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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION OF THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

In 1991 there were over 45,000 women incarcerated in prisons across the United States which represents a 140% increase in the past ten years (American Correctional Association, 1991). It is quite apparent from numerous sources that women are being arrested and sent to prison more often than any time in our nation's history. While the theoretical perspectives differ on this phenomena, the common factor with female criminality and corrections are that 70-80% of incarcerated women are mothers and had an average of 2.5 dependent children living with them prior to arrest and imprisonment (McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978; Baunach, 1985; Zalba, 1964; Glick & Neto, 1977). While no exact national figure of how many children whose mothers are incarcerated exists, it can be projected from prevalence studies that between 100,000-125,000 dependent children are in this situation across the United States. Everyday in Ohio it is estimated that 4,400 children deal with the loneliness, confusion, anger and helplessness brought upon them by their mother’s incarceration (Glick & Neto, 1977).
The children of female inmates in the State of Ohio are an unidentified population. No data is kept on the number of children who are affected by the state's intervention of incarcerating their mothers. In fact, no data is kept on females to determine if they are mothers once they are imprisoned. Using data from McGowan & Blumenthal's (1978) and Henriques's (1982) study of female mothers in New York City Ricker's Jail, it is estimated that 85% of these children are under the age of ten years old.

The remainder of the chapter will examine several of the social dimensions of the problem of needing to care for children who are often abandoned, placed with extended kinship families, frequently moved around and dealing with loss, fear, stigma and stability while their mothers are in prison. The problems of inmate mothers and the effects on her psychosocial well-being, her children and the caretakers of her children will be summarized.

EFFECTS ON MOTHER IN JAIL

One of the major requisites for maintaining a society is the socialization of children within the parental environment (Smygerki, 1955). In American society, this cultural task has been transferred to the mother. The social sanctions imposed on an incapable or unfit mother by
the legal system is strongly evident in the case of imprisoned females (Sametz, 1980; Palmer, 1972). Most researchers have taken the convenience of prison inmates and studied the psychosocial impact of child separation on the mother. Therefore, the literature is abundant and consistent on the effects of personality traits in female inmates.

The strongest negative impact on incarcerated mothers being separated from their children is the sense of loss which has been analogous to the crisis of divorce or death of a loved one (Browne, 1989). The loss of the parenting role fosters a feeling of inadequacy in light of social expectations. This is further reinforced by the stringent prison rules that limit communication and visitation between the parent and the child. The loss of control fosters a feeling of helplessness further adding to the personal sense of loss in the mother (Baunach, 1982, 1985).

Accompanying the loss of control, separation and helplessness of the mother is the overshadowing fear of the unknown. The literature states that the inmate mother toward the latter part of her incarceration becomes distressed over the issue of reunification with the children. The fear of being rejected by her children due to the prolonged separation becomes a psychological stress.
The concern over being personally capable of readjusting to parenting and how the children will react to her reasserting her maternal role is worrisome. The fear that the caretaker and children have bonded and both may not want to give up the relationship after she has been released is an overriding fear of many pre-release status mothers (Friedman & Esselstyn, 1965; Stanton, 1980; Baunach, 1985; Browne, 1989).

INMATE MOTHERS AND CHILDREN

Existing research reports indicate that incarcerated mothers prior to prison were predominately poor, receiving welfare assistance and are over represented by minorities (Glick & Neto, 1977; Zalba, 1964). Therefore, one can infer that these prisoners and their children were living in poverty prior to arrest and most certainly the children are now residing in poverty and dependent on public assistance in some format. Limited field research on the children of incarcerated mothers has been done as to their living arrangements while the mother is in prison, psychosocial effects of their loss due to maternal child separation and their general well being during the parent’s period of incarceration (Friedman & Esselstyn, 1965; Henriques, 1982).
Hairston and Hess (1989) studied incarcerated mothers and concluded that incarceration in a locked environment makes an unsurmountable obstacle to the parenting process and severely disrupts family relationships. From a mother's perspective, the mother-child relationship is effectively destroyed by incarceration and the feelings of loss, failure and separation as a mother has been added to the feelings of societal rejection and sanctioning due to criminality. The social degradation, feelings of inadequacy, stress and remorse associated with child rearing further distances the child-parent relationship (McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978; Baunach, 1982, 1985).

A scarcity of research exists as to the impact on children to a mother's separation due to imprisonment. What research can be found implies that parental absence contributes to the unhealthy psychosocial adjustment of these children (Friedman & Esselstyn, 1965; McCord & McCord, 1958). In most case studies, the past research has focused on the absence of a male parent rather than the mother. Since most female inmates are/were poor, single head of household and on public assistance, the studies of past childhood adjustment due to having an incarcerated parent may not hold up to contemporary social situations and the "Feminization-of-Poverty" (Sidel, 1984).
CHILD PLACEMENT

Who cares for the children of inmate mothers? This question has tremendous significance for parents, children and public child-serving agencies. With the typical inmate being in poverty with children, the issue of appropriate placement, living arrangements and children's well-being should have a significant involvement of the public child welfare and domestic court personnel. Foster care, court approved placements, legal guardianships and appropriate extended kinship placements are central to the inmate and the children's well-being (Feinman, 1986; Zalba, 1964). The literature is very scarce and wide ranging on public agency involvement with this class of youths and anywhere from 10% to 38% of the children are in custodial care of the courts (Feinman, 1986; Zalba, 1964; Sack et. al., 1976; Beckerman, 1989; Stanton, 1980; Henriques, 1982). We have very little knowledge, research and data that clearly shows an answer to who cares for children of inmate mothers and even less on the psychosocial well-being of the children in those placements and the eventual long-term outcome of these children's lives.

The responsibility for the placement of children before a mother's incarceration is a significant factor for the well being of both the mother and children during the
separation period (Baunach, 1982). A majority of mothers do not relinquish legal custody of their children and rely on relatives as a placement (McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978; Zalba, 1964; Howize, 1989; Carmouche & Jones, 1989; Hess & Hariston, 1989). The issue becomes that once a mother works out a caretaker plan prior to her prison time, she has little, if any, control over relative decision making or public agency involvement while she is incarcerated. Almost all inmate mothers want parental involvement during their absence and also plan on reuniting with their children and re-establishing a parental role upon release (Baunach, 1982, 1985). Prisons and correctional programs essentially sever, limit and curtail parental responsibility. The lack of communication with the mother and the caretakers decimates the parenting self-esteem of inmates. The literature indicates that very few correctional programs address this issue and in fact many states have formal statutes limiting female inmate’s visits with children (Palmer, 1972).

EFFECTS ON CHILDREN OF MOTHERS IN JAIL

There has been little research on the psychosocial impacts on personality development of children whose mothers have been incarcerated. A significant number of children are separated from their mothers during the early stages of
child development when parent-child bonding and relationships are formed. Henriques (1982) found that 85% of children of prison mothers are under the age of ten. The negative impacts on children denied maternal relationships in these formative developmental periods should be seen in later stages of development in terms of psychosocial problems and unhealthy personality traits. Second, the incarceration of mothers impacts on children since the youths are often moved abruptly from their surroundings, schools and communities. A change in caretakers, role models and friendships occurs (McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978; Henriques, 1982). In school age children, the impact of changing schools, explanations to peers and school officials about a mother’s whereabouts stigmatizes children. The effects of teasing from peers about a child’s mother in prison and the shunning of children by peers has been reported as effecting children to become withdrawn, under perform in school and gravitate to negative peer groups (Henriques, 1982; McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978; Stanton, 1980).

Finally, the most cited field research done related to the psychosocial impacts on personality of fifteen children whose mothers are incarcerated, comes from Henriques (1982). This research is over 11 years old and has a very small
sample. Quantitatively and qualitatively we know little about the psychosocial problems of children of incarcerated mothers and the quality of placements that children reside within during a mother’s prison term.

BEGINNING RESEARCH QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY

Beginning to formulate the problem and questions of interest to be studied will be taken from the limited quantitative research found in the literature. During the course of this study, additional research questions may emerge from qualitative data from participants and key informants.

1. After a mother is arrested, adjudicated and sentenced, who is responsible for the well being of her children?

2. Who do the children live with during this separation and does anyone evaluate the caretakers of the children as to what or how they provide for the child’s well-being?

3. How does the mother’s incarceration and absence effect the psychosocial status of the children?

4. What effect does incarceration have on the mother-child relationships for both parent and child?
5. What has been the response of local human service and child welfare agencies to provide an array of needed services, environmental, psychological and social to the children during a mother's absence?

CHOOSING AN EXPLORATORY RESEARCH DESIGN TO STUDY CHILDREN, INMATE MOTHERS AND CARETAKERS

During the literature search to explore this social problem for possible research, one encounters very few pieces of research that specifically address the question of the psychosocial effects on children due to maternal separation and incarceration. The scarcity is further exacerbated when looking for any field research on the "caretakers" of children due to maternal incarceration. In discussions on attempting to find existing data on this social problem from local publicly mandated agencies such as corrections, child welfare agencies, children's mental health and public assistance professionals, it became apparent that baseline data would have to be generated by the researcher.

This study of children of incarcerated mothers is intended as generating hypotheses. As the framework, identification of the problem and description of problem takes shape, the initial research questions will guide the research, data collection and methodology. As the data
generating strategies begin to focus the research, the emerging data will require the research to be flexible based on a more reflective practitioners' approach (Schon, 1984).

**PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY**

The basic purpose of this study is to identify and examine a sample of the population of young children whose mothers are incarcerated in Ohio prisons. Specifically, data will be collected, analyzed and presented in such a manner that trends, profiles and characteristics concerning the psychosocial well-being of children can be isolated with valid and reliable accuracy. Local caretakers of the children will be profiled to determine their ability to be positive role models, and likewise, inmate mothers will be examined.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

This exploratory study will contribute to the body of knowledge concerning children's needs while mothers are serving time in prison. The research design and methodology will generate first-hand data collected directly from children, caretakers of these children and key informants. Direct participant observation, psychometric testing and diagnostic interviewing will be done in a mix of quantitative
and qualitative strategies and settings. This approach is quite different than the past research that bases its conclusions on perceptions given by mothers and child welfare professionals through quantitative analysis of questionnaires and structured interviews.

The literature shows descriptive data concerning the caretakers of children, but the in-depth analysis of the quality of the child placement has never been done. This research purports to be the first attempt to shed light on who is watching the children of incarcerated mothers. The study could be the baseline research for others to build upon.

Finally, the extent of direct child contact in past research has been very limited. Some of the major and most quoted literature does not report the number of children directly interviewed by a researcher and some literature generalizes its findings on a sample of 15 children directly interviewed. This research will attempt to access a significantly higher number of children and provide a quantitative and qualitative analyses of the psychosocial status of children using respected psychological testing instruments and valid and reliable naturalistic inquiry.
LOCATION OF THE STUDY

The sample of female offenders, children and caretakers will come from the Franklin Pre-release Center which is a secure facility for female felons in the Ohio correctional system. Most respondents and subjects will come from the greater Columbus, Ohio region, therefore, the uniqueness of such a geographic location and its norms, demographics and culture may limit the research generalizations to the entire domain of all incarcerated mothers, children and their caretakers.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into five sections, each of which directly or indirectly discusses part of the dimension of the problem of inmate mothers, the children and the caretakers of the children. At the end of each section a summary of the literature and the theoretical considerations that guided the research design are presented. The chapter is divided into the following sections:

Section 1) **Causation of Female Crime** - Prior to the study of children and caretakers of inmate mothers, the antecedent act of being arrested and incarcerated must be elaborated to provide the theoretical framework for the study of the proceeding effects on children and placement of those children.

Section 2) **Maternal Deprivation and Separation** - To understand the psychosocial impacts on children due to a mother’s incarceration and proceeding behavior, the theories on separation during childhood development are elaborated.

Section 3) **Adult Home Environments And The Social And Moral Development of Children** - The study of children and their well being based on cognitive development and social learning provides an overview of the various theories of prosocial adult parenting and childhood development. The home environment of the
child prior to a mother's arrest and the subsequent placement with a surrogate parental environment should provide a richer understanding of the psychosocial impact on children and their social development.

Section 4) Review of the Major Studies on Incarcerated Women and Children - This literature review of the findings, methods and data analysis help guide the researcher in avoiding pitfalls in research design. It further allows a close review of gaps in the literature as well as identifies consistent themes and findings.

Section 5) Summary of Literature Review

Section I: Causation of Female Crime

Criminality of men or women is an observable act done by an individual and the theoretical explanations for the deviant behavior is grounded in three major groupings - biological, psychological, and socioenvironmental. In summary, the biological explanations theorize that the genetics of an individual determines his/her tendency to engage in criminal behavior, the individual had faulty childhood development and delayed personality development and chooses to do crimes, and thirdly, the interaction of an individual with societal structures leads to criminal behavior.
Biological Perspective:

Lombroso & Ferrero (1903/1916) of the "Italian School" of criminology attempted to apply biology to the study of female criminality. Using phrenology and physical body structure types, they projected a description of the female offenders. In essence, they contended that genetical predetermined factors directly cause female crime and pathological behavior. In regard to the size of the skull, facial features and body type, if the female is oversized and more male-like, then she is likely to engage in criminal behaviors.

Thomas & Thomas (1907) furthered the biological deterministic perspective by theorizing that men are catabolic and are rapid consumers of energy and females are anabolic and less destructive of energy. The premise was that the oversized female becomes more male-like (catabolic) and will engage in more behaviors that are destructive and pathological compared to her gender. Similarly, Crowie, Crowie & Slater (1968) examined female delinquents and concurred that oversized girls in theory and practice do in essence commit more crime and exhibit aggressive behaviors. They further contend that the chromosomal make-up of male and females using the XX or XY determinants of gender are associated with crime. They theorize that there is a cause
and effect relationship to the female criminal having multiple Y chromosomes. The premise is that too much "Y" increases masculinity and therefore, crime since criminal behavior is largely a male dominated social phenomena.

Pollock (1950) studied menstruation, pregnancy and menopause and the relationship of female hormonal changes to criminality. The author felt that female chemically induced deviance occurs due to tension, stress and brain physiology changes based on hormones. Dalton (1960) found that premenstrual periods are significantly related to committing crimes by adult female offenders. Ellis & Austin (1971) report that during the hormonal and menstrual cycles in a wide age range of female inmates that an increase in aggressive acts such as fights and prison incidents are both directly related. These findings support the biologically based theory on female criminality.

The biologically based theories on female criminality are generally refuted as being too narrow, ignoring the psychosocial influences of social interaction and basically flawed in methodology because of the inability to control for intervening factors (Crites, 1976). The biological theories of female criminality provides little assistance to this research project.
Psychological Theories of Female Crime

The theoretical perspectives of psychological explanations of criminal behavior generally fall into two major areas—Freudian psychoanalytic and faulty personality development of individuals within family environments. Freud (1933) contended that while the biological basis of female crime lies in the lack of a penis, the personal sense of inadequacy and constant cognitive battle to find homeostasis between the id, ego and superego leads to deviant behaviors. The breakdown of the ego and superego functions to regulate the instinctual drives creates pathological behaviors. Penis envy, oedipal complex, identification with the appropriate gender are but a few examples that females must overcome in the psychological development of a healthy personality. Mann (1984) contends that for over fifty years the Freudian perspective and its practitioners have dominated the study of female deviance looking for sexual rationales to support this "penis envy" generalization.

Psychological Personality Development Within Family Environments

This perspective bases the individual female relationships within the context of their parental interactions as a major factor in determining criminality. Massey (1976) contends in the social learning stage of
imprinting that preschool age children within the family environment are effected by forming long-term behaviors through observation and modeling the adult behaviors. Girls who either by modeling social behaviors of a parental authority figure or by negative experiences with a parent develop low self esteem, poor self concepts, problems with authority and personality traits that effect long-term behavior. Lewis's (1969) explanation of the culture of poverty theorizes that large families who are poor and have low socioeconomic status with a female single parent cannot adequately provide a prosocial family environment since mothers are in day-to-day economic survival. Females raised in an environment with a lack of positive experiences in the community and home internalize stress and develop psychological defense mechanisms that are unhealthy and cognitively restructured as analgesic thinking patterns that she will perpetuate in later life as a parent (Beeghley, 1983).

The major premise of these theories are that many forces within the family work against healthy personality development. An individual child's failure to mitigate and resolve the negative forces will lead to deviance in later stages of life.
Socioecological Theories of Female Criminality

These theories can generally be grouped into three categories. First is the socioeconomic group that equates poverty and the necessity to commit nonviolent property offenses for personal financial survival due to a discriminatory labor market. Second are the socialization and role theories and third, the feminist movement. While many sociological theories overarch with psychological theories in such areas as socialization patterns within families, the main premise of sociological theories are that the social environment causes female criminality in individuals, whereas the developmental and cognitive development theorist view the individual’s desire to engage in criminal activity as their main premise.

Socioeconomic theories contend that the causes of female crime appear rooted in the economic system. Smelzer (1961) theorized that the need of the industrial revolution to move from a cottage industry to a manufacturing based economy has caused a disruption in the extended family structure and that the nuclear family is best suited to today’s society rather than past family centered cottage system. While women had a strong partnership in the cottage system, the industrial factories forced her to now stay home and child rear or be forced in to the low paying service
industries. Sidel (1984) contends that the American capitalist system punishes women who have children and that child rearing demands, create a forced dependency on public assistance and blocked opportunities to good paying jobs. These are major factors in the "feminization of poverty." Edelman (1987) contends that the labor market has excluded females from competition for jobs and that social indicators show that the increases in pathological behaviors of women in general are increasing due to poverty.

Role theorists contend that females have been socialized by our culture to be more emotionally expressive, concerned about others, interdependent on emotional support systems and less aggressive in reaching goals (Gilligan, 1976). Thomas (1923) appears to have been the earliest theorist who suggests the socialization of females leads them to be less detectable in criminal behavior than males since they are more protected and supervised more closely, therefore more deceitful and non-observable in behaviors. Sociologists contend that the changing role of females in today's society has affected criminality. Social systems have blocked females in many economic spheres. Using Ohlin & Cloward's (1960) blocked opportunity theory on legitimate and illegitimate means to attain goals many authors have attempted to show female crime as a means to achieve
economic and social success (Adler, 1975; Cernkovich & Giordano, 1979). Since the roles of females are changing and the frustration increasing due to blocked opportunities, some contend that females gravitate to negative behaviors since their bonds to the larger society are weak or broken (Hirshi, 1969, 1991).

The supporters of the feminist movement and its effect on crime theorize that female crime is on the increase due to more women entering the labor market in the 1970s and therefore have a greater chance to commit white collar crimes than any other time in our history (Simon, 1975). Adler (1975) contends that as women become more equal in terms of legal rights, that they now will engage in criminal patterns that were predominately male. Crites (1976), Smarts (1976), Rans (1978) and several others refute the notion that the rise in female consciousness, equal opportunity and the feminist movement creates more crime. Critics contend that the criminality of women is still a predominant behavior of those in poverty based on statistical profiles of incarcerated females and prevalence studies of arrest rates. Recently, Unified Crimes Reports (1991) confirm that female crime is centralized in the poor, the young adult and the minority person living in an urban area.
The final perspective on female crime is the phenomena of the 1980s in terms of drug abuse laws, usage and arrest rates of females. The "war on drugs" and increased police practices on limiting drug trafficking has resulted in three important effects on female arrest rates. One, women are arrested and imprisoned more often for drug law violation; two, there is an increase in the arrest of minority females that use, deal or horde in the inner city crack cocaine trade and three, the construction of prisons to fight the war on drugs. Institutional theorists contend that if you build more female correctional beds, then the judiciary will fill them (Miller, 1991). In this theory, the black, female, nonviolent drug offender has been targeted as a social issue by policing practices and will be incarcerated in prison if beds exist.

Summary of Theoretical Perspectives on Female Crime and Usefulness to the Study of Children of Incarcerated Parents

The reasons for the review of the theories on female criminality are to provide a framework to understand why females are incarcerated and therefore the precondition that leads to the study of children of inmate mothers. It is apparent that no single theory can explain female crime. It is multidimensional, multifaceted, interinstitutional and a culturally complex social phenomena. The nature of the
complexity of the problem and the major or most significant
causal factors and ways to measure the power of their
effects are well beyond the scope of this research. But,
within the theoretical domain of female criminality there
exists theoretical perspectives that directly focus a study
of inmate mothers and their children. Lewis's (1969) theory
on the culture of poverty and the psychological influence on
children raised in families in poverty is helpful to access
the impact of the maternal role on children. This is
especially interesting since a recent profile (Henriques
1982) indicates that incarcerated mothers are: poor and on
public assistance - 90%, mostly black - 60%, undereducated -
65%, unskilled or never employed - 66%, younger adults - 28
years old, recidivists of crime - 68% and have had 2-3
dependent children at the time of arrest. The
internalization of personality traits of children raised in
"cultural of poverty" households should be evident in this
research project. From a socioeconomic perspective, Sidel's
(1984) "feminization of poverty" provides a framework to
access the impact of the economic labor market on females
and their children and the dependency on public assistance.
Beeghley's (1983) "cycle of poverty" frames the research
from an institutional perspective on how blocked
opportunities create socialization patterns in low income
families, therefore, affecting children's behavior reactions to stress. Cloward & Ohlin's (1960) opportunity theory provides a partial framework to access the question of females engaging in illegitimate means such as drug trafficking to maintain self esteem and status and how this may affect the socialization of young children being raised by a drug law violating mother. Hirishi's (1969) "social control theory" has a premise that negative experiences with the larger social structure alienate persons, therefore poor females engage in criminal behaviors since there is a weakened feeling of commitment to follow rules. The socialization of a child by mothers with little respect for societal social controls should be evident in the children of incarcerated mothers. Finally, Reckless’s (1967) theory on socialized containment of criminal activities through parenting skills does seem to be influential in studying children of inmate mothers.

