracting from the benefits (psychological wellbeing, facility security and reduced recidivism) derived from in-person visitation (see Bou-Rhodes 2019; Fulcher 2014; Murdoch & King 2020). However, many studies investigating the impacts of video visitation point to benefits for children and families (see Horgan & Poehlmann-Tynan 2020; Minson & Flynn 2021).

The present study

The aim of the present study was to understand the perceptions, experiences and ongoing feasibility of video visitation between fathers in prison and their children. The study used a mixed methods design that combined quantitative and qualitative approaches. Conducted in two stages, corrective services in six Australian jurisdictions, fathers in two NSW correctional centres, caregivers of their children, and community organisations supporting families separated by imprisonment in New South Wales were interviewed about their perceptions of the benefits, challenges and limitations of video visitations as well as how they compared to other modes of contact. These qualitative data were supplemented by document and quantitative data analysis on the uptake of video visits.

Stage 1 of this study reports on data from:

- 19 video or telephone interviews with corrective services staff from five Australian jurisdictions (ACT, NSW, Qld, SA, WA) and a written response to the interview questions from one jurisdiction (Vic);
- corrective services data records about the uptake of video visitation (NSW and WA); and
- corrective services policy (ACT, NSW, Qld, SA, Vic and WA) and/or research documents (ACT and NSW) about video visitation.

Stage 2 of this study reports on data from:

- 27 interviews with fathers in prison from two publicly-operated correctional centres in New South Wales;
- 17 interviews with caregivers of children with fathers in these two correctional centres;
- six interviews with support workers from two NSW community organisations that support children and families who have a family member in prison.

Ethical approval to conduct the research was provided by the Aboriginal Health and Medical Research Council and approval or ethics review was obtained from all participating corrective services. The research was supported by an Aboriginal Reference Group comprising Aboriginal cultural advisers with expertise in or experience of culturally safe research, and/or working with Aboriginal people in prison. Fathers in prison were introduced to the research project via posters displayed in communal areas in multiple languages. Fathers signalled interest in participation to staff, who notified the research team. The risk of coercion was managed in interviews with fathers in prison, and staff in corrective services and community organisations, by self-identification for prospective participation and a pre-interview verbal and written briefing highlighting that participation was voluntary, questions could be skipped and the interview could stop at any time.

Results

Overall, there was strong support for video visits and a clear desire for this option to continue to be offered alongside in-person visits. While participants acknowledged that in-person visits were preferable overall, for a wide range of reasons, video visits were considered an excellent complement to visitation modalities. The reasons for this position were myriad, including consideration of the child and carers' wellbeing, pragmatic considerations such as travel time and cost, fathers' mediated access to the child and family's social worlds, and equitable access for visitors overseas or interstate, and those with low mobility or disability. The most commonly reported benefit was that the quality of the relationship between the father and child was enhanced by the visual dimensions of the visit.

Relationship quality

Participants from every group discussed relationship quality as one the major benefits of video visits. Quality was derived from establishing, consolidating or deepening a relationship between the father and child or, less commonly, the father and the child's carer in the community.

If I didn't have the video visit, I wouldn't really have any relationship. (Father 25)

Relationship quality was closely connected to fathers' access to the social world of the child via the audiovisual medium. Unlike in-person visits, during a video visit the child could show, and in turn the father was able to see, the spaces the child inhabits, their toys, pets, awards, and other meaningful items and this was a powerful connector.

In the AVL [audiovisual link] they can show that person their ... 'look at my wall, look at my award', you know, they can help that person see the work they've been doing, or they can see the room or ... they can show them they have painted the house. So, I think it has a connection to the home, which, you know, is a bonus, because that person inside hasn't seen maybe that home or whatever they're showing them in a long time, so I suppose it brings that connection to them to the home. (Service provider 3)

Visual access had two impacts on the father: it allowed him to feel part of the child's life by being up to date and familiar with the things that are important in the child's world and to celebrate important events and milestones. These include birthdays and developmental changes. One carer mentioned that they organised events like blowing out candles on a birthday cake around the times that video visits were scheduled. Another carer described how video visits enabled the child's father to observe some of his 'firsts' but it also provided useful conversation topics to build or deepen the connection.

Carers and fathers stressed how important it was for children to actually see their father. Particularly for young children, video visits enabled some engagement with their father, including pre-verbal infants who could recognise their father.