The theoretical discussion of children of inmate mothers is directly associated with poverty, single parenthood, criminal life styles and child rearing techniques of the adult mother. Children socialized in a parental environment with the above descriptors have to deal with numerous obstacles to maintain a healthy and prosocial psychological development. Secondly, the social learning
theorists indicate that children raised in these environments internalize behavior patterns that will become more overt as negative behaviors in later stages of their lives. Therefore, the multigenerational cycles of poverty, criminal behavior and poor parenting should be evident in this research project. If the literature is correct then high correlations should exist between an inmate mother's own life style and the life style of the inmate's parents and consequently the older children of inmate mothers should become more evident in measurable areas such as school suspensions, delinquency and teenage illegitimate births.

Section II: Theories on the Impact of Maternal Deprivation on Childhood Development

Freud (1894) is generally the theorist who is credited with the psychological dimension of maternal-child bonding and states that the ongoing interaction of mother and child is the starting point of all later stage development in children. Freud contends that if a mother is unable to provide physical nurturance during this period of time when a young child is helpless and totally dependent, that this will create long-term personality dysfunctioning in their offspring. Burlingham and Anna Freud (1942) postulated that anxiety and depression in adults is an outgrowth of
maternal-child separation episodes that occurred when a child was very young. They based their support for this theory on several years of observing infants in a nursery and interviews with adults in regressive psychotherapy.

Bowlby's attachment theory (Bowlby, 1952, 1956) theorizes that young children require physical nurturance by a mother and that this evolves into a psychological attachment of trust, compliance in children to a mother's wishes and is the basis for future prosocial development. If a young child does not form this maternal attachment due to separation for prolonged periods of time then they will lack impulse control and that this disrupts future attempts at socialization and developmental stage progression. In Bowlby's (1973) writing on "attachment theory" he concludes that disruption in maternal-child relationships for prolonged periods of time leads to a three-stage response in children. First is distress, then despair and finally detachment from others and society in general.

Several theorists, building on Freud's initial work on maternal-child bonding, discuss severely disrupted mother-child relationships as being evident in psychopathic behaviors of adults. Fairbairn (1941), Bender & Yarnell (1942) and Odier (1948) began to restructure Freud's theory on separation anxiety and the effects and responses of a
young child's fear of losing the object of their love. The general theme in the psychoanalytic literature concludes that disrupted mother-child bonding is the basis for future pathology in terms of anxiety, lack of controlling stress, alienation, frustration and anger and inability to form close relationships (Sullivan, 1953; Westheimer, 1970; Ainsworth, 1972; Anderson, 1972; Roberson, 1971). While the psychoanalytic emphasis did much to mobilize concern for the effects of maternal deprivation in young children, it has been criticized for being overly generalized, based on very small qualitative studies and is sexist (Yarrow, 1963).

Developmental psychologists have begun to take a more scientific approach to the study of the reactions of young children at the time of maternal separation. Spitz & Wolf (1946) were the first to provide research based on detailed behavioral observations of 123 young infants undergoing maternal separation anxiety in an institutional setting. They conclude that a predictable syndrome of behaviors occurs in at least 10% of infants and toddlers. Initially, there is acute anxiety, active rejection of substitute mothers and finally symptoms of severe depression as evidenced by decreased activity levels, loss of appetite and withdrawal from people. The research noted a progression in severity of disturbance over time and concludes that if infants are
not reunited with their mothers within five months, irreparable damage is done.

Long-term effects of maternal separation was first studied by Bowlby (1944) on the case histories of 14 juvenile offenders who were all diagnosed as having serious difficulties in interpersonal relationships. Twelve of the 14 youths had been separated from their mothers in infancy and early childhood. Similarly, Bender (1947) studied adult mental patients and concluded that multiple maternal-child separation episodes affected these patients by leaving them with inadequately developed impulse controls. Gregory (1958) studied psychiatric patients and found that the loss of mothers due to death prior to the patient being ten years of age had a significant impact on mental status. Pringle & Bossio (1958) studied institutionalized children who were diagnosed as severely maladjusted and concluded that 9 of the 11 subjects had been separated from their mother during the first year of life. The early developmental psychologists suggest that the separation of a child from their mothers for prolonged periods of time during childhood is directly related to a child being institutionalized in either correctional or psychiatric facilities in later life.

Yarrow (1964) theorized that negative maternal separation effects on young children can be reduced if early
in infancy a substitute mother can be established prior to the mother-child bond develops. He concludes that maternal child separation, either short term or long term, is most severe if an infant and mother have formed a focused relationship. He contends that the most damaging time period for this to occur is 6 months to two years of age since an established stable affectional relationship has been formed. The other damaging affect on separation prior to six months of age is that a child may never have had the opportunity to establish a focused relationship and therefore be permanently impaired in the ability to form close relationships. Yarrow's recommendation that the substitution of a close maternal-caretaker relationship for the child immediately after mother-child separation will decrease the risks of development delays in young children.

The need for love and security from birth requires a stable, continuous and dependable relationship. The need for security in familial relationships where attitudes and behaviors are consistent and dependable are required. Pringle (1970) contends that it is the quality of the dependable family relationships that is the basic ingredient to a child's psychological development especially with its mother. Maternal expectation and discipline which are consistent, bad or good, enhance a child's sense of security.
by providing a predictable framework. A stable family life and routine provides children with a sense of continuity. As Bowlby contends (1971), if a child's emotional attachment and bonding with its mother is continually broken for periods of time or never satisfactorily established then later stage development both intellectually and socially is seriously affected. Rutter's (1972) study on lower socioeconomic families in London reports that if a parent figure is absent for long periods of time, young boys are at greater risk to commit delinquent behavior and young girls of having illegitimate babies. He suggests that the lack of parental role modeling deprives a child of social learning and, therefore, delays maturity which is exhibited during the teenage years.

Cognitive developmental psychologists such as Piaget (1932, 1965), Erikson (1960) and Kohlberg (1969, 1975) have reported that there are crucial stage requirements and competence tasks that must be mastered by children prior to moving in to a more advanced stage of intellectual maturity. Social cognition and appropriate behaviors are usually noticed in children during the pre-adolescent stage and since there is a hierarchy of mature thinking and resulting actions they are more easily detectable at this stage. The ability to separate from one stage of social development and
"decenter" into a new more advanced socially acceptable thinking and behavior pattern may be gravely impaired if there is no continuity in a child's life. He/she does not have the opportunity to experience prolonged activities and master the tasks if a parental home environment or caretaker system is constantly disrupted and unstable. Kohlberg's (1963) study of delinquent teenagers reports in his cognitive developmental model that delayed moral maturity and the inability to gain prosocial experiences stop cognitive development at stage II. Stage II is described as a self centered, narcissistic and egocentric phase where demanding behaviors and the desire to receive rather than to give are found. Kohlberg implies that a lack of consistent prosocial parenting for prolonged periods of time delay youths from progressing into adolescence and stage III cognitive thinking and behaviors which are more socially responsible for others, rather than for self.

The relevance of theories on maternal deprivation and separation provide an excellent overview for the study of children of inmate mothers. This population of young children are separated from their mother due to the state's intervention and there is very little mother-child interaction during this forced separation. Secondly, according to Henriques (1982), a substantial number of her
inmate subjects (53%) had multiple arrests and therefore, multiple mother-child disruptions across varying child developmental stages. Stanton (1980) reports that 38% of children in her study were moved more than once within the extended family and had multiple caretakers during the mother's incarceration. The effects of instability in children not having long-term parenting continuity in developmental stages should be overtly evident in the behaviors of children in this study. What those effects are in psychosocial development of children over age six will be a focus of the present study. The theorists on attachment theory, maternal-child bonding, continuity of parenting all indicate that the disruption will cause long-term pathology in the children of inmate mothers. This should be reflected by overt behaviors as poor interpersonal relationships with peers, poor school performance, delinquent behaviors, school suspensions and the amount of children in professional counseling for behavior problems.

Section III: Theories on Prosocial Parental and Caretaker Environments and the Effects and the Moral Development of Children

Hoffman (1976) suggests that empathy and guilt may trigger the process of perspective-taking, self examination and restructuring of values which may help strengthen and
motivate moral functioning and judgments in children. Damon (1988) supports this position and further elaborates that this process begins to occur at age two or three years in most children. Therefore, they contend that the fundamental building blocks of moral reasoning and prosocial behaviors are acquired by very young children in social interactions within the family environment. The quality of the family environment should have long lasting effects on the individual child's cognitive development.

Jean Piaget (1932/1965) determined children begin to learn rules from adults and he began to lay the groundwork for several principle theories that assume a sequence of formal stages in the development of children's understanding and judgments. Piaget pointed out that after a purely self-centered early (infantile) period where a child understands and feels everything through the physical medium of himself/herself that children progress past egocentrism to formal stages.

In synopsizing Piaget's moral realism of young children, "good" is defined in terms of obedience to adult and parental rules. The child takes these rules literally and evaluates his/her acts in terms of their exact conformity with the parental established rules. Initially, children's judgment and proceeding behavior was unconscious
egocentrism at first, it then becomes controlled/governed by adult restrictions and by moral directives.

If Damon, Hoffman and Piaget are correct, then this has direct relevance to the study of children of inmates. To acquire prosocial building blocks in childhood development, a child requires stability in adult relationships starting at a very early age. Secondly, an inmate mother’s children require positive home environments. This assumes that criminal activities and observing those activities does not foster positive behavior internalization in young children. If a child views adult behaviors and receives directives from adults who engage in criminal activities, young children assume that these activities are appropriate behavior.

Piaget (1965) theorizes that parental behavior can accelerate or deter a child’s moral development. Child rearing practices that are disrupted, inconsistent and infrequent are important to a child’s long-term development. If a child’s environment which is usually his/her immediate family or caretaker cannot or did not offer positive role modeling, moral rationality and directives, then children are unable to learn how to take into account what is prosocial and normalized behavior (Kohlberg, 1976).
The impact of the parental caretaker's behavior is the child's initial avenue to the experiences in the ecological environment which provides the child's moral development. In the preschool years, the parental environment yields enormous power that has life long implications. The parental environment does control the situations in which a child learns to function and develop as a social being. The moral building blocks and focus of a young child is acquired or retarded from being acquired due to early childhood parental environments and the quality of parent-child interactions during this formative developmental period for the preschooler.

Cognitive developmentalists provide research that supports the contention that children who consistently witness moral shortcomings of their family members, especially the adult parent whom they trust for social competence about rules, observe behaviors and begin to resolve inner psychological conflicts of a parent's misdeeds, such as imprisonment, by behaving in less than ideal ways. There is a wealth of support for the contention that the family environment and the social interactions of the parent-child in the preschool years are the foundation for moral development in later maturity. There is strong support that a retarded development in moral cognition
within the family environment will result in cognitive distortions and social dysfunctioning in later years of a child and that in the school environment some students will require substantive interventions to increase moral reasoning and prosocial behavior.

In the particular study of inmate mother’s children, this should be a measurable outcome by school indicators. Is the child’s school performance, behavior and delinquency rates different from other students who have not been raised in antisocial environments? The subject children should show overt negative behaviors if these theorists are correct. Stanton (1980) reports that 70% of the children of inmate mothers are underperforming at school and that 50% are school behavior problems (N=22) as rated by their classroom teachers perceptions.

Section IV: Review of the Studies on Incarcerated Women and Children 1964-Present

Sarapio Zalba (1964) is credited with the first attempt at studying female inmates and their children. Using the California Women’s Prison which at that time housed 20% of all the nation’s total female prisoners, he followed a multistage methodology to compile the quantitative data to describe female prisoners and children. Data was collected
from 849 prisoner questionnaires, a random sample of 137 prison files, 124 prison interviews and a field study of local child serving agencies in two counties. Zalba (1964) found that the majority of children of inmate mothers were under 6 years of age, 20% of the children were in foster care and the majority of children were being cared for by extended maternal kinships, especially the maternal grandparents. His data analysis concluded that the majority of children were living in poverty with relatives and that there was no cooperation between the various child welfare agencies working with the mother while she is imprisoned and while the child was separated from her in the community.

Friedman and Esselyston (1965) studied the affects of male imprisonment on male and female children and concluded that girls are more adversely affected than boys. Girls whose mothers divorce while their fathers are incarcerated are shown to be more depressed, under perform in school and "act-in" and become withdrawn. Their research was the first to recommend that children of all incarcerated parents have immediate attention by prison social service programming. Morris (1965) in a similar study of families of prisoners conducted 932 interviews of male inmates and 676 wives of inmates and concluded that women will rely on a wide kinship network for financial and social support due to the loss of
the chief breadwinner. She also concluded from the data that social service agencies did not have any extensive contact with prisoner's families even though the majority of children were doing poorly in school and exhibiting emotional problems.

Gibbs (1971) interviewed 638 female inmates at the time of intake into prison and collected data on the perceived well being of their dependent children as well as descriptive data on the children's placement and other demographics. She found that the amount of familial disorganization that occurred prior to the most recent imprisonment was more of a continuing maladaptive pattern than previously thought. The children of female inmates were living in poverty, part of broken marriages, many illegitimate and had once before been separated from the mother due to imprisonment and are interrelated symptoms of long-term social disruption affecting their childhood stability.

The U.S. Justice Department funded a national study of women's correctional programs (Glick & Neto, 1977) to identify the females in prison and determine what community based services were available or needed for them. Using a sample of 1,607 female inmates in 16 prisons, 46 county jails and 36 community based offender programs they
developed a profile of the typical female offender by age, ethnic groups, education, marital status, children, childhood home environment and numerous other demographic statistics. Their national findings describe the typical female offender as being poor, herself being raised in a broken home and perpetuating this cycle since 81% of the respondents were unmarried, divorced, separated or remarried living with a man and had borne an average of 2.48 children. The significance of this study is that it was the first national profile of incarcerated females and provides a baseline to begin further studies that are more focused on key dimensions of the problem. Their descriptive results of children of inmate mothers show that only 56% of inmates had dependent children, rather than the 80% most often quoted (Zalba, 1964). Also, significant differences in child care arrangements by ethnic groups was reported. Black inmate mothers rely on their parents to care for their children while whites were more likely to use nonrelatives and public child welfare, yet the majority of whites did have extended kinship placements but lesser use of grandparents.

The Children's Defense Fund sponsored the research of McGowan & Blumenthal (1978) in their study of children of women prisoners. This study collected data on the extent of children separated from mothers due to imprisonment and what
happened to their children, the effects on the mother, caretakers and children. The study results are consistent with Zalba (1964), Gibbs (1971) and Glick & Neto (1977) in that inmate mothers are living in poverty, are head of households, unskilled, minority and use grandparents and extended families as caretakers of their children. The methodology for data collection was a national mail survey of correctional administrators and a series of focused interviews with female inmates at a local prison. A field study was done by interviewing child welfare workers and older children of women prisoners to gain a qualitative perspective to the data. The national mail survey generated data from 74 prisons which housed 9,378 women. The results indicated that 70-80% of inmates are mothers, the mean was 2.4 children per inmate, 2/3 of the children were under ten years of age and 1/4 under the age of four and 75% of the inmates had their children living with them at the time of arrest. In terms of caretakers of their children, approximately 75% were extended kinship relatives and 12% were in public foster care.

As part of their methodology, data was collected at a local prison from 64 inmate mothers who represented 120 children. The results reported were that the 86% of the children were placed with relatives, had transferred AFDC
payments to the caretaker and 93% of the children were in the legal custody of the inmate and that 62% of the mothers had contact with their children on a weekly basis. Eighty-four percent (84%) of the inmates planned to reunite with their children after release. The most significant result found that 45% of the children of inmate mothers were under five (5) years of age, therefore, vulnerable to be affected by the forced maternal separation.

While the McGowan & Blumenthal study is one of the most significant in terms of children of inmates, it suffers from many serious methodological issues. The reliability and validity of data from a national mail survey to be filled out by correctional administrators is suspect since no inventory of institutions is reported. Secondly, the use of a local facility, Riker’s Jail in New York City, to collect data for generalization is very suspect due to the fact that the highly urbanized inmate mother may not reflect the typical inmate. The focused interview data that was collected is questionable as valid since it is based on the perceptions of the inmate mother and how she sees the children’s problems and caretaker adequacy from her perspective. Finally, the authors do not report the number of children or caretakers that were interviewed in the field, yet generalize several results such as children are
traumatized by the separation, have school problems, poor interpersonal relationships and receive a poor quality of care while in a relative placement. Any reader of the field study results can only conclude that the amount of face-to-face child interviews was very small and that caretaker interviews were non-existent.

Stanton (1980) studied psychosocial effects on inmate mothers and her children. This is the first major study conducted by a psychologist using more traditional instruments in assessing the impact of jail and maternal-separation effects on subjects. Seventy-five (75) mothers representing 166 children and 84 children were interviewed. The author used chi-square tests of statistical significance to determine whether variables were independent or that systematic relationships existed between a mother’s criminality, children’s living situation, children’s knowledge of the mother’s legal situation, children’s visitation, mother’s feeling about visitation, children’s attitude toward police (legal reasoning), school performance and if the financial situation have a psychological damaging affect on children. The study reports are similar to Zalba (1964) and Gibbs (1971) in the domain of the inmate mother’s description. She is young, poorly educated, a minority, has an unstable marital
relationship and disrupted child-rearing episodes, single head-of-household, living in poverty and dependent on welfare to support her and her children. The study's results add a new descriptive dimension that the other studies had not reported—alcohol and drug abuse were common personal problems. In the socioenvironmental sphere over half of the inmate mothers had female friends who had been incarcerated and over half of the inmate mothers had parents or siblings that had been in jail or prison.

Stanton reports that children experience multiple disruptions with the caretakers while mothers are in prison and 1/3 had more than one caretaker change and 25% of the children were separated from their siblings during this period. Direct questioning of inmate mothers concerning facts about the children's well being, name of school, teachers, children's friends, child welfare workers or specific children's activities were found to be generally unknown or incorrect. This suggested that the separation period creates a void in parent-child communication or connectedness with the child's placement and caretakers. Results were reported that children of inmate mothers do poorly in school, change schools several times and are over reported as behavior problems by teachers. Both mother and
children report anxiety concerning prison visits and reunification after prison.

Finally, Stanton reports findings that add a further new dimension to the knowledge and literature on this topic. Stanton's data shows that children are totally excluded in the legal process, proceedings and prison life by the criminal justice system. The courts assume no responsibility for the child's placement, and that prison rehabilitative staff are unaware of the existence or whereabouts of children. Jail and prison staff do not recognize any responsibility or interest in using children and parenting training as a component of the inmate rehabilitation process. She concludes that incarceration serves the legal needs of society but excludes the needs of children to have a normal upbringing during maternal separation.

The next significant study of inmate mothers and children was done by Zelma Henriques (1982). This descriptive and exploratory study was done at Rikers Island Prison in New York City and the data was collected from a sample of 101 participants - 30 incarcerated mothers, 15 children, 7 relative caretakers, 5 foster care workers and 44 correctional, human service and child welfare workers. The data collection instruments were a variety of focused
interviews aimed at capturing descriptive, perceptual and attitudinal attributes of each subject group. Henriques adds to the body of knowledge on this topic in the areas of profiling a child's perceived needs by direct interview. She reports that children of incarcerated mothers are at risk in several spheres of psychosocial development due to maternal separation. Feelings of anger, sadness and remorse about the mother's imprisonment and dislike of school and living situations were found. A second dimension that has never been discussed in the literature was the focused interviews with caretakers of these children and the results are reported that the inmate's selection of caretakers for her children were not good choices. Relative caretakers were unable to adequately provide for these children since the children's ages were mostly preschool. Caretakers are affected by the problems of these children and resented the responsibility since it intruded on their life styles and infringed on their own time. Reported school visits, having to go to court, bring the children to prison for visitation and other child welfare visits are responsibilities that caretakers feel should be done by public agencies or that they should receive financial compensation for doing. While the small number of caretakers can be criticized (N=7), Henriques does provide a qualitative aspect that could never
have been found by traditional scientific data analysis. Other results that are reported are similar to past studies concerning the socioeconomic status of the sample, demographics, lack of coordinated services and insensitivity of the criminal justice system to the unique needs of mothers and children. Aside from the numerous shortcomings in methodology, writing style of reporting her results, and the use of a single largely urban New York City prison, Henries's unique qualitative-in-depth understanding does make this study one of the most cited research books on the topic.