He can put a face to the name, to the voice, so he can understand who I am. So, if I didn't have the video visits with him, it'd be a lot harder for him to understand who I was. (Father 14)

Fathers mentioned that children could be more themselves on the video visits compared to in-person visits as the in-person visits come with more restrictions. Moreover, fathers said it was very challenging for young children to visit in person as they would get bored or run around, and the video visits offered them an opportunity to talk for a short period and then continue with their normal activities.

They're happy, they're comfortable, they're not shy, they actually want to talk to you. It's not like they have to stay there and talk to you. They can run off and come back. (Father 4)

Similarly, carers acknowledged that children do not necessarily know what to do on video calls and can lose interest quickly. Particularly for young children with limited attention spans, they have the ability to leave and return to the video visit, without having to stay in one spot.

Carers shared the ways that children took charge of the interactions and integrated the father into their play.

Because, I guess, the good thing about doing them on the video is that she just takes him wherever she goes. If she's finished playing with her activities, she's like, 'Okay, we're done now', and she goes on. They go on to the next thing, you know, and it's like he'll be on the trampoline with her. (Carer 11)

Carers used a range of strategies to facilitate a positive video visit. Some caregivers planned ahead to organise activities that would maximise interactions. One caregiver said that the father and child both enjoy a particular kind of lolly, and she always has a packet ready so that they can eat the same snack together.

[The father] really loves those snake lollies, yeah, so every visit that we've done via video I always have a packet here. That way [the child is] eating them with [the father]. (Carer 3)

Like in-person visits, video visits were not always positive experiences and there were times when difficult issues could not be resolved in the time allowed, which is typically shorter than in-person visits.

Visits and motivation for change

Retaining the connection between fathers and children and caregivers not only maintained or improved the quality of those relationships but also provided the father in prison with motivation to keep going and self-manage behaviour. In this regard, both video and in-person visits were highlighted.

We get families, and the one that's quite beautiful actually is we get a young man that hasn't spoken to his mum in 15 years. Now, on the video chat [they are] able to see each other and talk to each other clearly. So that there changes people's lives. It gives a person a reason to keep going. Jail can be quite daunting at times, and it can be quite lonely, it can be quite monotonous, but just that interaction over the internet can make somebody go and say, 'It is all worth it in the end and I'm gonna keep going'... Yeah, that was huge; there was not a dry eye in the house. (Qld staff 4)

It makes me feel like I'm not so much in jail, not as taken away from the world, like throw away the key, locked in a dungeon feeling ... There is hope. I'm gonna be home soon ... Makes me happier to be in prison. (Father 21)

You're opening their eyes to a life they once had, that they now have a realisation that 'I f***ed up and I'm in here, and I can't do it, and maybe I need to start reinventing myself so I can get back to it.' (SA staff 2)

Self-management by people in prison to retain privileges, including visitation, was also mentioned by a number of staff participants.

... they know if they screw around too much they could lose that privilege ... it's called self-management; they know if there's a prisoner gonna go and screw up then they're gonna lose one of their privileges, they'll self-manage themselves and there's nothing wrong with that. (SA staff 2)

While the research design underpinning these data did not include measures of release impacts, participants were asked to reflect on whether video visits might have a post-release impact on the father, child and family. Participants unanimously recognised the positive potential of video visitation, and this is supported by the existing literature on in-person visitation benefits (Wilson & Koons-Witt 2021).

We talk about recidivism and people being able to reintegrate back into society; they have a better chance of success when they maintain those community connections, so if a person is completely cut off it's obviously much more difficult. (NSW staff 1)

Practical arrangements

All participants reported that video visits were often preferable to in-person visits because video visits eased practical concerns such as travel distance, travel costs and the challenges of the prison environment. For people in prison from countries other than Australia, or who had family members overseas, this contact was the only way the distance could be bridged. Some carers did not have a drivers licence so driving to the prison was not an option and video visits filled this gap. Other families would have to travel long distances for a brief visit.

It would have been a six-hour drive each way for a 30-minute visit. Now I couldn't do that to three kids. (Carer 14)

The cost associated with visiting for some families meant that the carer was faced with difficult choices about how to best use limited family resources. In turn, this had an emotional impact on the father in prison.

I love seeing them and they love seeing me, but I felt guilty. Like I said, they'd go without fun stuff all week to come visit me. (Father 25)

Video visits enabled routine interaction, allowing the father to be part of the household to some extent. As previously discussed, this facilitated a quality relationship but also, pragmatically, carers appreciated the flexibility of video visits and how they could be integrated into daily life.

Children are penalised sometimes when children play sport; you know, if they're in something on a Saturday ... well then, they can't come ... So then they don't get to see their parents. (Service provider 3)

Carers were able to have conversations and involve fathers in parenting decisions.

Just because you are incarcerated, right? It does not mean that you are not still a parent, and that you are not still valued in that child's life. You can still parent from behind bars. (Carer 14)

Prison environment

For carers, fathers and service providers, the most notable aspect of the prison environment was its effect on the wellbeing of the child. Video visits were valued by the fathers who said they did not like their children coming into the correctional centre. This was particularly relevant for fathers with young children who worried about their children running off or getting upset, which in turn made the visit stressful. Fathers were also not keen on showing children their life in prison and sometimes children did not know their father was in prison.

I didn't really like them coming in, because jail, there's a lot of bad people in here. And if something happens on a visit, where it has in the past, I don't want the kids to see that because my kids had never seen me do anything, and they've never seen my bad side. (Father 23)

For children with a disability, visits to the prison may be particularly challenging. Several fathers who had children with autism indicated that in-person visits were challenging for their children and video visits were more suitable.

For corrective services staff, the most salient issues relating to the prison environment were the reduction in contraband and the positive effect on behaviour and atmosphere. Participants referred to wellbeing in a range of ways and highlighted both the child's and father's wellbeing. The wellbeing of the caregiver was much less commonly discussed. In the context of video visitation, child wellbeing considerations took several forms. First, it prevented the harms to children associated with in-person visits via screening and security procedures. The security process of prisons was described as being onerous and challenging for many children. It involved lining up and waiting, with children often becoming bored and restless. Particularly during the era of COVID-19 restrictions, carers and children often had to test prior to entering the correctional centre.

The screening process that happens for in-person visits could be quite daunting for children.

On the other hand, video visits might be easier on some children than having to go through the screening process at prison. You know, it's, it's a frightening, frightening experience ... sniffer dogs ... pat-down searches, so that can be quite devastating for some children. (Service provider 2)

Several carers pointed out that the prison environment could be distressing for children. Reasons included the institutional setting and the presence of other inmates.

He was actually being taken to the jail for the visits. He prefers the video calls because being in that environment in the jail ... he was really quite scared at the other inmates around. And yeah, so he actually prefers the video calls. (Carer 14)

While acknowledging that nothing replaced the opportunity for a hug in a face-to-face visit, all carers emphasised that video visits contributed to the wellbeing of their child.

I've dealt with the trauma that comes from kids visiting their fathers in jail. It's not the best place for a child to see its father. They come home with sometimes chips on their shoulders. They come home sometimes devastated that dad can't leave that area, so they come home sometimes crying and stuff like that. So, trauma comes in many different styles, and visiting personally can bring out those traumas or make those traumas happen. So, there's another [way that video visitation] is good. (Qld staff 4)

The reduction in contraband was one of the benefits of video visits most commonly cited by corrective services staff across all jurisdictions. In turn, reduced access to contraband, and particularly illicit substances, meant a safer correctional centre for both staff and prisoners.

Other good benefits that we found, while they stopped physical visits and went to e-visits, was drugs and contraband coming in: it essentially stopped. That's where we get a lot of stuff coming in and that, essentially, went to zero during that time. So it made a huge difference there for the security of the prison, definitely a big benefit. (WA staff 1)

Restricting in-person visits was perceived to constrict opportunities for people in prison to use standover tactics to coerce visitors into bringing contraband into correctional centres, and reduced arguments between people in prison and visitors.

There's been a massive reduction in the introduction of contraband. That's one of the key [areas] that's been really good. People haven't been pressured and assaulted and threatened to bring stuff in with a family member ... there's none of that peer pressure no more. (SA staff 5)

Barriers and challenges to video visits

Physical contact

One of the clear highlights of in-person visits repeatedly identified across participant groups was non-verbal communication, particularly physical affection including the opportunity to hug and hold children and loved ones. In this regard, video visits were lacking, and were considered a 'next best thing' when in-person visits were not an option, or to relieve some of the pressure of only attending visits in-person.