Baunach (1985) studied the psychosocial impact on inmate mothers on being separated from her children. Using the Women's Offenders Parenting Survey, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the Maryland Parent Attitude Survey (MPAS), she provides the first large scale use of psychometric tools to measure the separation impacts on mental status and personality. The research was conducted at two state institutions in Kentucky and Washington with a sample of 195 inmate mothers. The study reports that psychological consequences of separation from children result in a low self image, projection of positive traits onto their children, and they are overprotective, lenient in discipline and over-indulgence in raising their children.
Inmate mothers have a strong sense of guilt and use external indices to define their behaviors. Baunach presents results that suggest inmate mothers show poor control over their behavior, are impulsive, emotionally act out their feelings and are easily influenced by other persons perception of themselves. These results and the fact that most mothers plan to reunite with their children and reestablish a parental role are disturbing. If Baunach’s results of the psychosocial personality traits of soon-to-be parental role models are accurate, then we should conclude that most of the inmates are psychologically unprepared to provide a balanced child-rearing regime to their children and the readjustment period for the children will be difficult.

Similarly, Hairston’s & Lockett’s (1985) results indicate inmate mothers initially suffer from grief and loss at the time of intake into prison. They conclude that the severed mother-child relationship cause feelings of inadequacy and failure as a parent. These results concur with past research on the psychological impact on inmate mothers (Baunach, 1982,1985). Baunach summarizes the psychological profile of inmate mothers as a woman who is experiencing a sense of loss and grieving similar to death or divorce, overall fear of inadequacy and failure as a mother who is unfit and anxious. The fear and anxiety is
directed at her ability to readjust to parenting, her children would reject her and blame her for abandonment and the stigma they endured during her incarceration.

Baunach (1985) suggested that inmates fear that the caretakers of her children would bond with the children and caretakers will not relinquish her children upon release from prison. Henriques's (1982) qualitative data does support this contention since a common theme from caretakers is the need for more AFDC and financial supports since their responsibilities to care for the child are similar to a mother's role and that caretakers do exhibit resentment toward the mothers.

Section V: Literature Review Summary

The literature can be summarized into seven major problem areas for the study of female inmates and their children. They are:

Problem 1: the limited contact between a mother and her children while she is in prison
2: the psychosocial impact on the mother
3: the psychosocial impact on the children
4: the placement of her children due to parental imprisonment and assessment of
the parenting skills of surrogate mothers

5: the service coordination to children and caretakers while mother is in prison

6: the assessment of parenting skills of inmate mothers prior to release

7: the reestablishment and reunification of the mother and her children upon release

The problem of limited contact between a mother and her children while she is serving time has several contributing factors. Palmer (1972), Samitez (1980) and Baunach (1982) found that the prison rules on visitation times, lack of appropriate visitation rooms and insensitivity of correction officials make children's visitations a harsh and demeaning experience. The distance from the prison and the lack of transportation for children and caretakers to meet the visitation times at prisons impede the mother-child contact. Henriques (1982) suggests that caretakers resent the visitation routine and sabotage mother-child visits as too troublesome.

The negative psychosocial effects on inmate mothers are contributed to by the loss of maternal roles, grieving and fears of child rejection, resentment and bonding of children with a caretaker. The social degradation of being an unfit
mother and loss of control and helplessness over children's well being and decision making further contribute to the low self esteem of inmates (Hairston & Lockett, 1985; Baunach, 1982, 1985; McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978).

The negative psychosocial effects on children of imprisoned mothers has been reported as poor school performance (Stanton, 1980; Zalba, 1964; Gibbs, 1971; McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978). The social stigma endured and felt by children has been reported by Stanton (1980) and Henriques (1982). The trauma associated with a child seeing a mother arrested and the adjustment reactions of children to new schools, peers and caretakers is a significant contributing factor to the mental status of children (Stanton, 1980; McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978).

The informal placement of children in extended family networks is a major concern that has received little in-depth study by social scientists. While the descriptors of the adult caretakers is very consistent in the literature, only Stanton (1980) and Henriques (1982) report on the multiple times children are moved within the kinship networks, the resentment of caretakers who may not want the children but accept the responsibility due to familial obligations and the fact that siblings are separated and distributed among the kinship network is a contributing
factor in the well being of children. There is absolutely no research literature that indicates the quality of care a child receives or the investigation of the caretakers of children in this informal kinship network.

All research indicates that the existing local human service systems fail miserably in coordinating or even providing services to mothers in prison and children and caretakers in the community (Zalba, 1964; Gibbs, 1971; Henriques, 1982; McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978). With the exception of the Center for Children of Incarcerated Parents in California, Aid to Imprisoned Mothers in Atlanta and the Chicago Legal Aid for Incarcerated Mothers, there are few other community based advocates for service provision to children and caretakers. The literature strongly shows that the inmate mother and children are an "unidentified and ignored population" by the human service agencies. Therefore, the contributing factor in this problem are a lack of prison liaison programs, few if any children and caretakers support groups and a lack of specialized treatment and reunification programs for this population.

Finally, the literature is very scarce on the entire topic of multigeneration criminality in female offender households. Sociologists have long reported that poverty, family dysfunctioning, criminal home environments and the
"culture of crime" are strongly correlated to a child's chances of engaging in delinquency (Gibbs, 1971). The American Correctional Association's Task Force on the Female Offender reports that over 50% of all juvenile delinquents imprisoned in 1990 have a parent who has been incarcerated. Similarly, the Center for Inmate Mothers (Barnhill & Dressel 1991) reports that children of female inmates are five to six times more likely to be incarcerated themselves than other similar children who lived in poverty but whose mothers have never been imprisoned.

The literature on female criminality, effects of maternal-separation on childhood development both socially and psychologically, and the necessity of a prosocial parental environment is required for the healthy well-being of children seem to point to one crucial premise. Children raised in poverty, without consistent relationships and limited opportunities to learn prosocial behaviors due to the inconsistency of adults will be the future inmates, patients and bad parents of tomorrow. The children of inmate mothers are the "most-at-risk, unidentified population of children" that this researcher has yet to have encountered in over twenty years of social work practice. The merging of social, psychological and socioenvironmental theories point to these children and present scholars with a
challenge of increasing research on one of the most important topics of our time.

What the literature presents is that children of inmate mothers are products of a parental environment that they most probably will never escape from due to socioeconomic factors. Secondly, the children's psychological personality development will be greatly delayed due to findings that indicate that the majority of these children are under 10 years of age and have been separated from consistent mothering for prolonged periods of time. Third, the children will have formed personality traits that will interfere with positive interrelationships with others, societal norms and social institutions in later stages of their life.

While the theories abound, the research literature is so scarce on the study of inmate children that we cannot conclude that the informal child placement system used by inmate mothers is any better than sending the children to prison with their mothers. We do not know if the children of inmate mothers are placed in an extended kinship adult environment that will perpetuate criminal social modeling because the literature has no research on who watches the children past the fact that they are generally described as relatives of the inmate. Finally, if the entire domain of
children who were directly interviewed face-to-face or observed as preschoolers during the seven major and most cited research projects were added up, they would amount to less than 250 children in over 29 years of research. These facts derived from the literature review section of the dissertation drive the research methods which will be described in the proceeding chapter.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research methods used to collect data in the study of inmate mothers, their children and the caretakers of the children. This chapter is divided into the following sections:

Section 1) Purpose of the Study
Section 2) Overall Methodology
Section 3) Setting of the Study
Section 4) Inmate Mothers Data Collection Methods
Section 5) Caretaker Data Collection Methods
Section 6) Children's Data Collection Methods
Section 7) Data Analysis Plan
Section 8) Confidentiality and Protection of Human Subjects

Section I: Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to gather data on the psychosocial well-being of children whose mothers are incarcerated in prison. The data collection strategies of accessing a sample of children and gaining entry required the researcher to reflectively change methods and adapt to
the various client populations of inmates and caretakers to get their consent. Knowledge and data concerning inmate mothers, the women's correctional system, what inmate mothers want and need for rehabilitation was also gathered. Data on the persons who watch an inmate's children and their stories of commitment, glory, integrity and those who are not so glorious was collected. Finally, data was collected from interviews and testing of children which provided a volume of data. This study describes the demographic profile of 150 female inmates incarcerated at the Franklin Pre-Release Center in Columbus, Ohio. The description includes age, criminal history, marital status, ethnicity, family size, poverty status, placement of dependent children during prison and various selective factors that define the inmate in relationship to her children, selection of caretakers for her children and their psychosocial mental status. Second, the study describes 27 children of inmate mothers in terms of their ages, ethnicity, school performance, attitude toward their mother, psychosocial mental status, delinquency and global assessment of psychological well-being. Third, it describes 18 caretakers of inmate mother's children in terms of familial relationship, status of the relationship, attitudes on child rearing, socioeconomic status, perceptions of being a
caretaker and altered life style after becoming a caretaker. This study describes the congruence of attitudes between inmate mothers, her children and caretakers concerning the well-being of the children and qualitatively explores the lives and problems of caretakers and children while the inmate mothers are in prison. The data was statistically and descriptively analyzed to assess the association of key variables that are predictive of inmate mothers being a multigenerational part of a cycle of poverty, crime and instability. It also infers that school age children of inmate mothers are predictive of being involved in the multigenerational cycle of crime and instability.

Section II: Overall Methodology

This study was an exploratory descriptive design that took a group of inmate mothers and collected data on their children since the literature on this topic was very small in comparison to other correctional and criminality research. While many researchers avoid exploratory research designs (Darlington 1990), this study could not have been done in any other manner. No data is kept on female inmates who are mothers, who and where the children are and more significantly who and where are the persons watching those children.
A sequential stage methodology to collect data is necessary since no data exists on the extent of inmate motherhood, where caretakers are located and, therefore, who are the children to be interviewed. Stage I was crucial to all subsequent stages and data collection since it will begin to narrow and funnel the sample pools. Great care was taken in the instrument design and the protocol of administering the Stage I questionnaire since the entire focus of the research project hinges on data generated from the inmates.

The data collection was done in a sequential 4 stage process (see Appendix B, C, D, E, I for protocol).

Stage I  Self administered questionnaire to female inmates at the Franklin Pre-Release Center (N=150)

Stage II  Focused group interviews on each of the five (5) units at the Franklin Pre-Release Center for those inmates who have children who reside in the greater Columbus area (N=14)

Stage III  Interviews with caretakers of the children of inmate mothers (N=18)

Stage IV  Face-to-face interviews with the children of inmate mothers (N=27)
Section III: Setting of the Study

The Franklin Pre-release Center is a 460 bed minimum security facility for female offenders operated by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. It is located in Columbus, Ohio, which has a metropolitan population of approximately 1,000,000. The Franklin Pre-Release Center services the central and southwestern part of Ohio and the majority of inmates come from Columbus, Cincinnati and Dayton. The prison offers a variety of rehabilitative services such as drug rehabilitation, parenting classes, high school to college courses and vocational training. The initial setting of the data gathering to access and define the children to be studied requires an inmate survey being done at the facility to generate a study sample.

Section IV: Description of Inmate Mothers Population To be Studied

Since the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction keeps little data on the incidence of motherhood in female offenders, the profile of female inmates comes from a 1988 State Office of Rehabilitation and Correction report generated from a sample of 169 female inmates at the time of intake. This study was unauthored and was done by an intern from the OSU Department of Public Policy and
Management. The typical profile of the inmate describes her as:

1. a black female (55%)
2. living in an urban area prior to arrest (70%)
3. approximately 30 years old
4. serving her first prison sentence (84%)
5. incarcerated for a non-violent property offense (78%)
6. sentenced to a determinate sentence (65%)

Using the national prevalence studies of Glick & Neto (1977), it can further be implied that the female offender can also be described as:

7. single head of household (81%)
8. having between 2 to 3 dependant children at time of arrest
9. receiving public assistance at the time of arrest (92%)
10. dropping out of high school (65%)
11. having little if no adult work history (66%)

The general descriptors of the initial target population from which to generate the data is similar to what Lewis (1969), Beeghley (1983) and Sidel (1984) concluded as the culture, cycle and feminization of poverty membership.
Survey Instrument Design For Incarcerated Mothers

A self-administered questionnaire was designed to gather data for this study. Using existing survey instruments found in the literature the researcher drafted a questionnaire for initial review by an expert panel.

The compilation of survey items included in the questionnaire came from the research instruments of Zalba (1964), Glick & Neto (1977) and Stanton (1980). The expert panel reviewed the questionnaire for usefulness and advice. None of the prior authors had pretested their instruments.

Pretesting & Pilot Testing For Inmate Mothers

The questionnaire was pretested by female inmates who meet on every Saturday morning with an outside group therapist at the prison. Usually five to eight inmates attend this session and their comments were incorporated in the final instrument (See Appendix A). The expert panel and inmate pilot test was to establish the content validity and reliability of the items in the instrument. A Cronbach alpha statistical procedure (Cronbach, 1951) was done to determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire items and their reliability. The Cronbach Alpha was .86 for 26 out of the total 41 survey questions that were not demographic.
The final document was assessed by an educational specialist with over 20 years of experience in determining reading levels in correctional settings. It was intended that the construction of the questions could be easily read by a person with a fourth grade reading skill level. Current data available at the State Office of Rehabilitation and Correction indicates that approximately 90% of the female inmates read at or above the fourth grade level. This further enhanced the reliability of the survey questionnaire since it was to be self-administered.

Survey Implementation

The implementation of the survey instrument was done by distributing the questionnaire to 370 female inmates at Franklin Pre-release Center. The location for the return of the survey instrument was a designated mail drop on each dormitory building in the prison. After the distribution of the questionnaire, a presentation was made on each of the five units by the researcher to discuss the purpose of the study and arrange follow-up meetings with inmates who were from the Columbus, Ohio area. A total of 150 useable instruments were received for a return rate of 41%.

Inmate Mother Interviews

The survey questionnaire was analyzed and collated to funnel out female inmates who are mothers and who live in
Columbus, Ohio, and wish to be interviewed for further study. While the population should be considered a convenience sample, therefore, biasing the research findings, the research could not be done in any other way since no database on female inmates is available. This approach allowed for a group of cooperative research subjects to be interviewed at which time the names of children, location of children and caretakers can be gathered. Also, the appropriate entry to the sample of children and caretakers was accomplished by the inmates signing appropriate waivers.

A mixture of focused groups and individual interviews were conducted with the Columbus, Ohio, inmate mothers. The first instrument was a set of focused questions and a second instrument developed by James Hudson (1982) was administered which measures the degree of satisfaction a mother has with her children. The protocol is presented in Appendix B.

The focused questions were grouped into five content areas and the data was collected by using a group delphi procedure where consensus of the participant's answers was done and agreed upon by the inmates. The researcher also kept a tally of frequencies about each content area question by writing key words or responses of individuals. Since the researcher was an active group participant with the inmates,
it allowed for a content analysis to be done after the session.

Several inmates that were invited to participate could not or chose not to participate in a group session. Follow up was done on those inmates since many had requested to be interviewed directly by the researcher for a variety of reasons. Data was gathered by recording notes and responses for each of the focused questions.

The baseline inmate data gathering provided the researcher with a wealth of information on the typical Ohio inmate mother in terms of demographics, perceptions of motherhood and her relationship with her children, present mental status and a variety of concerns, comments and needs for herself, her children and for those watching her children.

Section V: Caretaker Data Collection Methods

From the data collection of Stage I and II, the researcher was able to generate a list of 32 names, addresses and phone numbers of caretakers. The protocol and instruments for the Stage III Caretakers data collection can be reviewed in Appendix C. As part of inmate cooperation, the researcher had asked that the inmate contact the
caretakers personally prior to our contact so that caretakers might be more cooperative to our request for interviews and access to the children.

**Data Collection Methods**

A mailing was done to prospective interviewees explaining the project and what information was to be gathered. A set of 10 focused questions were part of this introduction. This allowed the caretakers to decide if they wished to be interviewed or to help prepare responses and think about the caretaker role. A follow-up telephone call was made to the caretaker to arrange the interview time and all interviews were conducted in the caretaker’s home, allowing the researcher to observe first hand the living environment and relationship of the caretaker to the children.

The telephone introduction also allowed the researcher to attempt to convince hostile caretakers about the purpose of the research. Data was collected on the hostile or uncooperative caretaker as part of the telephone conversation and used as a source of information to be reported in the findings of the research project. A content analysis of the notes taken by the interviewer was done after the telephone conversation.
Section VI: Children's Data Collection Methods

Upon the approvals of the inmate mothers and respective caretakers, arrangements were made to interview and administer psychodynamic testing instruments to the children. The protocol for the child data gathering is described in Appendix C.

The setting for the data gathering was a mixture of home environments, at schools and programs at the Center for Peace Studies which received a foundation grant to provide therapeutic group services to inmate mother’s children. Children who were under the age of five were excluded from the study due to maturity. Children who were not aware that their mothers were in prison were excluded from the available study sample. Also, children who were outside of the greater Columbus, Ohio, region were excluded. A decision not to interview children on visitation days at the prison was made since it would interfere with mother-child visitation, and secondly, the prison environment is not a normalized setting for children to discuss their problems or lives.

Instrumentation For Children

A set of focused questions for children was developed for qualitative data collection (See Appendix E). Detailed notes of the responses to the questions was kept by the
interviewer and were content analyzed as part of reflective self debriefing (Wolcott 1990). General themes and key words were counted as frequencies of occurrence. The fifteen questions were grouped into five content areas:

1) school performance
2) caretaker selection
3) relationship to mother
4) problems you have being away from mother
5) sibling relationships

Child Psychometric Testing Instrument (Appendix D & E)

After a review of the Mental Measurements Yearbook (Mitchell, 1985) and the ERIC Center at the Educational Testing Services, the selection of two instruments was done. The Children's Attitude Toward Mother Scale (Hudson, 1982) and the Nowicki-Strickland Internal-External Control Scale for Children were selected (Nowicki & Strickland, 1973).

The Children's Attitude Toward Mother Scale is a 25 question survey that is a 5 item Likert scoring key from 1 (rarely) to 5 (most). The test measures a child's perception of maternal satisfaction. Reliability tests for internal consistency have been reported as high as r=.96 (Beal, 1986). Test-retest reliability measures of r=.82 after a 90 day interval has been reported. Correlations of convergence validity with Family Adaptation and Cohesion Scale
(Olsen, 1980) have been reported as high as .63 with a sample size of 100. The high correlations on reliability and validity make this instrument unusual as a quick assessment tool to assess maternal satisfaction in global terms.

The Nowicki-Strickland Internal-External Control Scale for Children is a 40 item true or false test measuring helplessness, feelings of alienation and tendency for depression. Based on the child’s reading level, the instrument can be self administered or the interviewer can read the question and record the answer.

The reliability estimates for internal consistency via the split-half method is $r=.63$ for children 7 - 10 years of age with a sample size of 300. The test-retest reliabilities done at a 9 month interval ($r=.62$), 5 week ($r=.76$) and one year ($r=.52$) were done for 499 children. Therefore, based on the Cohen and Cohen (1983) suggestion that reliabilities for human and behavior scientists tools that rate .50 over one year intervals are very strong measures. Validity measures computed for a sample of 182 nine year old blacks had positive correlations ranging from .31 to .51 with the Intellectual Responsibility Questionnaire (Crandel, 1965) and a correlation of .41 with the Bialer-Cromwell Child Depression Scale (Bialer 1961).
with a sample of 29 children age 9. Convergent validity above $r = .3$ is generally considered adequate for the human and behavior sciences (Darlington, 1990).

Validity and Reliability of the Data Collection

The inmate survey (Stage I) was constructed from four previous studies in which none of the authors had done a content validity or reliability pretest. Content validity was established by the use of a panel of experts who reviewed the questionnaire items twice. First after its construction and secondly after a pretest. The reading level skills required to complete and understand the survey was established by a reading expert working in a correctional system. A pilot test was done ($N = 22$), and to establish reliability a Chronach Alpha Procedure on 26 items was done with a resulting internal consistency score of Alpha = .86. The final results of the pretest, pilot test and reliability scores were reviewed by Dr. William Eldridge, Chairperson of the dissertation committee.

The Stage II inmate interviews consisted of a set of five open ended focused questions. Each question was to measure and assess a dimension of the problem of inmate mothers, their children, their perceived needs, the needs of the mother, caretakers and overall well-being of the children. The reliability of the content analysis was done
by using a delphi procedure where responses were written to each question and the group refined and came to a general consensus on answers to each question. Reliability of the Stage II focused group and individual interviews are strengthened since only one rater interviewer was used (Gregg Hungerford, MSW).

The Stage III caretaker interviews provided a variety of reliability and validity challenges. Two raters-interviewers collected the qualitative data from a set of 10 focused open-ended questions. The interviewers were the researcher, Gregg Hungerford, MSW, and Rebecca Fields, MSW, who was employed by the Center for Peace Studies to provide group therapy services to inmate mother’s children. To enhance reliability between raters, a debriefing session was held weekly and notes, questions and recall of interview responses were exchanged. Since some caretakers were uncooperative and hostile on the telephone contact, the recall and notes were discussed and recorded by the researchers since this is an important source of information.