I'm very thankful these video things come about, but nothing is like in-person ... hugs and getting to see him grow—you can't see how tall he gets ... the difference or energy when you can hug him and hold him is different to the video ... So it makes a difference, but contact visits will always be the best visits, I believe, for family in general. (Father 24)

However, there were some contingencies during physical distancing where contact was significantly reduced or disallowed and this disadvantage of video visits was moderated. Similarly, people in prison required to have non-contact visits only were not able to share affection with their family members, reducing the gap between in-person and video visits.

Technical barriers

For the majority of participants, technical barriers related to the video dropping out due to reception problems. In many cases, the reception issues were considered to have largely improved since video visitation was established and therefore was considered a mild inconvenience rather than a major technical issue. However, one of the two prison sites in New South Wales and some of the rural and remote regions in the other jurisdictions were identified as having ongoing reception problems.

It just freezes heaps, like I will be frozen or they will be frozen and most of the time it happens but it depends where you are in the room, I guess 'cause it mustn't pick-up. (Father 1)

Major drawbacks relate to poor internet connectivity. Connectivity and application outages have resulted in a lag to video calls, which causes frustration to the visitor cohort and family/friends, and calls being cancelled. (Vic, written response)

Less commonly, corrective services participants reported that the technical challenges were occurring on the visitors' side of the contact due to problems accessing suitable devices or connecting to the internet. This barrier may be more likely to impact people living in rural and remote communities.

That was a bit of a negative, actually ... for families that didn't have internet reception or mobile phone or an iPad or whatever it was. And again, we're talking probably a very small [group], but it would have affected our Aboriginal cohort and population a lot more than anyone else. (SA staff 4)

The other thing is ... remoter areas have limited 3G and 4G capability. A lot of the remote areas, including here, they're still on 3G. A lot of them will be out of range and not able to do it. (WA staff 1)

While the large majority of NSW correctional centres use the same video visit system, there are some exceptions (private prisons) as well as variation in the number and length of video visits across individual correctional centres. This lack of consistency was identified as a potential source of frustration for some visitors.

It would be really nice if there was consistency across the system as well. And not having different systems in different prisons, because people do get moved around a lot. And so then, every time that most in custody get moved to a new centre, the family has to familiarise themselves with how it all works at the new centre and get used to the technology and work out how it all works and that's really stress-inducing for some people. (Service provider 1)

Overall, carers in New South Wales were satisfied with the booking system and the ease of organising visits. While the platform was identified as easy to use, there were issues with accessing visits. Several carers noted that the video visits were released in the very early hours of the morning, which was difficult. Limitations on available times were also a concern, which could be exacerbated by family conflict or poor communication. With only one visit available per week, some carers noted that the father's other family members 'book from underneath me' (Carer 3) and that they did not know if the visit was already booked until they logged in.

Some participants expressed concerns about the privacy of video visits, as they could hear other calls in progress and vice versa. For this reason, many preferred having video visits in AVL suites where possible, though it should be noted that the lack of privacy generally in video visits mirrored face-to-face experiences.

Everyone has a booth. I was in a cell, in a small room, whatever ... more privacy. We see each other, we see the front ... but you can't talk loud here. You need to be quiet 'cause if there's four of us talking, we can't hear, no one can hear the other ... most of the time, I need to grab my ears, listen, repeat myself a couple of times. That's the only thing here: just more privacy, so we can be more loud. (Father 26)

Security and compliance

The security concerns that presented barriers to the introduction of video visits in many jurisdictions pre-COVID-19 were not realised in the data. Incidents of rule breaking were reported but they were largely characterised as minor infractions, as opposed to security risks, and were not commonly detected. There was a general view among corrective services participants that access to any visit modality was important and this was speculated to be a disincentive to rule breaking. Despite the reportedly low rate of rule breaking, safety, security and rule compliance remained lively concerns.

I mentioned [earlier] people flaunting different parts of their body. When people got used to it [video visits], it didn't happen. So I was surprised how people responded to it, very quickly coming into line with how the government wanted it to operate ... Everybody decided they will follow the rules and they wanted that visit regardless. (Qld staff 4)

They walk past from behind you and they'll stop and they'll listen for a couple seconds and walk off, but they didn't really worry very much. Unless you put someone on a visit that wasn't meant to be on there, they'd say something, but otherwise it's all right. (Father 14)

One of the ways in which this was managed was via the careful monitoring of visitors, particularly with regard to existing orders which prevented contact with particular people including family members, current or former partners or children. In this way, video visits mirrored in-person visits. However, one carer noted that she was verbally abused during a video visit in front of her children, and expressed concerns about whether the visits were adequately monitored. Like all contacts, video visits have the potential to be used as a coercive tool and this important issue warrants further research.