The Stage IV children interviews also provided a challenge on the open-ended focused questions. To resolve this, the children who were 6 - 10 years of age were interviewed by one rater and the children 11 years or older
were interviewed by the other rater. A comparison of rater's evaluations was done and similarities of responses was discussed. The content validity and reliability of the two testing instruments is discussed in the previous part of Chapter 3.

The Stage I instrument (See Appendix B) was developed to gather data that:

1) describes the inmate mother demographically
   Q. 1, 5, 10, 11, 23, 41

2) describes the inmate's criminal history
   Q. 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 20, 21

3) describes the inmate's family history
   Q. 6, 19

4) describes the children of the inmate
   Q. 12, 13, 14, 22, 23

5) describes the children's caretakers and placement
   Q. 15, 16, 24, 25, 28, 29

6) describes the perceived problems of the children
   Q. 17, 18, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38

Stage II focused questions (Appendix C) were constructed to measure the dimensions of a mother's perceptions of:
1) her children's well-being separated from her and relates back to Stage I questions 17, 18, 27, 30-38

2) her caretaker choice as being good for her children's well-being - Stage I questions 15, 16, 24, 25, 28, 29, 33, 38

3) her personal problems being incarcerated

4) her recommendations for programming while she is in prison to increase her parenting skills and child contact

5) to measure her attitudes of parenting by using the Parental Attitude Toward Children Scale (Hudson 1982)

Stage III focused questions (See Appendix D) were developed to measure several facets of personality and the relationship of the caretaker with the inmate mother and with the children.

Q. 1, 2, 8 focused on the familial relationships and personal commitment for caring for the inmate's children and relates back to the Stage II question of the inmate's caretaker selection and Stage I questions 15, 16, 24, 25, 28, 29

Q. 3, 4, 8, 9, 10 helped define the caretaker's role and the personal commitment for caring for the children.
Q. 6, 7 focused on the caretaker's perceived well-being of the child in their care and the quality of the inmate mother's relationship to the child. These relate to Stage II questions on how a mother perceives how well her child is doing and in Stage I questions 17, 18, 27, 30-38.

Stage IV was designed to measure the child's perception of his/her mother and the relationship to how his/her mother perceives his/her well-being (See Appendix G). By using the Hudson (1982) complimentary instruments Parents Attitude and Child's Attitude Scales, a statistical correlation for congruence or convergence can be assessed.

The Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control (1973) adds the unique child assessment of helplessness, depression, mental status and global well-being and correlates back to a parent's perception and a caretaker's perception of how the child is actually doing during this mother-child separation (See Appendix H).

The limitations of this research methodology and data collection as valid and reliable are few. While great length and exhaustive strategies to control for threats to validity and reliability were taken, we could not control for the biased sample of inmate mothers that generated the data. The inmate mothers of this study were voluntary
participants and, therefore, not randomly selected from the population of all inmate mothers at the Franklin Pre-Release Center. Second, the research criteria of being from Franklin County and accessing only children ages six years and over further limited the samples of caretakers and children. Third, the caretakers were voluntary participants and some refused to participate, therefore, closing access to another number of children. Therefore, it is assumed that generalizations back to the entire population of inmate mothers at the Franklin Pre-Release Center should be approached with some caution.

Section VII: Data Analysis Plan

The data collected descriptive and aggregated into tables, charts and percentages. As with any exploratory study, the purpose of the data collection focused on description and association of variables rather than clear cut independent or dependent variables. There will be no testing of any hypothesis.

The use of Pearson product-moment correlations will be presented in table form since the Stage I data lends itself to statistical association between variables and clusters of variables and most all variables were dichotomous and could be dummy coded as 0, 1, 2. Chi square methods were done on
a set of variables by race only to see if significant racial
differences exist in child placement, crime, poverty, type
of arrest, etc. A priori significance levels of \( P < .05 \) will
be set for all chi square analysis. A one way ANOVA was
performed on the results of Parental Attitude and Child
Attitude of Parents Scales since they are complimentary.
The ANOVA results are reported at \( P < .05 \) for significance in
the perceptions of inmate mother's scores and child scores
of parent-child satisfaction.

Section VIII: Confidentiality And Protection of Human
Subjects

All completed Stage I questionnaires were assigned a
code number. The code book and raw data was kept by the
researcher in a locked fireproof box at the researcher's
home. Data was directly inputted into an IBM PC and could
not be retrieved without a file code and questionnaire code
number. No one could identify an inmate's name without the
original raw data instrument.

Files were constructed as each stage was completed.
For example, if inmate 007 was included in Phase II, that
the data was placed in her file. Likewise Stage III, IV,
Consent Forms, etc. were kept in the inmate's file in a
locked box. The review, retrieve and orderly collection of
data into the file assisted the researcher when it was time to do the data analysis.

The Ohio State University Committee on Human Subjects Review granted this research protocol (93B0092) and approved it on April 26, 1993 (See Appendix I). The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Research Review Committee granted its conditional approval on April 13, 1992 and all conditions were met on April 26, 1993 (See Appendix J).
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

This chapter presents the findings of the data collected from questionnaires received from 150 inmate mothers at the Franklin Pre-Release Center for Women, 107 caretakers and 353 children. Data was also collected from 42 structured interviews with inmate mothers, fourteen in-depth qualitative interviews and an eight-member focused group interview with female inmates. Data was also collected from 32 informal interviews and 18 in-depth qualitative interviews with caretakers of inmate children. The children’s data was collected from focused interviews with 27 children ages six to 17, and two corresponding psychometric test instruments of 22 children (See Appendix B, C, D, and I for protocols). All participants were voluntary and should be considered a population of convenient subjects and not necessarily representative of the entire domain of each group. This study was designed as an exploratory study to gather data, describe and explore the relationship of inmate mothers, caretakers and the well
being of children affected by the imprisonment of their mothers.

The findings are presented in three sections:

Section 1) The description of inmate mothers as to their demographics, criminal history, perceived needs of their children and caretaker choices.

Section 2) The description of caretakers of inmate children, their needs, their problems in surrogate parenting and the perceived needs of the children in their custody.

Section 3) The description of the children of inmate mothers as to their demographics, psychosocial well being, perceptions of their mothers and general problems and strengths in coping with daily life.

Section I: Description of Inmate Mothers

The overall average age of the inmate mother participating in this study was 30.8 years with the majority of inmates having less than 90 days left to serve in prison or until a parole board date (Tables 1 and 2).
Table 1: Inmate Mother Age Distribution (N=148)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-over</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Inmate Participant's Sentencing or Parole Board Release Date (N=150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less 30 days</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-89</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-179</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-1 yr.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1 yr.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Past research indicates that African-American females are incarcerated disproportionately compared to the overall proportion of the general population (Henriques, 1982; Glick & Vito, 1977; Zalba, 1964). This finding is confirmed by this study and Table 3 data shows 49% of the respondents were African-American compared to the general population of the catchment area of the Franklin Pre-Release Center - 17% (official ODRC Records 1993).
Table 3: Ethnicity of Inmate Mother Respondents (N=150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As suggested by the past research, the marital status of inmate mothers had a significant majority of women who were single and head of households at their recent time of arrest (79%). This figure includes the 16% of inmate mothers living with their boyfriends since Ohio does not recognize common-law marriages as of October 1991 (See Table 4).

Table 4: Marital Status of Inmate Mothers (N=150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced, separated</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with boyfriend</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legally married</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The poverty status of the sample inmate mothers is presented in Table 5 with 43% of the population responding that they were raised in poverty and 57% reported that they were on public assistance at the time of arrest. A correlational association of .757 emerged between the two variables. This suggests that a general predictor is that
an inmate mother raised on public assistance as a child will be on public assistance at the time of arrest.

Table 5: Poverty Status of Mother at the Time of Arrest *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On public assistance</td>
<td>84(148)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised on public assistance</td>
<td>58(136)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N varies by category. N is denoted by ( ).

The average number of children that the inmate mother had living with her at the time of arrest was 1.90 while the average number of children she has given birth to was 2.69. This difference is due to the fact that either relatives or public agencies took care of approximately 31% of the inmate mother's children prior to her being arrested. The average number of an inmate mother's household is described in Table 6. A comparison of fertility rate versus dependent children living with her at the time of arrest provides an interesting finding. If an inmate mother has one or two children, they are less likely to have them living with her at the time of arrest. The age of the mother or her necessity for AFDC for financial survival may be a factor in who the dependent children lives with prior to arrest. This can be seen by comparing the number of child living with her (family size). As family size increases, the percentage living with her increases.
Table 6: Family Size of Inmate Mothers (N=141)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>f</th>
<th># children conceived</th>
<th># children living w/mother</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six +</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presently pregnant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of inmate mothers in this study did not graduate from high school and were on public assistance. The low economic status of the women is consistent with past research literature (Zalba 1964; Gibb 1971; Glick & Vito 1977; Henriques 1982). A Pearson correlational factor of .88 was found indicating the strength of this association (See Table 7).

Table 7: Comparison of High School Drop Out and Public Assistance Rates of Inmate Mothers *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Pearson R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.S. drop out</td>
<td>89(140)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub. assistance</td>
<td>84(148)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N varies by each category. N is denoted by ( ).
The general descriptive profile of the demographics of the inmates in this study is as follows:

"A black female, 31 years of age, single head-of-household who was raised in poverty and on public assistance and never completed high school."

This would be consistent with the literature of Lewis (1969), Beeghley (1983) and Sidel (1984) on the cycle of poverty, culture of poverty and feminization of poverty.

The following descriptive data presents findings that are additive to the prior profile of inmate mothers. The few past research studies on inmate mothers rarely collected data on the inmate's criminal behavior past the most recent arrest or recidivism rate. Table 8 presents findings that the responding inmate mothers were sentenced for non-violent property offenses and that this was usually related to drug law violations. They are not violent or dangerous inmates, but rather drug abusers and economic nuisances to society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-violent property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug laws</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forgery/fraud</td>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>petty theft</td>
<td></td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td>( 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent personal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assault</td>
<td></td>
<td>( 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempted murder</td>
<td></td>
<td>( 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murder/manslaughter</td>
<td></td>
<td>( 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vehicular homicide</td>
<td></td>
<td>( 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other misc.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 presents the age of the first arrest of inmate mothers. The average age of a first arrest was 24 years of age and 15% were female juvenile delinquents. Twenty-nine percent (29%) of the inmate mothers are now serving their second or third prison term (See Table 10). This finding is significant in terms of child-mother disruption since it would indicate, at least in terms of jail or prison sentences, that many children have had multiple disruptions from their mothers due to incarceration during their significant childhood development stages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 years and under</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 21 years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - 25 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 29 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 33 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 and over</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Recidivism Rate of Inmate Mothers N=150

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f=2nd Prison Term</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This study finds that a significant amount of the inmate mothers were raised in a household where one or more of their parents, siblings or close relatives were incarcerated. This is associated with the inmate's self reporting about her close associates/friendships on the outside and their histories of criminal behaviors and incarcerations (See Tables 11 and 12). The respondents report that 67% of their non-relative close friends have been in jail or prison, that 58% of their immediate childhood family or relatives were incarcerated in jail or prison as they were growing up. It is also reported that 19% of the inmates had multiple different family members in jail or prison.

Table 11: Close Personal Associates of Inmate Mothers Who Have Criminal Records and Imprisonment (N=150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jail or Prison</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

150 | 100%
Table 12: Family Criminal History of Inmate Mothers (N=150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt/Uncle</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple members</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 represents the strength of the association between the variables of the inmate’s family criminal history and the criminal history of her close personal associates when she is not in prison. The Pearson product correlation coefficient (r = .76) strongly suggests that the inmate mothers are immersed in antisocial environments permeating from childhood through adulthood.

Table 13: Correlation of Criminal Associates and Inter-Family Criminality (N=150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close associates</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition of the criminal history findings of this study now added into the profile characteristics the typical inmate mother as:

"A black female, 31 years of age, single head-of-household who was raised in poverty and on public assistance, never completed high school, had at least one of her immediate family involved in a crime
as she was being raised, closely associates with several criminal friends when she is not in jail, uses drugs and supports herself and her children with non-violent crime and drug profits and will most likely be arrested and sent to jail or prison again upon her release."

Inmate Mother's Perception of Motherhood, Child And Caretaker Relationships

It was suggested in the literature that inmate mothers are over permissive in child rearing, are lax in discipline for a child’s transgressions and highly protective of her children (Baunach 1985). This research study found that inmate mothers have a highly optimistic view of themselves as excellent mothers. Throughout the discussions and interviews with inmates, a common theme was expressed about how they were good mothers and that they will continue to be good mothers upon release and reunification with their children. This study’s findings suggest that this may not be an accurate perception of themselves when compared to their older children’s ratings on a parallel test using the Hudson Mother-Child Attitudinal Scale. Inmate mothers rated themselves in the highest tenth percentile in terms of mother-child attachment norms, whereas the teenagers of the inmates rated them in the lowest 15th percentile (see Table 27). The data suggests that the large gap in the self ratings of mother-child attachment may be a serious issue for reunification of the sample inmate with her older
children. While the sample size of both the inmates and teenagers are small, it does present a direction for further exploratory and hypothesis testing.

The vast majority of the inmate mothers (86%) were found to be content with the placement plan for their children while they are in prison. A common theme during qualitative interviews expressed by inmates was that she was an active participant in the placement planning for her children and that the caretakers of her children were the best possible choices she could arrange. Along the same theme, inmates presented their relationships with the caretakers of her children in a positive light. This research finds that the data, both quantitative and qualitative may not support this contention. Almost 30% of the inmate responses to the initial survey shows that the extended family system and to a small extent, the public child welfare system had already removed her from child rearing since children were placed with relatives prior to her most recent arrest (see Table 6, p. 86). Later in this chapter research data will be presented that caretakers are resentful of having to alter their lifestyles to care for the inmate’s children, have a low image of the inmate as a mother and in most cases that the caretakers themselves are not skilled in prosocial parenting. Therefore, the quality
of the placement of inmate children, even if she was an active participant in the placement planning is highly questionable.

**Description of the Caretakers**

This study indicates that an overwhelming majority of children (86%) are staying within an extended kinship system. Approximately 50% of the children are staying with a maternal grandparent and 3% with the paternal grandparent. Another 15% are staying with maternal siblings, and a surprising 18% are in the care of their natural fathers. This finding of male caretakers is four times higher than the past caretaker placement choices reported in the studies done from 1964-1985 (Zalba, 19674; Glick & Neto, 1977; Baumach, 1985). In this study sample, men are becoming more legally designated and taking responsibility for their children's placement while the mother is incarcerated (See Table 14).

**Table 14: Relationship Type of Caretaker Used by Inmate Mothers During Her Incarceration N=137**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother/Father</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling/Cousin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex In-laws</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The choice of a caretaker by an inmate mother is a total avoidance of the public child welfare system by the mother and the extended family. During the course of the qualitative interviews with inmate mothers and caretakers, there is a strong consensus to avoid the child welfare services for any help. The reasons given are very consistent. "If they know I am in jail, they will take my kids away from my relative for good." In almost all cases of local inmates and caretakers interviewed, the researchers were told stories of themselves, relatives or friends who had negative encounters with the Franklin County Children’s Services. Only one caretaker in our study requested help from the local child welfare service agency because a 13 year old teenager that she had custody of needed counseling after a suicide attempt. The caretaker did not have the money for outpatient treatment and asked child welfare for financial help to pay for outpatient counseling.

The caretaker system used by inmate mothers is an informal foster care system of extended family members. The researcher found no differences between races in using the informal system versus public child welfare system. From a research perspective, nobody knows much about this informal system. It is closed, private and very inaccessible to researchers. We were told by key informants that many inmate
mothers would not participate in this research project because of the location of the caretakers, children and the possibility of what might be found out about the caretakers activities. Several caretakers refused to participate in the study once they were contacted and solicited by either the inmate in jail or by the researcher. A total of 18 caretakers were interviewed. From a list of 32 local caretakers, the researchers were able to engage 56% (see Table 15). No natural fathers who had guardianship of the inmate's children agreed to be interviewed. The researcher was denied access by the local children services agency to foster care families due to confidentiality policies, therefore, public caretakers were not part of this study.

Table 15: Caretakers Who Agreed or Refused to be Interviewed by Type N=32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Uncooperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling/Cousin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of the caretaker interviews are reported in narrative form. Data was collected by qualitative interviews and the researcher avoided any quantitative methods. A series of focused questions guided the
interviews (See Appendix D), but the recording of data was done in self debriefing by reviewing notes. The researcher wanted the caretakers to tell their stories of caring for the young children.

The first reported finding is a general theme throughout the interviews. The present caretaker decided to accept the responsibility of being a caretaker not because the inmate mother asked her or him to do this. The decision of accepting the children was done primarily by the maternal grandparent voluntarily coming forward and taking the children. If a sibling or cousin accepted the children, it was done by discussing it with other immediate or extended family members. The decision was arrived at by determining who was best suited based on income, size of the house, health of the parents and the ages and number of children involved. Contrary to past literature (Stanton 1980; Henriques, 1982), the inmate mother in jail, pending trial and eventually prison had little input as to her children’s placement or caretaker plan.

As part of the discussion of child placement, a recurring theme began to covertly emerge. Caretakers were ashamed, disappointed and angry at the inmate mother. In 14 of 18 interviews, the caretaker directly made statements such as:
"That no-good damn daughter of mine."
"Look what she did to these kids."
"What type of life is she going to have."
"I’ll have these kids for the rest of my life. She’ll just get out and be back on the streets again and back in jail.
"I got two of my own, now because of her I got five. I ain’t happy. She better get out (prison) soon."

It was the general impression of the researchers that caretakers, especially grandmothers, masked their feelings about being a caretaker to the inmate and other relatives. Discussing the anger and shame with a non-judgmental and helping professional was a cathartic and emotional release for the grandparents. In several cases the caretaker wanted the researcher to return again. "When will you be back again?" "Where can I reach you?" Caretakers are not happy about their inmate daughter or sister. This is contrary to the inmate mother’s perceived notion of her positive relationship with the caretakers which was previously discussed in this chapter (p. 91).

This study found that the caretakers of inmate mother’s children were unprepared for the initial tasks. While they are or have been mothers, they accepted children and have to cope with children who in some cases are traumatized by the mother’s arrest and who are showing overt emotional and psychological adjustment reactions. Caretakers report that the first few days are the hardest for them and the children. Children are upset, angry and afraid of being
abandoned. This appears to be a general reaction, since most all caretakers mentioned that the initial few days were difficult for everyone and that no one was there to help. In the few cases in this study, the researcher interviewed caretakers who accepted infants as part of all the children and such material needs as diapers, Similac, cribs and other infant things were not available. The caretakers stated they had to make do with whatever they could afford to buy, borrow or get from the inmate mother's residence.

The impression of the researcher was that 16 of 18 caretakers provided adequate food, shelter and clothing in a clean and safe household. The researcher, who was a past child protection investigator, felt that two of the households could be perceived in terms of not clean enough or too small, but they were not concerning enough to report to the local child protective authorities. While finances of the household have been effected by accepting children, it was not an overriding concern of the caretakers. Most all of the households and caretakers interviewed had applied for or were receiving AFDC benefits or transfers of benefits to care for the children and living in subsidized public housing. With only one exception, the caretakers were caring for children who had no special needs or long term debilitating conditions.
The data showed that caretakers had generally negative things to say about the inmate mother's relationship with her children (see Table 16). While inmate mothers perceived their relationships with their children as excellent, caretakers informed the researchers that this was not the case in the majority of children. Taking into consideration that many caretakers were projecting their resentment toward the mother, they did consistently state examples that the mothers were drug abusers, would leave their children with strangers, were not good role models and were not treating their children right. When pressured to discuss "treating-your-kids-right" none of the caretakers would cite examples of physical child abuse, but rather side stepped the question. While concerned, it is apparent that they would never report an act of child abuse or neglect on their relatives.

Table 16: Caretaker Assessment of the Quality of the Inmate Mothers Parent-Child Relationship N=18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent - loving, caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average mothering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average in mothering skills</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor - inconsistent, bad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caretakers report that the greatest hardship in watching an inmate's children is the change in lifestyles. This is very evident in the case of maternal grandparents and maternal sisters with children. In the special case of grandparents, we found that the caretaker was old. While researchers avoided asking any ages it was quite apparent that most caretakers were between 55-70 years of age. In one instance it was found that an older woman was watching six children ranging from 5-17 years of age without any relative or agency support. She was a widow and had moved into a small public housing apartment. When her daughter with six children was arrested, she immediately went out and requested a larger public subsidized house to accommodate her "new family." During her daughter's lengthy sentence for drug trafficking, she has had a mild heart attack and was told to slow down by her physician. She reports that, "I will die from loving these kids too much. I have to make up for what my daughter lacked in caring for them kids." On another visit, an older caretaker was watching three inmate's children and two nephew's children due to a divorce. The researcher arrived at 8:00 AM as the morning routine and getting ready for school was occurring. Corporate business would have been proud to have this grandmother as a productivity engineer. The observed order,
efficiency, excitement and tasks were remarkable. As each went out the front door, the caretaker gave a lecture, encouragement, a final inspection, a kiss and a smile. The twinkle in her eye and the pride were so evident. These few moments were part of the glory of the stories about caretakers. Also, with the glory comes the tragedy.

Ten out of eighteen caretakers consider themselves as rigid and strict disciplinarians. In one case, it bordered on verbal and emotional abuse toward three children who, it was quite apparent, were rebelling at the caretaker's directive to go inside the house. The hostility of the seven year old boy and support of his two sisters prodding to confront the grandmother in front of the researcher were evident. In discussing this rebellion and her reactions to the children, she said, "Those kids are the most bad kids and my daughter never made them do anything. They don't mind me and always hurt my cats. I have to be stern or they'd run me over. They will end up just like their mother." In another case, a caretaker who was a sister to the inmate and watching her three children began to cry when talking about the children. "I have two kids and since these three came, I can't control my two girls, they are turning bad and I don't know what to do. I have even thought of having children's service come and take those
three. I just can't handle this. I want my home and kids back like it used to be."

During three interviews, caretakers were drinking alcohol or had alcohol on their breaths. During one interview session, the caretaker, and a 17 year old male child openly drank 40 oz. malt liquors. Both had little regard for the fact that this was inappropriate and did little to mask their drinking behavior. When asked about the caretaker's drinking habits, the teenage male told the researcher, "This is how we make it through the day." This occurred while four younger children, ages 6-9 years, were playing in the backyard. When asked about drinking and watching the children, the caretaker responded, "The backyard's fenced and if they go to the alley, I'll whip them good. They know better." One caretaker did not remember that I was coming at a set time. When a younger child that was to be interviewed let the researcher in the house, the caretaker was surprised and quickly ran about the living room and picked up 13 empty beer cans. The adult stated that she had several friends over the previous evening and did not have time to clean up prior to the visit. It was 3:30 PM in the afternoon.

When asked about what caretakers needed to make their jobs of watching the children easier, a general theme
emerged. Caretakers lose their lifestyle, alter it to accommodate the task and generally want respite. The greatest need emerged as to some sort of respite program that would allow a caretaker the "mental health time" away from the children, confusion, problems and just relax. Many caretakers recounted stories of what they used to do but now cannot do because of child care demands.

After several reviews of the researcher's notes, it was found that most caretakers had focused on the problems of the inmate mother and the caretakers own problems and generally passed over the problems that the children were experiencing. Aside from collecting and recording the most frequent concerns about the caretaker's perception of the children's problems, little in-depth qualitative data was able to be collected from the researcher's notes.

While the caretakers offered little about the problems that the children were dealing with, they were very consistent in discussing school problems (see Table 17). Both academic and behavior areas were the largest concern of caretakers, while the psychological well being of the children and the mother-child relationship were not as concerning to them.
Table 17: Children’s Problems as Identified by Caretakers *(N=18)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School behavior</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Child relationship</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Multiple responses, therefore, f exceeds the N

The uncooperative caretakers were also a source of data in this study. A letter of introduction, two or three calls and in a few instances, front door solicitation was done. The front door solicitation was discontinued after an encounter with a husband who was the caretaker threatened to shoot the researcher. Collecting data is important, but not that important. As far as husband caretakers go, the researcher was met with outright hostility about any solicitation for information concerning the children. What was found was that the male caretakers who have custody and guardianship of the children verbalized great anger about the inmate mother more than they have concern for the children. In all four cases, it was reported that the males or ex-husbands did not plan on allowing any contact between the child and mother while she is in prison or after she is released. The reasons for this could not be ascertained
from the usually short and hostile telephone contacts. The researcher suspects that some inmate mothers who volunteered for this research had lost the formal custody of their children to the father and gave the consent to be interviewed with the possible hope that the researcher would find negative situations.

Telephone contacts with other maternal caretakers were met with general suspicion and distrust. Since one researcher was white and one African-American, if one was turned down for cooperation, the next follow up call came from the other researcher. A matrix of female to female, white male to white female and vice versa was attempted. The researchers became convinced that caretakers who were uncooperative were hiding some secret. The general theme that was encountered was that the inmate mother had no authority to give the caretaker's name, address and phone number to strangers. Second, the inmate mother had no authority to decide who these children talk to since the caretaker has custody. Along the same theme, four caretakers stated that the inmate mother is just wasting the researcher's time, since the inmate will never have custody of these children again. Elaborate researcher explanations that we were not calling on behalf of the mother was usually unsuccessful in eliciting cooperation.
Description of Children

This study found that the average age of the child is 8.1 years old. As earlier reported (McGowan & Rosenthal, 1978; Henriques, 1982), 86% of the children were under ten. This sample is slightly older with 85% being under age 13 (see Table 18). Significantly, it was found that 37% (132) of the inmate children in this study are pre-school age and under 5 years of age. According to Massey (1976), Piaget (1965) and Damon (1988), these children are in the imprinting stage of social development where it is contended by social and cognitive developmental psychologists that 90% of the core value systems and belief systems are internalized by the children from observing primary adult caretakers.

Table 18: Age Distribution of Inmate Children N=354

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unborn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high school aged children (N=51) account for 14% of the total children in this study. The interpenetration of the data shows that the male juvenile delinquency rate was a surprising 40%. While the overall sample reported a 13% incidence, if it is factored against the number of males age 12-17 in the sample, it is much higher since juveniles under the age of twelve are not detained in juvenile court in almost all counties in Ohio. Similarly, a closer analysis of the data showed the teenage pregnancy rate to be an astounding 60% (See Table 19). These findings strongly confirm past theorists (Bowlby, 1944; Rutters, 1973) who contend that elevated behavior problems such as delinquency and pregnancy rates will occur in the children of inmate mothers in later stages of childhood development due to multiple mother-child disruption episodes in formative years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>17 (43)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant</td>
<td>15 (25)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N varies by category. N is denoted by ( ).
If only using the high school age criteria and the male delinquency and teen pregnancy rate it can be inferred that up to 82% of the older inmate children in this study have shown serious and overt behavior problems during adolescence. This finding suggests that the multigenerational cycles of poverty and criminality are evident in the children of inmates.

This study found that 49% of the children had been separated previously from their mother due to jail or imprisonment. In other words, half of the children had experienced multiple childhood disruptions in the mother-child relationship in their developmental stages. Compounding on the disruption due to the mother’s incarceration was the finding that 35% of the siblings were placed separately with different caretakers during this separation. This suggests that the lack of sibling continuity may lead to a sense of abandonment in many children. In 19% of the children they were moved more than once to another caretaker during their mother’s incarceration, exasperating the affects of sibling disruption, stability of adult-child relationships and could lead to a serious psychological sense of abandonment (see Table 20). Taken as a whole, 1/2 of the children have had multiple disruptions, 1/3 have been separated from their
siblings and 1/5 were moved among multiple caretakers during their mother's incarceration.

Table 20: Children's Disruption in Sibling and Adult Caretaker Relationships *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children multiple disruptions</td>
<td>67 (137)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due to mother in prison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings placed separately</td>
<td>37 (107)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children moved multiple times</td>
<td>26 (137)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N varies by each category. N is denoted by ( ).

We found that the children in this study rarely, if ever, see their mothers on prison visitation days. Fifty-seven percent (57%) of the children never have visited their mother in prison and an additional 15% rarely visit. In review of the sentencing patterns of inmate mothers, it was found that most inmates serve an average 13 months prison term. Therefore, the vast majority of children may not see or visit their mothers for up to one year. It was reported by inmate mothers that in some cases they have not seen their children in 4 years.
Table 21: Frequency of Child-Inmate Mother Visitation N=136

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitation</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once per month</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times per month</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every few months</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school age children of this sample of inmate mothers were found to be having difficulty in school. For all school age children (N=221), 14% had been suspended at least once. If taking into account it is rare that a student under the age of 10 is formally suspended, then the more realistic estimate for older children is more likely to be 25-35%. Similarly, the data shows 33% of the children had been in counseling of some sort at the urging of the school based on the information from the inmate mother and caretaker. Taken as a whole, the children of inmates are likely to experience interpersonal relationship problems with peers and adult authority figures once presented with wider social interactions outside of the immediate family and caretaker environment. When asking the inmate mother if her children need counseling for personal problems, the respondents indicated that 57% of the children are in need of help (See Table 22).
Table 22: Children's School, Interrelationships and Personal Problems as Perceived by Inmate Mothers *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children suspended from school</td>
<td>31(124)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in counseling</td>
<td>42(128)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's needs for counseling per</td>
<td>74(130)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N varies for each category and is denoted (N).

The interwoven results of the open-ended interviews done with younger children from ages 6-10 years are presented in narrative form. Children were interviewed in a variety of locations; home, school, YWCA and on walks or doing recreational activities (See protocol in Appendix D, E).

In general, the young children of female inmates verbalize good images of their relationship with their mothers. They recall pleasant memories and do show remorse that their mothers are not with them. In only one case, a young male, age six, could not recall his mother but did verbalize pleasant visits with his father who periodically sees him. There was only one incident of resentment directed at the inmate mother found during the interviews of the younger aged youths who were all under ten years of age. However, it was found that in 5 children under the age of 10 the role of the mother or caretaker being a mother was
confusing for the children. When asked, "What does a mother do?" and, "Who does that for you?", most children responded that the caretaker is the mother since their real mother can't do it because she is not there. It is apparent the respondents in the study did not have clear or concise images of the inmate mother as being their mothers. This suggests that the instability of the inmate mother’s parenting role prior to her arrest may have an affect on the children's view of motherhood. Compounding this affect is the fact that the caretaker is the maternal role model. Surrogate motherhood roles and biological mothers appears to be a confusing concept for the younger children of inmate mothers.

The children in the study had no idea of how they got to be placed with their present caretaker. None of the children had input into their present placement. Conversely, none of the children had any desire to live anywhere else.

The greatest remorse for the young children was the fact that they were separated from their siblings. In the qualitative portion of the study, 5 out of the 13 sibling-family units were disrupted. In 4 out of 5 of the sibling disruptions, it was the older brothers and sisters that were not living with the sibling's caretaker household.
As the older youth become disruptive or get into trouble, he/she may be removed from the younger children and placed with another adult caretaker within the extended kinship network. The younger children expressed remorse and concern over the older sibling’s absences. The greatest verbalized concern of the younger children was that they did not know the location of the older sibling.

The children of inmate mothers express concern over the return of their mothers after prison. They verbalize that they will be happy for the mother’s release, but conversely the children were concerned about leaving their neighborhoods, friends and school mates. This suggests that the children want stability upon their mother’s release and that the reunification may in essence create yet another disruption in their lives.

During this study, the researcher had the opportunity to transport and observe 9 children of inmate mothers during a program offered by the Center For Peace Studies and Community Development for this special population. The program was a therapeutic and recreational group that met for a half day on Saturdays during the summer. The interactions of the children in terms of play, sharing, cooperation and discussions between the children could be observed and recorded with the researcher being a
participant-observer. Four out of 9 children were boys and all children were between 6 - 10 years of age and all children were African-American.

During this initial session, the researcher observed 13 acts of aggressive and violent behavior. Twelve of the 13 recorded acts were done by the males. Physical acts such as pushing, hitting and stealing another’s candy were recorded. It must be remembered that 3 of the 4 boys were not related and had never met each other prior to this day. Their initial reactions were to be aggressive and pre-emptively violent to their peers. While the research goal was to observe the young persons interrelationship patterns, it became an observation in violence by young boys. The young girls were more appropriate in their behavior and cooperative in play and discussion. They tended to ignore or tolerate the boys verbal and physical inappropriate behavior. One exception did occur during transporting two sisters, age 9 and 7, home. Upon arriving in the alley behind their caretaker’s house, the older girl saw two young boys on bicycles. To the horror of myself and another adult volunteer helping in transportation, the girl said she was going to kill one of the boys and jumped out of the van before it stopped and knocked the boy off his bicycle. The younger sister said, "How ya going to kill him? With a
knife?", and she ran into the caretaker's house. While scrambling to stop the girl from hurting the boy any further, the caretaker came out on the porch and told the girl to go inside immediately. Helping the boy up he stated, "She's crazy." Another neighbor across the alley who had observed this incident shouted out to the researcher, "You better do something before that girl kills that little boy someday." The caretaker explained that the girls did not get along with the boy because he makes fun of them for having a mother in jail.

During the Saturday session, the researcher had to wait for the therapist to complete a session. The researcher and a volunteer attempted to administer a 25 question psychological tool to four girls (See Appendix G). It was observed that two of the girls could not read the instrument or understand the directions. The instrument is a widely accepted test and is written at the first and second grade level for seven or eight year olds. Both girls were 9 and 10 years old and entering the fourth grade. Orally reading the questions and asking the two girls to mark an 'x' in the "yes" or "no" columns was also unsuccessful. Both girls could not comprehend spatial columns or match "x"s with the right questions or column. It was apparent that both girls had learning difficulties and could not read at a second
grade level or follow simple written or oral instructions and also had spatial relationship problems.

During the waiting periods, the researcher took small groups of 2 or 3 children down to the YWCA gym and jogging track to observe their play. On the jogging track, the children were very aggressive in their running and racing. Allowing the children to run a race against an adult, all the youths went to great lengths to win. Shoving or pushing the adult aside and exerting themselves to win the race was observed in 8 out of the 9 children. The researcher found that using unfair practices was viewed as ok with them if it meant they could win. In discussing winning or losing after the race, the children generally expressed no remorse for the researcher losing. In fact, it was found that the children relished in the fact that they won by being unfair. Even though in reality, the adult could have won easily, none of the youths realized that was the experiment.

The Psychological Well Being of the Children of Inmate Mothers

A. Unborn, Infants and Preschool Aged Children

The very young children of inmate mothers were unaccessible in this research study. Data collected from the inmate mothers in this research project (N=150) shows that 37% (132) of the respondent's children were under the age of five years. Table 23 shows the distribution by age.
Table 23: Distribution of Children Under Five Years by Age
N=132

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>cf</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unborn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the few pregnant inmates who did respond to the questionnaire did indicate that all 10 were serving sentences for drug law violations and that their average age was 22.7 years. This finding is significantly lower than the average inmate age of 30.8 years. Further analysis of the data collected from the pregnant inmates showed that this was their first incarceration (80%) and were bearing their first child (70%). The data suggests that the pregnant inmate is young, a first time offender and may possibly have abused drugs during her pregnancy and the unborn child could be a high risk for developmental delays.

It has been reported by several theorists that very young children require continuous and consistent parenting to effectively master social, emotional and physical growth task during early stages of development (Bowlby, 1956, 1973; Freud, 1939; Goldstein, Freud & Solnit, 1973; Erikson, 1960; Piaget, 1932/1965; Damon, 1988). This research found that the vast majority of the very young children under five are
residing with a maternal or paternal grandmother and have not been placed separately from their siblings if they also were under the age of five years (121 of 132 or 92%). The data suggests that grandmothers of inmate mothers are the most frequent choice to raise the infants and young children in the extended family system. The data further suggests that if an inmate mother has a mixture of preschool, school aged or teenagers, then the older youth are more likely to be placed with relatives other than the grandmother. If taking into account 35% of all sibling units found in this sample were disrupted (See Table 20, p. 105), the conclusion can only be that older children are more likely to experience separation as they increase with age.

The data indicates the young children are developing attachments to grandparents to receive the consistent parenting and nurturing that is required. This suggests that the extended caretaker family system does recognize this developmental need of the very young and that grandmothers are perceived as best suited to the task, especially since only one of the local grandmother caretakers out of the 14 interviewed was employed.

B. School Aged Children (Six to Ten Years of Age)

Children who are elementary school aged are generally exposed to the larger social world outside of the immediate
caretaker environment. At this age, most leading theorists of child development such as Erikson (1960), Piaget (1932/1965) and Damon (1988), contend that the child must become competent in tasks related to coping and getting along with the larger social context around them.

Most inmate mother's children experience problems at school as reported by the inmate, caretaker and the interviewed children. It was learned from observing 13 elementary school children over the period of four weeks in the specialized summer program for children of inmates offered by the Center For Peace Studies and Community Development, that most were experiencing very poor peer interrelationship problems, short attention spans and poor cooperation in following adult authority directives.

Since the research was aimed at capturing the quantitative as well as qualitative psychosocial well being of inmate children psycometric tests were administered to 11 elementary school aged children to access: 1) the amount of attachment and resentment toward the children's inmate mother, and 2) the overall direction of their self esteem, psychological coping and internalized self control, and amount of fatalistic thinking.

As was suggested in the qualitative part of the data collection, the Hudson Parent-Child Contentment psychometric
test confirmed that young children hold a positive perception of their mother. While the inmate mother may have been inconsistent, gone for prolonged periods of time and not skilled in parenting, the young children held a very positive view of their mother. The overall mean score of the younger child was in the top twenty-fifth percentile.

The results of the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale (1973) did not support the contention that the younger children as a whole were suffering from excessive feelings of helplessness. The average mean score was 12.1 which is ranked in the average range of percentiles - 53%. The differences in the perception of well being between the qualitative - quantitative test results may be accounted for by the fact that the Nowicki-Strickland Scale was administered in a setting of one or two children at a time. This was done since earlier attempts at larger group administration was unsuccessful due to the short attention span of the children and their disruptive behaviors (See p. 111). The rater was much more nurturing, patient and praising of the children; therefore, the youths attempted to please and present themselves in a positive light to a more affectionate adult. The children were allowed to sit on the researchers lap and talk among themselves before answering. The results indicate that this sample of younger children
aged 6 to 10 years of age are not as psychologically impaired as past researchers had indicated (Hairston & Hess, 1989; Stanton, 1980; Henriques, 1982; Baunach, 1982; McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978). The following results of the older teenager's scores on the same instrument are in stark contrast.

C. Teenagers of Inmate Mothers (Ages 14 - 17 Years)

The older children of incarcerated mothers should be expected to be struggling with the issues of adolescence. The developmental needs of adolescence are generally in the areas of independence, conformity to social controls imposed by peers and society and a sense of identity and purpose. Central to the issues of adolescence is the support of the home and parental environment to assist the adolescent in coping with the new tasks. In this research study, the research questions of adolescent-mother relationships during the separation due to her imprisonment should have significant implications since most of the youth were raised in a single parent household. Secondly, the amount of connectedness between the adolescent and his/her mother should provide insight as to how these youth feel toward their immediate adults as a role model. Thirdly, the incarceration period has been considered by many researchers as an abandonment of the child by the inmate. It has been
contended that older children feel they have been abandoned, rejected by adults, have low self esteem and multicomplex psychosocial problems due to the multiple separations in their earlier childhood development (Baouch 1979, 1985; Hairston & Hess 1988; Browne 1989; McGowan & Blaumenthal 1978).

To assess the psychosocial impact of maternal imprisonment, this research study was able to engage 11 out of 51 teenage youths (22%) that were known to the researchers based on the inmate data collection methods. The results of the 11 youths, four female and seven males, interviewed and psychometrically tested are as follows.

The older children of inmate mothers were found to be much more resentful, embarrassed and angry in their feelings toward their mothers than the younger aged children. Using a cluster of questions on the Hudson Children’s Scale (Hudson, 1982), it can be found that the older children feel a great sense of shame, embarrassment, resentment and anger toward their mothers (see Table 24).
Table 24: Older Children’s Perception of Their Inmate Mother N=11.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>X score</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel ashamed of my mother.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mother’s behavior embarrasses me.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I resent my mother.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel angry toward my mother.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* scores are based on a Likert Scale with 1=rarely to 5=all the time.

The overall mean score of the teenage respondents was compared to the scale norms of the Hudson for Children. The mean score of the teenagers ranks very low in the amount of contentment that one has with their mothers. This suggests a serious impairment in the children’s feelings of continuous caring and affection toward their mother, who is generally the most significant adult in a child’s life. The data further suggests that the younger children have yet to have enough maturity, social experience and intellectualization to comprehend their plight, whereas the low scores of the older children may be more accurate due to maturity and experience and they can verbalize their resentment easier. One seventeen year old child who is a school drop out, has a long juvenile arrest record and is unemployed at the present time was interviewed and probably reflects the resentment better than any quantitative testing. He stated:
"Why you comin' round now with all these questions about my mom? Where the **** were you ten years back when I needed help. Maybe I wouldn't be this way, man. Maybe I'd be somthin'. She done nothin' but bring me down."

This youth reflected the basic theme that was found throughout the various interviews that were conducted by the researcher with the teenagers. The male teenagers were more vocal, harsh and angry toward their mothers, whereas the teenage girls were more withdrawn, calm and showed little affect in discussing their mothers and their present plight.

It was found that ten out of the eleven teenagers had significant child rearing responsibilities delegated to them by their present caretakers. In one case, a 16 year old girl reported that she frequently misses school since she must take care of two infants, one a sibling and one left by a second cousin who can't be found. This same young girl also watches two older siblings aged 6 and 9 in the caretaker's absence. In most cases, the teenage boys were found to also share significant child care responsibilities if the other younger children in the caretaker household are school aged. Most male teenagers reported that they did not mind the child care duties and that it gave them a sense of pride as a big brother or "man-of-the-house."