Summary and conclusions

On the whole, widespread uptake of video visitation in prisons is a positive outcome emerging from the challenging experience of the pandemic. Although this research focused on fathers' experiences, the results may be more broadly applicable to all parents in prison. The challenges of family separation are experienced by mothers and fathers. Moreover, there was congruence in the perceived benefits and limitations of video visits across the diverse sample of fathers in this research, indicating shared perceptions and experiences.

The use of video visitation technology has been met by corrective services with enthusiasm and goodwill, largely viewed as an opportunity for innovation in a setting that has historically been slow to introduce change. Key messages that emerged from the research are as follows.

A window into the child's world

Video visitation enables incarcerated fathers to enter the social world of their child in ways never before possible. Through video chats, fathers can be 'present' virtually for milestones and special events. They can share interactions with their child while the child remains in the comfort of their own home, supporting the child's emotional regulation as compared to the potentially stressful prison setting. Fathers can see things in the child's environment, such as a new pet, or a new home, with a depth that could not be captured by photographs. This new level of access can enable fathers to be more attuned to what is happening in their children's lives, strengthening their capacity to parent their children and maintain their emotional relationship. However, it is important to stress that video visits are a complement to and enhancement of, rather than a replacement for, in-person visits, which enable essential physical touch and interaction.

Father engagement in video visitation

Some fathers are able to engage in child-focused ways during video visits and take on their child's perspective. However, others found interactions more challenging. Fathers could be supported to prepare for the visits to enable meaningful interactions—for example, by thinking through beforehand what they would like to talk about with their children. Carers also encouraged fathers to be mindful of their moods before going into the visit as this can impact the quality of the visit. As video visits develop in the future, opportunities to connect visits with other parenting-focused initiatives, such as creative story writing and reading, should be explored to achieve compound benefits.

Balancing safety and privacy

Given the newness of video visitation, issues are arising which require policy attention. One significant concern that emerged from the research is the potential for coercive control. Corrective services will need to balance the desire for privacy with the need to monitor the potential for abusive or otherwise unsafe interactions.

Providing equitable access

The research uncovered some issues around equitable access to video visitation, related to booking policies as well as availability of technology. A ‘first come, first served’ policy for booking video visitations meant that, in large extended family networks with complex dynamics, slots for video visits could be dominated by one person, while another was unable to book a visit. In situations where there are different carers of a father’s children (who may not communicate with each other), a quota system could allow each child a minimum number of monthly visits with their father. There are also issues with access to video visitation technology, which relies on internet connection and may not be available to families in remote areas.

To date, the focus of corrective services has been on what we term ‘Video visitation 1.0’—ensuring that incarcerated people can see and communicate with their loved ones. Now that the pandemic has subsided, and it is clear that video visitation will continue going forward, corrective services are turning to the question of how else video visitation can be used, especially around procedures for in-cell technology use. We suggest that this evolution to ‘Video visitation 2.0’ should centre on how video visitation can be more effectively use to support quality contact that can strengthen and enhance relationships between prisoners and their families, especially children.

References

URLs correct as at November 2023

Australian Bureau of Statistics 2023. *Corrective Services, Australia: National and state information about adult prisoners and community based corrections including legal status, custody type, Indigenous status, sex*. March Quarter 2023. <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/crime-and-justice/corrective-services-australia/latest-release>

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2015. *The health of Australia’s prisoners 2015*. AIHW cat. no. PHE 207. Canberra: AIHW

Bartlett TS & Trotter CJ 2019. Did we forget something? Fathering supports and programs in prisons in Victoria, Australia. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 63(8): 1465–1481. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X19828575>

Bou-Rhodes A 2019. Straight to video: America’s inmates deprived of a lifeline through video-only visits. *Boston College Law Review* 60: 1243–1278

Casey-Acevedo K & Bakken T 2002. Visiting women in prison: Who visits and who cares? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 34(3): 67–83. https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v34n03_05