To assess the general psychosocial well being of the adolescents, the Nowicki-Strickland Instrument was
administered to the eleven participants. The instrument is designed to measure the loss of control in a subject as to their perception between one's action and its consequences and how helpless a person feels in general. The results of the instrument show that this group of teenagers are experiencing a severe amount of helplessness and fatalism concerning their present social situation. The mean score of the group was 16.7 and ranks in the 84 percentile of the norm. The results are compared to past researchers (Kendall et al 1975; Stein 1974) who used the instrument to measure emotional disturbed children in residential mental health settings. The present results were also compared to past research reports of Fenhagen & Duke (1975) in their accessment of juvenile delinquents. A comparison of the present test results of teenagers of inmate mothers to emotionally disturbed and delinquents is very significant. The test results suggest that the older inmate's children may be more severely impaired than previously suggested by mothers, caretakers and others.

**Table 25:** Comparison of Nowicki-Strickland Results of Inmate Mother's Teenagers With Past Research Findings of Other Teenager Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>X score</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers of inmate mothers</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally disturbed children</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens in residential placement</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjudicated delinquents</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Comparison of Hudson & Nowicki-Strickland Results and The Well Being of Children

To further analyze the psychological well being of children, the following tables (Tables 26 and 27) were constructed to compare the three levels of test results of the Hudson Scales and the two levels of the Nowicki-Strickland Scale.
### Table 26: Comparison of Mean Scores on Selected Questions on Parallel Hudson Mother-Child Scales from Inmate Mothers, Young Children, Teenagers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Inmate Mother (N=8)</th>
<th>Age 6-10yr (N=11)</th>
<th>Age 14-17yr (N=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My mother/child gets on my nerves**</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I dislike my mother/child</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My mother/child’s behavior embarrasses me</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I wish I had a different mother/child</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My mother/child puts too many limits on me</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I resent my mother/child</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I hate my mother/child</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I really like my mother/child</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I do not love my mother/child</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel very angry toward my mother/child</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel very proud of my mother/child</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My mother/child does not understand me</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel ashamed of my mother/child</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Scores are reported as overall Xs

** Inmate mothers responded to items with child, while children responded to items with mother in questions.

Hudson Scale Responses:  
1 = Rarely or never  
2 = A little of the time  
3 = Some of the time  
4 = Good part of the time  
5 = Most or all the time

The amount of contentment between inmate mothers and young children is very high and similar. Both groups over represent their relationships as excellent. When compared to the older teenager’s perception of the mother, the contentment decreases sharply. The findings are that
caretakers do not view the inmates as good mothers (see Table 16, p. 100) and that older teenagers are usually not placed together with their younger siblings (see Table 22, p.117 narrative). The data suggests that as the child grows older he/she has faced greater disruption and discontinuity than the younger children and that this results in more feelings of resentment toward the inmate mother.

Likewise, a comparison of the Nowicki-Strickland results (See Table 27) shows that the younger a child of an inmate mother is, then the lower his/her feelings of helplessness and corresponding depression. Conversely, the older the child, the more hopeless, depressed and fatalistic the child becomes.

Table 27: Comparison of Means of the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Results For Young Children and Teenagers of Inmate Mothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>X scores</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inmate's children 6-10 years of age (N=11)</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>53rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate's children 14-17 years of age (N=11)</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>84th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data suggest a far greater and more global implication, if the human service, education, correction, child welfare and mental health agencies can intervene and engage children of inmate mothers at an early age, it may be
possible to decrease the amount of hopelessness, fatalism, resentment and dysfunctional behaviors that occur at a high rate in the later teenage years of this group of children. The data suggest that the larger social context of relationships of inmate children has yet to effect their psychological well being under age ten (See Table 27). The finding that most children under the age of five are placed together with a maternal grandmother (p. 116) may provide the nurturing and sense of well being and cohesiveness of the sibling/family unit necessary to offset the childhood deprivation of not having a consistent mother. In fact, one could hypothesize that based on the psychometric test results of the young children that their psychosocial well being is best served by having their mothers incarcerated. Further research and much larger samples are required to test this hypothesis based on the present research sample sizes of twenty-two children tested.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The inmate children that were interviewed or tested in this study, live in Columbus, Ohio, and were all school aged, mostly living in poverty, high crime areas and were predominantly African-Americans. The children were found to be having numerous problems in almost all aspects of their lives. School, adult authority figures and interpersonal relationships with peers were all very troublesome. Most of the children have had multiple disruptions in their relationships with their mothers and other adult parental role models. The majority of the older children were found to be fatalistic, feeling helpless and having little personal control over their lives. It was found that most of the children mask their feelings of depression by being very aggressive and violent, especially the male children.

The children have already experienced multiple disruptions in their childhood development, maternal-child, adult-child and sibling relationships. They rarely, if ever, maintain a relationship with their mother while she is incarcerated.
The children of inmate mothers do poorly in school. Low academic performance and behavior problems were reported in the vast majority of older teenager children. Up to 1/3 of the younger elementary school aged children are already at an early age showing overt school behavior and academic problems.

The social economic status of the children has not been affected due to their mother's incarceration. Most children remained on public assistance and lived with relatives in neighborhoods that were low income and high crime areas of Columbus.

While the younger aged children showed no remorse, resentment or embarrassment about having a mother incarcerated, the older children reported significant resentment, fatalism and embarrassment. The masked depression of older children is overtly acted out in males by delinquency and females by illegitimate pregnancy.

The 150 inmate mothers in this study were typically from multigenerational low socioeconomic environments, poorly educated and reliant on public assistance. Almost fifty percent had been raised in a poverty household, had a parent or immediate family that was incarcerated and close associates who also had criminal records and had been in prison. They are over represented by African-Americans and
the vast majority were single head of households at the time of their most recent arrest.

In terms of the mother’s criminality, the vast majority were found to be multiple non-violent property offenders. Over one-third of the mothers were serving sentences for drug abuse offenses and about one-third were serving time for property and fraud offenses to support drug abuse habits or improve their economic plight. In terms of public safety of society, they pose little threat for being engaged in violent crime.

As inmate mothers, they have little contact with their children while in prison. They have exaggerated self images as loving and concerned mothers and unrealistic expectations for positive reunification with their children. Inmates are generally happy with the placement of their children within the extended kinship system while they are in prison. They are over optimistic about the quality of the relationship they have with the caretaker of their children and their older children.

The 18 caretakers that participated in this research study were mostly from low socioeconomic environments and minorities. They were generally old, poor, single head of household, minority and living in blighted inner city areas of Columbus. They are financially reliant on public
housing, public assistance, social security or AFDC transfers from the inmate mother to care for her children.

The majority of the caretakers are reluctantly watching the inmate’s children and do not receive public agency social service support in that task. The vast majority of caretakers are resentful, embarrassed or hostile toward the inmate mother for a variety of reasons. Caretakers have made significant alterations in their life style to accommodate the children during the inmate’s incarceration. In most cases, the caretakers are poorly educated and do not exhibit prosocial parenting skills in watching the children. Older children are given a substantial amount of freedom by the caretakers and, in most cases, the caretakers require the older children to be active in the care of the younger children or siblings in the household. In the case of older children who become unmanageable, the older caretakers arrange for a male relative who is a son or cousin to accept the caretaker supervision and the responsibility for the boy. In this study, the four teenage girls that were interviewed were living with the caretaker and had extensive child care responsibilities for younger siblings and other children in the extended family.
Implications for the Correctional System

A. Prison Staff and Their Perception of Inmate-Child Services

In general, correctional administrations deal with issues of overcrowding, budget crises, personnel problems, prison inmate issues and a multitude of other legal and political problems. Many times, the social programming in the areas of rehabilitation, social services and needs of inmates past the prison fences take the lowest priority (Allen & Simonsen, 1992). During the literature review, it was suggested that prison staff is unconcerned about the family problems of inmates. This was absolutely refuted during the course of this research at one institution. The leadership and key informants at the Franklin Pre-Release Center, and its present attempts at inmate programming, desire for additional programs and funds for inmate-child services were very evident. This study found that the correctional administrators are keenly aware about the inmate's special needs and receptive to inmate children programming issues past the prison walls. Several practical obstacles inhibit programming at the Franklin Pre-Release Center at the present time:
1) lack of data concerning the whereabouts of an inmate's children
2) an overcrowded facility with little space to accommodate a Parenting Center or Children Center
3) a lack of program staff to facilitate a specialized mother-child visitation and reunification program
4) a state correctional office that focuses on male inmate policy issues

B. Community Corrections and Shifting Institutional Services and Dollars

This study found that the vast majority of inmates were multiple, non-violent, property offenders that were transferred to the Franklin Pre-Release Center to serve out the remaining part of their sentences. A wide variety of institutional social and rehabilitative services are made available to inmates. During the course of this research study, the need for community based correctional facilities for low risk offenders was discussed with key informants inside and outside the prison system. Community residential facilities for male offenders have been much more widespread than for female offenders in Ohio. From a public protection standpoint, most of inmate mothers in this study were drug
and property offenders and pose a very small risk of offending in a structured community based residential program. The transition from institution to community supervision and ordered participation of work, parenting, education and vocational training should provide a fiscal as well as social cost savings to correctional policy makers. Only a small portion of women in Ohio prisons are violent offenders yet the prison population has drastically increased. Prisons are over used due to conservative sentencing decisions made by lawmakers and implemented by the judiciary (Allen & Simonsen, 1992). Community corrections programs for female offenders, especially those with young children, are very scarce in Ohio. Sentencing low risk female offenders with children to prison does little to improve the ability of the inmate mother to be successful since the incarceration has essentially severed family, economic, social and parental relationships. This scenario certainly does not reflect contemporary correctional practices.

A community corrections model should allow for the linkages of the inmate, caretaker and children to a wide array of local social services much easier than in an institutional based model of rehabilitation. The special case of female inmates with very young children in a
community corrections program should be more desirable rather than institutional placement and total separation from her children. The findings of this present study suggest that multiple separation episodes of inmate mother-child relationships during early childhood developmental stages negatively effects the long-term personality of children. Correctional policy makers should increase the amount of community correctional beds and programs for the non-violent female offenders with young children in an attempt to be fiscally prudent and also break the cycles of multigenerational criminality.

C. Inmate Mother-Child Visitation

This study found that 72% of the participating inmates rarely or never have visitation with their children. The reasons for this noncontact vary. Some inmate mothers don’t want their children to see them in prison, others have difficulty with caretakers that are unwilling to take the children to visit, and others state that the requirements to get visitation privileges are too much trouble. Significantly, upon closer analysis of data and discussion with inmates who have never seen their children so far (57%) it was found that almost 75% are placed great distances from
their children and caretakers, therefore, transportation is an issue. If one of the goals of rehabilitation is to increase parent-child contact, correctional policy makers should encourage the funding of voluntary transportation services and assist in coordinating visits and transportation based on inmate’s requests for assistance. One such program is the Aide to Imprisoned Mothers in Atlanta, Georgia. It is partially funded by federal and state correctional grants and provides free transportation for family visits in cooperation with the Georgia prisons (Bloom & Steinhart, 1993).

During the course of this study, several inmates commented that the visitation room at Franklin Pre-Release Center was not a good place to visit with their children. There was a wide variety of explanations—not enough toys, too much supervision, not a natural feeling, too much noise, no activities for the inmate and the children, the prison does not make caretakers feel comfortable. Correctional policy makers should encourage and fund specialized visitation programs or centers for children visitation. One such program is the Bedford Hills Correctional Children’s Center in the New York State system. A separate building with a set program of staff and volunteer social services, recreation and child centered space is aimed at making the
visits relaxed, comfortable and interactive between the family units (Bloom & Steinhart, 1993).

D. Allowing Inmates to Become Responsible for Mother-Child Programming

While conducting the data collection for this study, a group of eight inmates was asked to discuss what they thought would be good programming to assist them in being better mothers when they were released. During the discussion, they outlined a program that would enable inmates to have prolonged visits, develop closer ties and better interrelationship skills with their children and allow themselves to take responsibility for a positive visit. The inmates directly criticized the present Parenting Classes at the Franklin Pre-Release Center stating they felt that the material was presented as a lecture and that they needed down-to-earth interaction and training with their children present. Correctional policy makers should encourage inmates to take responsibility and do "bottom up" planning and engage inmates in planning and presenting a model Parent Center Program for consideration and possible implementation.
Implications For the Child Welfare System

A. Need for Children of Inmates to be Designated At-Risk

The reality of this study’s research findings suggests that children of inmates are not identified by most child welfare agencies in Ohio as at-risk-children. In an ideal world of human service intervention on behalf of children, this study’s client population should be the highest priority for intervention and family reunification by child welfare agencies. Mothers are absent due to incarceration, substitute parenting by relatives is occurring, children have disrupted maternal child episodes and reunification of families is federally mandated by PL96-272, the Child Welfare Act of 1980. To meet the mandate of PL96-272, public child welfare agencies should be responsive, preventive and routine in case managing the children of inmate mothers.

B. Inmate and Caretaker Fears of Child Welfare Involvement

The vast majority of children of inmate mothers (90% N=312) in this research study were not engaged by the child welfare system. In fact, inmate and caretaker respondents stated that even if their children or grandchildren were in need of social support services offered by the local child welfare agencies, they would not contact them for
assistance. The reasons for avoiding any help from child serving agencies is because most of the inmates and caretakers are economically and socially disenfranchised and have had or heard of negative experiences with the child welfare workers in the past. It was the consensus of the adults who were mostly black and poor that when child welfare workers intervene, the results and responses further work against helping their situation. In fact, from their perspective, contacting child welfare for help makes matters worse, and they end up more socially oppressed and disenfranchised. It was subtly indicated by the respondents that child welfare workers are culturally insensitive and biased in their decision making and perspective of minority children’s needs.

Incarcerated mothers do not want referrals to the child welfare agencies to assist their children in the separation process. The inmate’s reasoning is based on a perceived fear that once she is investigated, the child care worker will declare her “unfit” and take permanent custody. Many inmate mothers may in essence be unfit but from a socially and economically disenfranchised perspective, she has at least had a successful event in bearing and nurturing children in a world where there were no other positive rewards achievable. The fear of losing the children is far
greater than the risk of engaging the child welfare system to provide social services for her children. Secondly, the child welfare professionals also avoid contact with inmates for a variety of reasons. If a referral is accepted then the child welfare worker may investigate and file charges of neglect or dependency on the caretaker, and in essence work to the detriment of the mother reunifying with her children. Thirdly, child welfare workers do not like to travel great distances or go through correctional visitation requirements to interview an inmate mother and accept a referral or provide the necessary reunification services and plan (Bloom & Steinhart, 1993). Inmates, key informants and child welfare workers all reported that reunification services are difficult to provide since correctional facilities, caretakers, court hearings and distances between all the parties are unsurmountable obstacles and, therefore, a waste of time. Key informant child welfare workers have indicated that large caseloads and more receptive parents in the community are priority cases.

The Franklin County children Services Board reports it provided foster care to 1,958 children; family preservation services to 1,070 families; 12,748 family investigations and purchased treatment services for 3,630 children. It is not known how many of these services were
for children of incarcerated mothers (FY 93 Franklin County Children Services Annual Report).

C. Proactive Advocacy For The Child-At-Risk

The issue of incarcerated mothers and caretakers not wanting social agency support, and the child welfare systems issues of not wanting to be involved should be irrelevant. The children, the victims of the situation, who need, deserve and have a right to services to assist them in their future lives should be the primary social focus of all the adults who supposedly are looking out for their best interests. As this research study reported, the negative long-term personal and social costs to the children will predictively occur if no social agency intervenes. Avoidance by adults and the benign neglect by public social services will only perpetuate the multigenerational cycles of poverty, crime and psychosocial dysfunctioning played out through these children.

Child care workers should proactively engage inmate mothers as soon as they are adjudicated and sentenced to prison terms. The inmate mothers should be included in agency service plans even if there are no reports and referrals of neglect, abuse or dependency. Child care workers are viewed by the inmate and caretaker as the enemy. Engaging inmate mothers at the personally vulnerable time of
long-term incarceration in a nonjudgmental, helpful and concerning way about the effects and well-being of her children would increase the positive image of child welfare involvement over time. Secondly, the provision of social services to the inmate’s children and caretakers should be done with no legal directive. This researcher knows of no legal restriction to a child welfare agency to offer and provide services to children who need them. Instead of excluding children since there is no abuse and neglect, the child welfare system should include children on the basis of need rather than legal directive.

The child welfare system can help children of inmates indirectly by providing supportive services to the caretakers of an inmate’s children without legal directives. As earlier reported, this study found that caretakers are older and in some cases having health problems, need respite and partial homemaker services and are dealing with the stress and psychosocial problems of poverty and are not necessarily very skilled in prosocial parenting. Nonlegal and nonjudgmental offers of assistance for social supports for the caretaker and the children can have a positive effect on the image of child case workers.
D. Nonprofit Social Services to Support Public Child Welfare Agencies

Finally, the child welfare system appears to be constrained by legal directives, mandates, overburdened case workers, financial limitations for funding social services and the placing of low priority on inmate children. This narrow perspective can be off set by the development of nonprofit and voluntary community agencies that could specialize in only inmate children services and help with coordination and evaluation of "systems" intervention. This research study found that there was only one nonprofit agency providing any services to inmates and children in Franklin County. Creative and innovative programming, needs assessment and specialized services done by private nonprofit agencies should be funded, expanded and encouraged by the encumbered public child welfare agencies and their associated policies. The Center For Peace Studies and Community Development can fill the gap for inmate mothers and children services if data and financial resources are made available.

Implications For the Child and Adolescent Mental Health System

In this study, the findings of children of female inmates (N=354) quantitatively and qualitatively suggest that up to 82% of the teenagers and 57% of all
school age children are in need of counseling and are at high risk for serious and prolonged emotional and behavioral problems. Taking into account that 86% of the children in this study are under the age of thirteen, then a significant amount of targeted child mental health supportive services should be made available to this population. Knitzer as early as 1982 in her book, *Unclaimed Children*, contended that the range of mental health services needed by severely emotionally disturbed children and adolescents is frequently unavailable since problem children are often "unclaimed" by the public agencies with responsibility to serve them. Similarly, Stroul & Friedman (1986) found that there have been only a few programs nationally that attempted to get mental health, child welfare, juvenile justice and education agencies to work together on behalf of disturbed children and youth. Therefore, children such as the kind found in this study, with serious and complex psychosocial problems, receive services in an uncoordinated and fragmented fashion, if they are receiving any at all.

The early identification and intervention by mental health professionals should be promoted for the children of inmate mothers. Children of inmate mothers based on the sole criteria of maternal-child separation during childhood development should be the basis for screening and case
management by the mental health system. The identification and intervention to assist high risk children and their parents or caretakers should be done at an early age to divert and serve more children before they become more seriously impaired in later teenage years. The major focal point of mental health identification of potential children at risk of developing emotional problems lies in the fact that the mother is in prison and can easily be engaged. Local community mental health systems know where to find the mother and eventually the children at risk. During this research project, only one case of local mental health intervention was found, and this was done by the caretaker taking the initiative to engage the child with the local mental health agency after the teenage girl attempted suicide. The researcher is unaware of any local mental health agency making contact at the Franklin Pre-Release Center on behalf of an inmate who has a child with emotional problems and needs services.

A second point of identification for the local mental health systems is the school age children of inmate mothers. Stanton (1980) reported that 70% of these children under perform at school and that 37% were behavioral problems as rated by classroom teachers. Inmates and caretakers of children in the present study reported that up to 25% of the
school aged children have behavior problems severe enough to receive a school suspension. Engagement and referral between the mental health system and the school at the time of suspension should be a criteria for identification and case management by the local child mental health system.

The local Franklin County child mental health system reports that there are over 1,800 severely emotional disturbed (SED) children that it serves (Franklin County Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Board Annual Report, 1992). The data are not kept in a manner that indicates if any of these cases are children of female inmates and receiving services. In addition to the SED youth, service statistics indicates that 10,276 duplicate youthful clients receive other supportive services. During fiscal year 1993, the local mental health system expended $10.7 million dollars on children's services, yet the data are not kept in a manner to assess how many children of inmate mothers are receiving services in the community.

Implications For the Juvenile Justice and Domestic Court Systems

This research study found that up to 40% of male children of inmate mothers are adjudicated juvenile delinquents. It was found that 58% of the female inmates had an immediate family arrested and imprisoned, they
themselves are now in prison and that up to 40% of the male children are delinquents. The quantitative and qualitative findings strongly suggest that a multigenerational cycle of criminal families does exist.

Early identification and juvenile justice case management services to the children of inmate mothers should be provided. Preventative juvenile court programming for these children could divert many from future delinquency. Specialized recreation services at police youth leagues, police officers acting as big brothers and big sisters to children of inmates are creative ways to engage the justice system with these youth. As with many other social service agencies, juvenile courts can engage the inmate mother at prison and eventually her children in the local community. Identification and intervention at a very early age of these at-risk children could have significant impact on future antisocial behaviors and decrease the need for restrictive detention at a later age.