- De Claire K & Dixon L 2017. The effects of prison visits from family members on prisoners' well-being, prison rule breaking, and recidivism: A review of research since 1991. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse* 18(2): 185–199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838015603209>
- Folk JB, Stuewig J, Mashek D, Tangney JP & Grossman J 2019. Behind bars but connected to family: Evidence for the benefits of family contact during incarceration. *Journal of Family Psychology* 33(4): 453–464. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000520>
- Fulcher PA 2014. The double-edged sword of prison video-visitation: Claiming to keep families together while furthering the aims of the prison industrial complex. *Florida A&M University Law Review* 9(1): 83–112. <https://commons.law.famu.edu/famulawreview/vol9/iss1/5>
- Harris ZL & Landreth GL 1997. Filial therapy with incarcerated mothers: A five week model. *International Journal of Play Therapy* 6(2): 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0089408>
- Hayes D, Butler M, Devaney J & Percy A 2018. Allowing imprisoned fathers to parent: Maximising the potential benefits of prison based parenting programmes. *Child Care in Practice* 24(2): 181–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13575279.2017.1420038>
- Horgan ES & Pöhlmann-Tynan J 2020). In-home video chat for young children and their incarcerated parents. *Journal of Children and Media* 14(3): 400–406. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2020.1792082>
- McCarthy D & Adams M 2017. Prison visitation as human 'right' or earned 'privilege'? The differing tales of England/Wales, and Scotland. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law* 39(4): 403–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2017.1390292>
- McLeod BA & Bonsu J 2018. The benefits and challenges of visitation practices in correctional settings: Will video-visitation assist incarcerated fathers and their children? *Children and Youth Services Review* 93: 30–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.07.004>
- Minson S & Flynn C 2021. Symbiotic harms of imprisonment and the effect on children's right to family life: Comparing the impact of Covid-19 prison visiting restrictions in the UK and Australia. *International Journal of Children's Rights* 29(2): 305–325. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718182-29020011>
- Murdoch DJ & King LL 2020. "Not feeling like a caged animal": Prisoner perceptions of a remote video-visitation system. *Journal of Crime and Justice* 43(2): 212–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2019.1653216>
- Payne JL & Hanley N 2020. COVID-19 and corrections in Australia: A summary review of the available data and literature. *Victims & Offenders* 15(7–8): 1367–1384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2020.1829226>
- Productivity Commission 2023. *Report on government services 2023*. <https://www.pc.gov.au/ongoing/report-on-government-services/2023/justice/corrective-services>
- Schubert EC, Duininck M & Schlafer RJ 2016. Visiting mom: A pilot evaluation of a prison-based visiting program serving incarcerated mothers and their minor children. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation* 55(4): 213–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2016.1159641>

Shlafer RJ & Poehlmann J 2010. Attachment and caregiving relationships in families affected by parental incarceration. *Attachment & Human Development* 12(4): 395–415. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616730903417052>

Wilson A & Koons-Witt B 2021. 'They still know I'm their momma': Incarcerated mothers' perceptions of reunification and resuming a caregiver role. *Feminist Criminology* 16(5): 583–606. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085120983468>

Dr Natalia Hanley is a Senior Lecturer in Criminology at the University of Wollongong.

Dr Elisabeth Duursma is a Research Theme Fellow at the Transforming early Education and Child Health (TeEACH) Research Centre, Western Sydney University.

Professor Amy Conley Wright is Director of the Research Centre for Children and Families at the University of Sydney.

Dr Helen Simpson is a Lecturer in Criminology at the University of Wollongong.

Laura Metcalfe is a Research Assistant at the Research Centre for Children and Families at the University of Sydney.

General editor, *Trends & issues in crime and criminal justice* series: Dr Rick Brown, Deputy Director, Australian Institute of Criminology. Note: *Trends & issues in crime and criminal justice* papers are peer reviewed. For a complete list and the full text of the papers in the *Trends & issues in crime and criminal justice* series, visit the AIC website: www.aic.gov.au

ISSN 1836-2206 (Online) ISBN 978 1 922877 24 6 (Online)
<https://doi.org/10.52922/ti77246>

©Australian Institute of Criminology 2024

GPO Box 1936
Canberra ACT 2601, Australia
Tel: 02 6268 7166

Disclaimer: This research paper does not necessarily reflect the policy position of the Australian Government

www.aic.gov.au