Implication For the School Systems

The children have substantial academic and school behavior problems as reported by themselves, inmate mothers and caretakers. The challenge to the school system is to retain, tutor and deal with these children. The children enter the school system with little internalized social
control mechanisms, multiple disruptions in adult authority relationships and from substitute caretaker households where daily living is stressed for survival rather than academics. School systems should adapt their traditional practices for the young elementary aged children of inmate mothers. Supportive services such as tutorial programs, specialized social enhancement classes, programming for caretakers and children, home visitation and most importantly positive role modeling should be part of the school systems. Traditionally, most schools label problem children as behaviorally disordered, suspend, use in-class detention and isolate children who are disruptive and lacking in social skills (Benninga, 1991). Academically, these children are initially mainstreamed into traditional elementary classroom regimes. It was found that almost all caretakers and 57% of all the inmate mothers were school dropouts. It should be expected that the majority of the children will also dropout if not targeted for academic enhancement programming. The poor academic and behavior performance of these children is not an encouraging sign for their being economically successful as adults in a competitive labor market.

The Franklin County Board of Education research office staff report that the school system experienced a school drop out rate of 39% in 1992, had 480 severe behaviorally handicapped students, permanently suspended
244 youths and temporarily suspended 3,800 youths in the 1991/1992 school year. It is not known how many were the children of inmate mothers. At the same time, this research study reports that over 50% of children of inmate mothers experience school problems.

Implications for the Police and Adult Justice Systems

Three important effects have occurred because of the increased policing of the war on drugs that arose out of the 1980’s that legislatures, judiciary, correctional and police policy makers did not foresee. First was the increase in the arrests of women for drug possession, usage and trafficking and the “get tough sentencing” that requires incarceration. Second, the policing practices created the need for a massive increase in female prison beds. Third, the inner city crack cocaine trade requires the policing of blighted urban areas where many minority and single female head of households live. The socially and economically disenfranchised underclass females who are drug law violators end up in prison (Allen & Simonsen, 1992). The result is the expanded new child welfare problem that has been created - children of inmate mothers. The results of the present research study confirms this phenomena.

While the good rationale of the social policy of the war on drugs is commendable, the bad policy outcome is that
Poor women are ending up in prison, and an increase in disrupted families and children has occurred. Extensive research is needed on this issue to assist judges, court officials and correctional officials in their determination of sentencing of mothers with children, the levels of incarceration that are required and the type of services that would decrease recidivism. As early as 1976, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards called for new diversion and classification systems that would create alternative programs in half-way houses and local residential placements that would allow women to keep their family ties, receive localized services and vocational training. Research on the recidivism rates of inmate mothers who are sentenced to community correctional facilities versus institutions should be done to assess the differences in social and economic costs to society. The development of judicial criteria, cost-benefit analysis and community sentencing options should be researched. Research on the feasibility of downsizing female prisons and shifting the correctional dollars to community programming where cost-savings and dollars-following-the-inmate strategies should be explored.

To this researcher's knowledge, there is no existing national research literature on the decision-making of
arresting officers when a female single head of household is arrested. What does the officer(s) do with the children at the time of arrest? Are child placement decisions at the time of arrest made by a police officer? Do they attempt to find a neighbor, relative or responsible adult at the scene of the arrest? Do they automatically take children to the local children services to sort out child care arrangements? Do they officially write into the arrest report the significant child reactions and child care placement and referral so that prosecutors and judges are aware of the children involved? Since the arrest may lead to long-term imprisonment, should the child welfare system be automatically involved when single females with children are arrested so that child placement decisions can be proactive? This topical area is fertile ground for criminologists, penologists, child welfare and social science researchers.

Facilitating Community Linkages to Inmate Mothers and Their Children

While inmate mothers sit in prisons, their children live in the community. In larger metropolitan areas of Ohio there exists a multitude of public and private child welfare agencies whose mission it is to provide care and services to children. Yet there does not appear to be a central point of entrance for inmate mothers and children into the wide
array of services available to them. This scenario does not reflect contemporary multi-agency community collaboration in children services. Eldridge (1981), Knitzer (1982), Stroul & Friedman (1986) and a multitude of other recent scholars have long contended that the planning and interprofessional collaboration of localized agencies usually results in cooperative agreements, but fragmented services. In the case of inmate mothers and children, Zalba (1964) through Bloom & Steinhart (1993), over 29 years and several research projects in between, the plight of coordinated social service integration to inmate mothers and children has not been adequately addressed nationally, regionally or locally.

The integration of female correctional institutions and community based child services agencies has not occurred since there is no specific agency or organization that has the sole responsibility of providing services to incarcerated mothers and their children. The need for a new community based social service agency to fill this gap in responsibility is evident.

The logical point of entry into a coordinated continuity of care system for mothers, caretakers and children is at the prison. A lead organization such as a nonprofit agency similar to Aid to Imprisoned Mothers, Inc. of Atlanta, Georgia, could fill this gap in service
coordination. The liaison between corrections, community services and the three generations of persons at-risk (inmate, children and caretakers) could provide a vital link. A core group of community volunteers could provide advocacy similar to guardian-ad-litums to ensure that the placement of children is appropriate and that the best interests of the children are met. In the area of family supports, the liaisons could provide transportation for child visitation, be a friend to an inmate and assist the inmate mother upon her release to resolve family reunification issues. The liaison could assist caretakers in linking them to local social services for themselves and on behalf of the children. Finally, a specialized lead agency could assist in the development of programming to assist in school academic tutoring for children, big brother and sister prosocial role models, diversion from antisocial and delinquency behaviors and specialized support groups for children to serve their psychosocial needs.

Implications for the Policy Decision Makers of Human Services in Ohio

The problems of inmate mothers and their children are not a new revelation in human services or corrections. In June of 1964, the State of California Department of Social Welfare and the Department of Corrections released the
results of the Zalba study (1964), Women Prisoners and Their Families, which was jointly funded by both agencies.

"The analysis of the various data from several samples of inmates, families and personnel of pertinent agencies, pointed compellingly to the necessity for certain policies, procedures, and services that either do not now exist, or to the existence of which there is insufficient attention, even indifference." p.121

Similarly, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in 1978 released the national study, Why Punish the Children (McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978).

"Emerging prisoner’s rights, women’s rights and children’s rights groups all provide natural constituencies for children of offenders. Much could be accomplished if these groups were to focus some of their attention on the needs of this population.... These groups (correctional administrators and inmates).... have pointed out clear direction for change." (p. 94)

Outside of the key correctional informants and researchers in this present study, few other people know much about the children of female inmates. The research literature since 1964 has been benignly ignored by leading government officials. It is the feeling of this researcher that law makers, the highest ranking state officials in Ohio and social welfare leaders in Columbus, Ohio, where most of the data was collected, are not educated or knowledgeable of this group of children and women. The plight of these children is an untold story. This research was an attempt to increase public awareness of their unique problems.
CHAPTER VI

RECOMMENDATIONS

"Perhaps the most comprehensive statement one can make about female criminality in the United States is that it has been almost completely ignored by criminologists, lawyers, penologists and social scientists."

- Rita Simons (1991)

In Ohio, from 1981 through 1991, there has been an increase in the number of female correctional beds from 792 to 2,196 (Official Records, ODRC 1993). This represents a 272% increase in beds in this decade. The general increase in beds and incarceration rates of female offenders is a direct effect of increased policing practices aimed at decreasing the drug trafficking and usage in the inner city and socioeconomically blighted areas of Ohio's metropolitan communities. The increased policing has lead to the increase in female arrests. The arrest of the socially and economically disenfranchised females has created a special problem and challenge for the entire domain of child welfare and family services. It has been estimated that 80% of the female inmates had dependent children at the time of arrest. This research project found that the vast majority of
inmate mothers were multiple non-violent property offenders, were raised in cultures of poverty and crime and likewise raised a family in a culture of poverty and crime. The cycle must be broken! As society requires the punishment of female offenders, it has the opportunity to break the intergenerational cycles. Incarceration compounds and exacerbates the effects on children of female inmates, it also provides opportunities for social change.

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** Shift the resources and allocation of correctional dollars into the use of non-institutional community based correctional programs where inmate mothers are ordered to participate in parent-child programs, work-fare and an array of localized services.

Such "dollars-following-the-patient" strategies have already shown that cost-effective rehabilitation can occur in very dysfunctional mental patients (Dieker, 1986). Several male correctional rehabilitation programs for drug abusing adults are in existence in the Columbus areas and are funded by the ODRC. Community correctional programming similar to Comp Drug, Inc's 80 bed male offender residential program at the Columbus YMCA is just one example where female inmates and their children and caretakers can be
offered a cost-effective rehabilitative program. The only similar program is a 16 bed unit for females located close to the Ohio State University campus area. Work-fare, parent-child programming, substance abuse counseling and an array of local parent-child linkages could be provided while the inmate is sentenced to residential incarceration. If the inmate fails to cooperate in the programming, she is immediately sent back to an ODRC prison with no option for early release.

RECOMMENDATION 2: At the time of intake into any Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction facility, the female inmate with children should be immediately engaged by correctional social service staff and local child welfare agencies.

This research project found that no one maintains a database on the children of inmates. The female correctional facilities have the unique opportunity to refer inmate mothers to the local public mandated child welfare agencies to assist them in recognizing the need for linkage and transitional care services between female inmates and children. Key informants inside the correctional system indicate that the lack of coordination and services from Children Service Boards to inmates with children in most counties is nonexistent.
RECOMMENDATION 3: The State Department of Human Services should provide child welfare case managers onsite at all Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction female facilities to engage and maintain linkages with the inmate, her children and the caretakers.

This study found that 95% of the female inmates want and expect to be reunified with their children. The study also found that this may not be realistic based on the data and reports from caretakers and older children. Since the informal foster care network is an extended kinship system, relatives and inmates are developing reunification plans rather than the professional child welfare system. The clinical assessment of an inmate’s ability to reunify with her children must be improved in the best interest of the children. The placement of the children in the informal kinship foster care system should be evaluated by the local child welfare professionals for every inmate mother at the time of intake into an Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction facility.

RECOMMENDATION 4: The caretakers of the children of inmate mothers should be offered and be made aware of a wide array of localized services in support of their role as substitute parent.
This study found that caretakers face multiple problems in being surrogate parents for an inmate mother. The role and responsibility for watching children is reluctantly accepted and many cases met with hostile resentment toward the inmate. In most cases, the caretaker is struggling with poverty and disfranchisement prior to accepting the responsibility for a relative's children. Public agencies must accept the responsibility to work with relative caretakers even though no present abuse, neglect or psychopathology may be evident. Caretakers need to be fully educated about localized social support services and programs for themselves and especially for the children in their custody.

RECOMMENDATION 5: The local child welfare agency must engage and take responsibility and the lead advocacy for the children of incarcerated mothers even if there is no legal jurisdiction to do so at the time of referral.

Due to the informal kinship foster care system practice, lack of data, void in coordination and leadership, the child welfare agencies should establish better ways to coordinate, engage, refer, assess and reunify children by working closely at correctional facilities. This study found that the vast majority of inmates and caretakers avoid
the child welfare system out of fear of losing their children permanently. Key correctional informants indicated that child welfare workers generally fail to deliver appropriate services to incarcerated mothers even if the agency has the legal custody. Child welfare agencies should provide appropriate services such as reunification plans and regular visitation to inmate mothers. State child welfare policy makers must re-examine the role of state intervention in only cases of neglect, abuse and dependency referrals. This research project found that the majority of children face numerous problems and are effectively blocked by a lack of coordination, uneducated caretakers and avoidance of public child care workers to services that may help them in their daily and future lives. The unidentified population of inmate-children-at-risk must be advocated for, represented and assisted if the vicious cycles of poverty and crime are to be broken.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Correctional policy makers at the State Office of The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction should provide additional funds and incentives to promote programming that facilitates mother-child visitation to each women’s prison.

During this study, it was found that 72% of inmates never or rarely see their children while incarcerated. Caretakers and inmates indicated that prisons do not offer a
child-centered visiting environment, convenient visitation procedures and transportation for children. While pre-release visitation and programming are available and encouraged at all Ohio correctional facilities, the inmate respondents indicated that classes would be more meaningful if the mother and children could both participate and that the visitation rooms be more natural, private and child-centered. Correctional policy makers should facilitate and coordinate the development of volunteers to transport children of inmates on visitation days. Increased funding for the development of community based programs similar to Friends of Inmate Mothers in Atlanta, Georgia, or Aide to Incarcerated Mothers in California are highly encouraged.

**RECOMMENDATION 7:** State policy makers in the legislature, judiciary, corrections, child welfare, mental health and education systems need to be educated to the specialized needs of the unidentified population of children of incarcerated mothers.

Policy makers should be educated and learn more about the circumstances of children who are in many cases the victims of state interventions and the lack of coordination for services between publicly mandated agencies. At the most restrictive level of state intervention (prisons), this
study estimates that at least 4,400 children on any given day are affected by a mother’s incarceration. The study found that the long-term effects on children such as illegitimate teenage births, male delinquency, educational drop out ratios, associated poverty rates and counseling needs should be a great concern for Ohio’s citizenry. The findings further suggested that after a mother’s incarceration there is no follow up as to the well being of the child and in most cases no effort of case management is made to coordinate existing services for the benefit of the children.

The education, advocacy, coordination of services and general well-being of children of inmate mothers should be a statewide effort to draft policy, plans and recommendations to implement a reform movement on the care of inmate children.
APPENDIX A

SOLICITATION LETTERS TO INMATE MOTHERS,
MOTHERS WITH CHILDREN IN COLUMBUS,
CARETAKERS OF CHILDREN
Hello, my name is Gregg Hungerford. I am a child researcher from Ohio State University. I am not part of the prison staff, parole office, courts or anything else. I am trying to find out how children get along when they are separated from their mothers due to prison. In order to do that, I need your help by filling out the attached form and attending a meeting in a few weeks so that I can personally talk to you. I am very interested about your concerns about what your children are feeling about your incarceration and how this study can help start programs and make things better for your children.

You can choose not to fill out this form and not participate in my study of children of inmate mothers. This study is totally voluntary and no one will hold anything against you at the prison, parole board or courts if you do not want to be in the study. If you want to participate, all the information you give me is confidential. Your information will never be given to anyone with your name on it. I will put a private code number on your form instead of a name. Only I will ever know or see your name. This means that not even the Warden will ever be able to identify you from the information you give me. Your decision to participate or not participate in this study will not effect positively or negatively future decisions by the parole board. Any future programming for inmate mothers at the prison will not effect your participation even if you choose not to be part of this study. Also, I want you to know and be aware that confidentiality does not apply if during my study you tell me or write something like you plan to escape, hurt someone upon release or hurt yourself. By law I would have to report that to the proper authorities.

With the information I receive in doing this study, I hope that changes can be made to improve things for inmate mothers and your children while you are both separated.

Thanks for your time. It will take about 15 minutes to complete this form. Hang on to it and I will pick them up and be on your unit tonight for a few minutes around 9:30 PM if you have any questions.

Principal Researcher:  __Dr. William Eldridge____
Associate Researcher:  __Gregory P. Hungerford, MSH__

Phone: (Area Code 614) 292-6288/Admissions 292-2972/Student Services 292-7488/Dean 292-5300
TO: Inmates with Children in Columbus

FROM: Gregg Hungerford, MSW

Thank you for your response to the original questionnaire that you voluntarily filled out and turned in several weeks ago. From the information in the questionnaires, I have selected over 30 inmates from Columbus for a closer follow-up, small group interview. I will also be meeting with other inmates who live outside of the Columbus area on an informal basis during the next two weeks.

Enclosed you will find several forms for you to review and fill out prior to the small group interview.

Again, let me restate that you do not have to participate in this study. If you choose not to come, fill out forms or drop out of this study, nothing will be held against you by me, by the prison staff or be put on your record. However, be aware that confidentiality does not apply to information you give about bodily harm to others, child abuse or dangerous behavior to yourself or to others. By law, I must and will report that information to the appropriate authorities such as the Warden. I hope to see you since your participation and information may affect in positive ways and make a major difference in the future in the lives of children, other inmates and caretakers of inmate children.

Here are the questions we will discuss at the meeting on April 29 from 6:30PM-8:00PM at Visitation Hall.

Question 1. What has been the biggest problem you have faced being away from your child/children?

Question 2. Do you think your child/children are doing okay? What are their biggest problems being away from you?

Question 3. How did you determine where your child/children would stay while you were doing your time?

Question 4. What are the biggest problems you think your caregivers are facing watching your kids?

Question 5. What would help them in taking care of your kids?
CARETAKER LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is Gregg Hungerford. I am a child researcher from the Ohio State University. I am doing a major study on the "Children of Inmate Mothers."

_________________________ has given me her permission to talk to you since you have the formal or informal legal guardianship of her children while she is in prison. I am a researcher. I am not part of the prison staff, parole board, court or child welfare agency. I am concerned about children and what we can do for them when mothers are arrested and imprisoned.

We do not know very much about the special problems that come up for mothers, children and local caretakers of the children when she goes to prison. We almost know nothing about the special problems people like you have in taking care of inmate's children. I need your help in understanding the difficulties or rewards of watching children and things that can be done to make the job easier for you and that would benefit the children.

_________________________ has given me your telephone number. I will call in a few days to talk with you about the possibility of interviewing you for the purpose of my study and answer your questions about participating, confidentiality of information and who I am. I have enclosed a consent form to be reviewed and a list of questions that I would be asking you to discuss with me. These things may also help you decide if you want to voluntarily participate in the study. Your participation in this study will not affect, positively or negatively, the inmate mother in future decisions concerning parole/release or will not be a part of her prison record.

Principle Researcher: ___________ Dr. William Eldridge ___________
Associate Researcher: ___________ Gregory P. Hungerford, MSW ___________

Phone: (Area Code 614) 292-6288/Admissions 292-2922/Student Services 292-7488/Dean 292-3300
APPENDIX B

INMATE QUESTIONNAIRE
INSTRUCTIONS: Please fill out the survey by using an (X). Fill out questions quickly without writing notes or explanations of your answers. If a question is confusing, use your BEST GUESS. If you do not wish to answer any questions, just leave it blank.

PART I - ABOUT YOU

1. What is your age? __________

2. How old were you when you were arrested the first time? __________

3. Were you ever arrested and held as a juvenile?
   ___ No
   ___ Yes, a local detention center only
   ___ Yes, detention center and a state juvenile prison

4. As an adult, have you ever served time before?
   ___ No
   ___ Yes, in a local jail only
   ___ Yes, local jail and state prison

5. What is your ethnic group or race?
   ___ African-American (Black)
   ___ White (Caucasian)
   ___ Native American
   ___ Hispanic
   ___ Other __________________________

6. When you were growing up, did any member of your family go to jail or prison?
   ___ No
   ___ Yes
      ___ Mother
      ___ Father
      ___ Brother or sister
      ___ Aunt or uncle
      ___ Grandparents

7. Have any of your close friends on the outside ever been in jail or prison?
   ___ None
   ___ A few
   ___ A whole lot

8. What crime are you being held for at present?
   ___ petty theft
   ___ forgery or fraud
   ___ burglary
   ___ robbery
   ___ prostitution
   ___ assault
   ___ drug laws violation
   ___ manslaughter, homicide, murder
   ___ other __________________________
9. How much time do you have left until you meet the parole board or EDS date?
   ____ less than 30 days
   ____ 30 - 59 days
   ____ 60 - 89 days
   ____ 90 - 179 days
   ____ 180 - 1 year
   ____ over 1 year

10. Right now are you
    ____ legally married
    ____ common law married/boyfriend
    ____ legally separated or divorced
    ____ widowed
    ____ single, never married

11. Were you on welfare, SSI, AFDC or food stamps at the time of your arrest?
    ____ Yes
    ____ No

12. How many children do you have? ________

13. What are their ages right now? (youngest one first)
    ____ years (youngest)
    ____ years next youngest
    ____ years next
    ____ years next
    ____ years next

14. How many of the above children were living with you at the time of arrest? ________

15. Who is taking care of your children who are under the age of 18 years while you are here? (Mark ALL that apply.)
    ____ your mother or father
    ____ your husband/boyfriend
    ____ your sister or brother
    ____ cousins, aunts, uncles
    ____ friends
    ____ foster care, or some agency
    ____ other: ______________________

16. If you have more than one child, were all of your children who are under the age of 18 years placed together or separated (because no one could watch them all)?
    ____ together
    ____ separated

17. How often do your children visit you here?
    ____ once a week
    ____ once a month
    ____ every few months
    ____ several times a month
    ____ never
18. Are you a grandparent?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

19. When you were growing up, were your parents poor?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

20. Do you feel like the police were fair to you each time you were arrested?
    Yes
    _____ No

21. Do you feel like the courts and judges have treated you fairly?
    _____ Yes
    _____ No

**PART II - ABOUT YOU AND YOUR CHILDREN**

The Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) and the Peace School run by Dr. William Eldridge (who comes to the prison often on Saturday mornings) want to start a new program for the children of inmate mothers. We need some information to help us begin to plan this program.

22. Your CHILDREN'S "FIRST" names only: SEX-(M or F) AGE-(YRS)
    1. ____________________________ ___
    2. ____________________________ ___
    3. ____________________________ ___
    4. ____________________________ ___
    5. ____________________________ ___

23. Using the list of children above, where does your child presently live (mark with an X)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child 1.</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Franklin County</th>
<th>More than 30 miles from Columbus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Are you happy with where your child lives at present?
    _____ Yes
    _____ No

25. Since you have been in prison, have any of your children been moved to another placement or relative?
    _____ Yes
    About how many times have they been moved? ________
    _____ No

26. Do you have legal custody of your children?
    _____ Yes
    _____ No - Guardian, who is your relative
    _____ Children Services Agency
    _____ Some Other Agency
27. Do your children over 5 years of age know you are in prison?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

28. Have you ever been separated from your children before this time
    because you had to go to prison or jail?
   ____ Yes  If yes, how many times? ________
   ____ No

29. Do you plan on getting your children back when you are released?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

30. Have any of your older children who are under the age of 18 been
    arrested as a juvenile?
   ____ Yes  If yes, how many times? ________
   ____ No

31. Have they been in a local juvenile detention center?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

32. Have any of your older daughters who are under the age of 18 been
    pregnant?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

33. How do you feel your children are handling being away from you?
   ____ Good
   ____ Fair
   ____ Poor

34. Are your children doing okay with their grades at school?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

35. Have any of your children been suspended from school?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

36. Have any of your children had counseling for personal problems?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

37. Do you think any of your children need help with personal problems?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

38. Do you think your children have enough safe recreation activities in
    the neighborhood where they live right now?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No
39. Are you interested in having your children go to the Columbus YWCA for group activities once a week with other children whose mothers are inmates?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

40. What is your full name? We need this so we can get back to you in a couple of weeks if you want your children to be part of our new program at the Center for Peace Studies?
    NAME:  ____________________________

41. Did you drop out of high school?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

Is there anything else you would like to say to me? Please write it down here (please be brief).

______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
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PROTOCOL FOR INMATE MOTHER’S
FOCUSED GROUP INTERVIEWS
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PROTOCOL FOR FOCUSED GROUP INTERVIEWS

Selection of Inmates to be Interviewed

Upon receipt of Phase I Self Directed Questionnaire data, a pool of Columbus, Ohio inmates that wished to further participate in the study will be invited to a voluntary meeting.

Prior Mailing to Sample Pool

A mailing through the prison system will be done. The mailing will have:

1) a letter stating the purpose of the meeting
2) a consent form for the mother to be interviewed and for the children to be interviewed
3) Hudson Index of Parental Attitudes (1982)

Initial Focused Group Discussion Questions

1. What has been the biggest problem you have faced being away from your child/children? Visitation? Feel that they may resent you? Guilt for being sent to prison and disrupting their lives?

2. Do you think your children are doing okay? What are their biggest problems?

3. How did you determine where your child/children would stay while you were doing your time? Did you decide? Did someone else decide for you? How difficult was it to work out a plan?

4. What are the biggest problems you think your caretakers are facing watching your kids?

5. What would help them in taking care of your kids?
APPENDIX D

PROTOCOL FOR CARETAKER INTERVIEWS
CARETAKER PROTOCOL FOR INTERVIEWS

Selection of Caretakers to be Interviewed

Shortly after the Stage II data is collected, a pool of Columbus, Ohio caretakers will be selected and asked to voluntarily participate in the study.

Prior mailing to Caretaker

A mailing through the postal service will be done. The mailing will have:

1. a letter of introduction stating the purpose of the study and a request for an interview and informing them that I will be telephone calling to arrange for a voluntary interview.

2. a consent form to be interviewed

3. a list of focused questions that I will be asking them.

At Home Site Interview

I will conduct a focused interview and upon completion I will ask the caretaker to fill out the amended Hudson Index of Parental Attitudes (91982). At that time, I would:

1) make arrangements for the child interview and instrument implementation with the child/children that he/she is taking care of for the inmate mother.

2) ask the caretaker for the consent to interview the inmate's children that he/she is watching

3) provide the caretaker with a copy of Nowiki-Strickland Internal-External Focus of Control Instrument and the Hudson Child-Parent Attitudinal Scale and a list of focused questions I would be asking
Focused Questions for Caretakers

1. How did the children come to be living with you? Were you actively involved in this plan with their mother?

2. How are you related to the child/children?

3. What does your role as a caretaker involve?

4. What changes, if any, have you had to make in your lifestyle in order to watch the children?

5. How are you coping with the whole situation?

6. Can you describe the relationship between mother and child/children prior to the mother's incarceration?

7. How do/does the child/children deal with the separation from their mother and the fact that the mother is in prison?

8. What are your concerns, questions, feelings and hardships about being a caretaker?

9. What programs, if any, would be helpful to you and the children?

10. What is the children's source of financial support? Is it enough?
APPENDIX E

PROTOCOLS FOR CHILDREN’S INTERVIEWS
PROTOCOL FOR CHILDREN'S INTERVIEW

Selection of Children:

Based on Stage III data and consent of the caretakers, arrangements for testing will be made for those children selected.

Testing:

1) a brief introduction text will be read to the child to engage and make the youth feel at ease

2) ask a list of focused questions

3) implement the Hudson & Norwicki-Strickland either verbally or in writing based on the preference of the youth, his/her age and the judgement of the interviewer
INTRODUCTION TEXT TO CHILDREN

Hi, I'm Gregg. I do child research and I need you to help me on a very important study. I am talking to a lot of children who have moms in prison. I am doing this because we do not know much about how mom's being in prison affects children like you.

I have children too. Here is a picture of my children. She just had a baby and I am a grandpa. This is a picture of my grandson.

Let's start talking about you and your mom. I am going to ask some questions. If you don't want to talk about a subject, just let me know and I'll go to the next question. If at any time you want to stop, just tell me and it will be okay and we'll end the talk. Is this okay with you?
FOCUSED QUESTIONS FOR CHILDREN

Area 1: How are you doing in school? With grades? Other kids? Teachers?

Area 2: Do you have brothers or sisters? Do they live here with you? If not, do you wish they did? Do you see them often? Do you miss them?

Area 3: Why are you living here? How did you get here? Who brought you here? Did anyone ask you if this is where you wanted to live? How long have you lived here?

Area 4: Do you know where your mother is? Why she is there? When will she be back? Do you visit her? What was it like to visit a prison? Do you want to visit her again?

Area 5: What is it like not to have your mother here with you? Is it hard for you? How? What will it be like when she comes home again? Will you be happy or sad?
APPENDIX F

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORMS
INMATE MOTHER'S CONSENT FORM

I voluntarily agree to be interviewed for the purpose of the research project: A Study of children of Incarcerated Mothers, by Gregg Hungerford. My participation in this study will not affect positively or negatively future decisions by the parole board for early release.

I understand that all information I may give is confidential. My participation is voluntary and I may discontinue at any time. I understand that confidentiality does not apply to verbal or written statements I give about escape, violence or harm to myself or others during or upon release from prison.

I consent for my child/children to be visited and interviewed for the purpose of this study. I further understand that the caretaker of my children may decline to be interviewed or decline for the children to be interviewed.

Inmate's Name: ________________________________

Child's Name: ________________________________

Caretaker's Name: ________________________________
Address: _______________________________________
Telephone: ____________________________________

Principal Researcher: __ Dr. William Eldridge ___
Associate Researcher: ____ Gregory P. Hungerford, MSW ___

Phone: (Area Code 614) 292-6288/Admissions 292-2572/Student Services 292-7488/Dean 292-3300
CARETAKER'S CONSENT FORM

I voluntarily agree to be interviewed for the purpose of the research project: A Study of children of Incarcerated Mothers, by Gregg Hungerford.

I understand that all information I may give is confidential and that my name and identity will be kept confidential. I understand that confidentiality does not apply to verbal or physical information concerning child abuse.

Since I have formal or informal legal custody and guardianship, I consent for the following child/children to be visited and interviewed for the purpose of this study.

Child #1 ___________________________
Child #2 ___________________________
Child #3 ___________________________

Your Name: _________________________
Date: _____________________________

Principle Researcher: Dr. William Eldridge
Associate Researcher: Gregory P. Hungerford, MSW
APPENDIX G

HUDSON PARENT-CHILD ATTACHMENT INSTRUMENT FOR INMATE MOTHERS AND CHILDREN OF INMATE MOTHERS
Instructions
IPA

This questionnaire is designed to measure the degree of contentment you have in your relationship with your child. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by placing a number beside each one as follows:

1 = Rarely or none of the time
2 = A little of the time
3 = Some of the time
4 = Good part of the time
5 = Most or all of the time

___ 1. My child gets on my nerves.
___ 2. I get along well with my child.
___ 3. I feel that I can really trust my child.
___ 4. I dislike my child.
___ 5. My child is well behaved.
___ 6. My child is too demanding.
___ 7. I wish I did not have this child.
___ 8. I really enjoy my child.
___ 9. I have a hard time controlling my child.
___ 10. My child interferes with my activities.
___ 11. I resent my child.
___ 12. I think my child is terrific.
___ 13. I hate my child.
___ 14. I am very patient with my child.
___ 15. I really like my child.
___ 16. I like being with my child.
___ 17. I feel like I do not love my child.
___ 18. My child is irritating.
___ 19. I feel very angry toward my child.
___ 20. I feel violent toward my child.
___ 21. I feel very proud of my child.
___ 22. I wish my child was more like others I know.
___ 23. I just do not understand my child.
___ 24. My child is a real joy to me.
___ 25. I feel ashamed of my child.

Copyright The Dorey Press, 1982
Adapted Hudson CAM for Children

This questionnaire is designed to measure the degree of contentment you have in your relationship with your mother. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by placing a number beside each one as follows:

1 = Rarely or none of the time
2 = A little of the time
3 = Some of the time
4 = Good part of the time
5 = Most or all of the time

1. My mother gets on my nerves.
2. I get along well with my mother.
3. I feel that I can really trust my mother.
4. I dislike my mother.
5. My mother's behavior embarrasses me.
6. My mother is too demanding.
7. I wish I had a different mother.
8. I really enjoy my mother.
9. My mother puts too many limits on me.
10. My mother interferes with my activities.
11. I resent my mother.
12. I think my mother is terrific.
13. I hate my mother.
14. My mother is very patient with me.
15. I really like my mother.
16. I like being with my mother.
17. I feel like I do not love my mother.
18. My mother is very irritating.
19. I feel very angry toward my mother.
20. I feel violent toward my mother.
21. I feel very proud of my mother.
22. I wish my mother was more like others I know.
23. My mother does not understand me.
24. I can really depend on my mother.
25. I feel ashamed of my mother.

Copyright The Dorsey Press, 1982
APPENDIX H

THE NOWICKI-STRICKLAND INTERNAL-EXTERNAL
CONTROL SCALE FOR CHILDREN
THE NOWICKI-STRECKLAND INTERNAL-EXTERNAL CONTROL
Scale For Children

1. Do you believe that most problems will solve themselves if you just don’t
   fool with them?

2. Do you believe that you can stop yourself from catching a cold?

3. Are some kids just born lucky?

4. Most of the time do you feel that getting good grades means a great deal to
   you

5. Are you often blamed for things that just aren’t your fault?

6. Do you believe that if somebody studies hard enough he or she can pass any
   subject?

7. Do you feel that most of the time it doesn’t pay to try hard because things
   never turn out right anyway?

8. Do you feel that if things start out well in the morning it’s going to
   be a good day no matter what you do?

9. Do you feel that most of the time parents listen to what their children
   have to say?

10. Do you believe that wishing can make good things happen?

11. When you get punished does it usually seem it’s for no good reason at all?

12. Most of the time do you find it hard to change a friend’s (mind) opinion?

13. Do you think that cheating more than luck helps a team to win?

14. Do you feel that it’s nearly impossible to change your parent’s mind about
   anything?

15. Do you believe that your parents should allow you to make most of your own
    decisions?

16. Do you feel that when you do something wrong there’s very little you can do
    to make it right?

17. Do you believe that most kids are just born good at sports?

18. Are most of the other kids your age stronger than you are?

19. Do you feel that one of the best ways to handle most problems is just not
    to think about them?

20. Do you feel that you have a lot of choice in deciding who your friends are?
21. If you find a four leaf clover do you believe that it might bring you good luck?

22. Do you often feel that whether you do your homework has much to do with what kind of grades you get?

23. Do you feel that when a kid your age decides to hit you, there's little you can do to stop him or her?

24. Have you ever had a good luck charm?

25. Do you believe that whether or not people like you depends on how you act?

26. Will your parents usually help you if you ask them to?

27. Have you felt that when people were mean to you it was usually for no reason at all?

28. Most of the time, do you feel that you can change what might happen tomorrow by what you do today?

29. Do you believe that when bad things are going to happen they just are going to happen no matter what you try to do to stop them?

30. Do you think that kids can get their own way if they just keep trying?

31. Most of the time do you find it useless to try to get your own way at home?

32. Do you feel that when good things happen they happen because of hard work?

33. Do you feel that when somebody your age wants to be your enemy there's little you can do to change matters?

34. Do you feel that it's easy to get friends to do what you want them to?

35. Do you usually feel that you have little to say about what you get to eat at home?

36. Do you feel that when someone doesn't like you there's little you can do about it?

37. Do you usually feel that it's almost useless to try in school because most other children are just plain smarter than you are?

38. Are you the kind of person who believes that planning ahead makes things turn out better?

39. Most of the time, do you feel that you have little to say about what your family decides to do?

40. Do you think it's better to be smart than to be lucky?
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OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL SCIENCES REVIEW
SUMMARY SHEETS OF PROTOCOL 9380092
"INMATE MOTHERS AND THEIR CHILDREN"
BEHAVIORAL & SOCIAL SCIENCES
SUMMARY SHEETS

1. In a sentence or two, describe the background and purpose of the research.

The state of Ohio has over 2,200 incarcerated females of whom 89% are mothers with 7.5 children on average living with them prior to their arrest. This exploratory research study proposes to describe the inmates, their children and who watches their children while they do their time. This is a multistage and exploratory study since no data is kept by any public or private agency on inmate mothers, their children or the caretakers of the children.

2. Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

Stage I -Inmate mother self-administered questionnaire (voluntary) - FPRC site.
Stage II -Focused group interviews with Columbus, Ohio female inmates (voluntary) - FPRC site.
Stage III-Caretaker interviews with local persons (voluntary) - their home site
Stage IV -Interviews with local children ages 7-17 whose mothers are in jail - to be arranged with caretaker

3. What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaires, tests, or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and either include a copy or indicate when a copy will be submitted for review.

The multistage methodology design and instrumentation are as follows: (attached)
Stage I Inmate mothers self-administered questionnaire cover letter conveying purpose, voluntary and confidentiality Waiver forms Parental Attitudinal Scale (Hudson 1982) Focused Questions
Stage II Introduction cover letter to selected inmates Parental Attitudinal Scale (Hudson 1982) Focused Questions
Stage III Introduction cover letter to caretakers Parental Attitudinal Scale (Hudson 1982) Interview Questions
Stage IV Introduction text to children Children's Attitude Scale Toward Mothers (Hudson 1982) Nohiki-Strickland (1973) Locus of Control Scale for Children

4. Will the subjects encounter the possibility of psychological, social, physical or legal risk? YES If so, please describe.

YES, there is a limited distress and psychological risk expected. It is expected that some inmate mothers recounting their children
will experience emotional distress in discussing their children and their plight. Also, some older children may experience emotional distress. The interviewer is a MSW with over 20 years of experience in dealing with inmates, children and mentally ill persons in the helping process. Any distress in individual respondents will be sensitively handled in an appropriate and professional manner based upon my level of experience and the respondent's needs at the time of interview, during and post interview. Clinical backup will be provided by Dr. William Eldridge; Nelson Griffin, MSW; and, Rebecca Fields, MSW; all of whom have appropriate experience and are employed by the Center for Peace Studies - Inmate Project in Columbus, Ohio. Social risks have been limited by the attached protocols to ensure confidentiality and identity of the participants. Legal risks have been explained to the inmates and caretakers concerning the limits of confidentiality laws.

5. Will any stress to subjects be involved? YES If so, describe.

Same as answer to question above (#4).

6. Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? NO

7. Will there be a request for information which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? YES If so, please describe.

Inmate mothers generally perceive their children and their relationship as being strongly favorable. Therefore, inmates are very sensitive to answering questions about their children. Asking children about their plight without mom may be sensitive. Very little is known about children's feelings concerning their mother's criminality which was the main focus of the proposed study. Finally, only two past researchers have ever asked caretakers how they perceive their substitute parenting role and relationship to inmate mothers and watching the children. Their results did not report the personal or sensitive reactions to the topic.

8. Will the subjects be presented with materials which they might consider to be offensive, threatening or degrading. NO

9. Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

- Inmate mothers: Stage I - 15 minutes
- Inmate mothers: Stage II - 1 hour
- Caretakers of children: 1 hour
- Children of inmate mothers: 30-45 minutes

10. Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted? Subjects must be informed about the nature of what is involved as a participant, including particularly a description of anything they might consider to be unpleasant or a risk. Please provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of the written solicitation and an outline of the oral solicitation.
Volunteer inmate mothers—self directed questionnaire and focused group interviews
Volunteer caretakers of inmate children—focused interview
Children who know mother is in prison and only children who are 7 years of age or older living in Columbus, Ohio
Written/oral solicitations to the volunteers in the study and explanations and instrumentation are attached

11. What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What, if any, inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

Cover letters signed by principle researcher and associate researcher to inmate and caretakers about what participants can expect as a subject
Waiver to talk to children by inmate mother only if she has legal custody
Waiver by inmate mother to talk to caretakers
Waiver by caretaker to be interviewed and also to interview children

12. How will you insure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? Yes. If so, please include the form, and if not, please indicate why not.

A packet of several forms and waivers is attached. Absolutely no one will be contacted unless it is voluntary and waivers are signed prior to any data collection being done.

13. Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? No

This is stated in written/oral solicitations.

14. Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made a part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? No

This is stated in written/oral solicitations.

15. What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data?

Single researcher/analyst/rater - Gregg Hungerford, Ph.D. Candidate
Data storage kept on computer disk on pc at researchers home
Code book and raw data kept in locked, fire-proof box at researchers home
All subjects receive a code number. The master code book will be destroyed at the completion of the study. The only person having access to the master code book will be Gregg Hungerford.
Letter from Warden of the Franklin Pre-Release Center
16. If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subject or society?

YES. Summarized research results will be presented to the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections for use in policy and program decisions for inmate mothers and their children.

17. Will any data from files or archival data be used? NO
TO: The Ohio State University
    Human Subjects Review Committee

FROM: Barbara Brown Nichols, Ph.D.

RE: Committee Membership on the Dissertation
    of Gregory P. Hungerford
    A Study of Children of Inmate Mothers

DATE: April 12, 1993

Please take this memo as my cooperation to work with the
Human Subjects Committee's concern over the major issue of confi-
dentiality of individual information given to Gregg Hungerford in
his study of inmate children that will be collected at the Frank-
lin County Prerelease Center where I am warden.

At no time during the data collection process will I have
any interest to know the list of participating inmates. During
any future testing of Gregg's dissertation, I will exclude and
excuse myself from the committee if raw data collection forms or
data would be presented in such a manner that I would know the
identity of the inmate.

It was assumed by me, that in good faith, and by the use of
an inmate code number, only known to Gregg, that confidentiality
and identity would be assured. At present, I am responsible for
450 female inmates in my facility and my interest is in summated
and aggregate data that was collected and prepered in a valid and
reliable manner so I may use it in programming and policy deci-
sions concerning inmate motherhood.

Again, let me restate that I would fully cooperate with the
Human Subjects Review Committee's concerns. As a Ph.D. from Ohio
State University, I am very sensitive to the topic of confidentiali-
ity and research and also the doctoral students' completion of
their dissertations.

Thank you for your consideration.

/h

cc: File
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APPROVAL FORM
RESEARCH PROPOSAL APPROVAL

Proposal Title:

The individual submitting this research proposal has read and agrees to the conditions specified on the reverse side of this approval form.

Submitted by: The Center For Peace Studies and Community Development
Name

YWCA, 65 South 4th St., Cols., OH 43215
Address

(614) 621-2642
Telephone

Date Submitted: 2/25/92

Advisor: Dr. William D. Eldridge, LSW
Signature and Title

College of Social Work, The Ohio State University
Academic Institution

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION AND CORRECTION:

Research Review - Central Office

3/20/92

Date

Chief - Management Information Systems

3/30/92

Date

Managing Officer/Field Supervisor

4/3/92

Date
RESEARCH PROPOSAL APPROVAL

Time Frame:
Start Date: ___________ Completion Date: ___________

Estimated Departmental Cost:
Hours: _______________ Dollars: $_____________

Final approval is contingent upon the following conditions:
- Confidentiality of subjects' identity
- Signed approval by subject(s) if needed
- Copy of results is to be provided to this Department
- Approval of research advisor if research is part of an educational requirement
- Research design is in accordance with accepted standards regarding human subjects' rights
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