
Student Work

6-1-1979

The Children of Inmate Mothers: Policies and Perceptions

Virginia Hronek Burns
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Burns, Virginia Hronek, "The Children of Inmate Mothers: Policies and Perceptions" (1979). *Student Work*. 2178.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2178>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

THE CHILDREN OF INMATE MOTHERS:
POLICIES AND PERCEPTIONS

A Thesis

Presented to the
Department of Criminal Justice
and the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Virginia Hronek Burns

June, 1979

UMI Number: EP73720

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73720

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My appreciation is extended to the many persons who assisted with this research. I am indebted to Dr. Samuel Walker for his constant guidance. Dr. Janet Porter and Dr. Jane Woody provided valuable assistance. Dr. Julie Horney's advice was an important contribution. My mother, Fran Hronek, helped in numerous ways.

This research could not have been completed without the cooperation of the agency personnel and inmate mothers who agreed to be interviewed. I am grateful to all of them.

Special thanks to my entire family, especially my spouse, Bob, and my children, Julia and Benjamin, for their sacrifices and support while I worked to complete this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	
Background Information	1
Overview of the Thesis	2
The Problem	2
Research Objectives	2
Method of Determination	4
Collateral Issues	4
The Female Offender	4
Women's Correctional Facilities	6
Children of Inmate Mothers	8
Maternal Deprivation	9
Nebraska Statutes on Children and Youth	11
Dependency	11
Administration of Assistance, Power and Duties	14
Services Available to Douglas County Dependent Children	14
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	
Limited Research	
Effects of the Mother's Criminal Process of the Children	16
Deficiencies Within the System	16
Effects of the Mothers Incarceration	17
Limited Services for Children of Inmate Mothers	18
Innovative Programs for Inmate Mothers and Their Children	21
National Programs	25
Nebraska Programs	25
	27
III. METHODOLOGY	
The Sample	32
Agencies	32
Inmate Mothers	33
Questionnaire	34
Data Collection	34
Measurement	37
Limitations of the Research	37
IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS	
Agencies Policies and Services	39
Inmate Mother Perceptions of Services Received by the	50
Children and the Children's Unmet Needs	
Responses to Similar Questions Posed to Agency Personnel	52
and Inmate Mothers	
Inmate Mothers and Their Children	61

IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS (Continued)	<u>Page</u>
Comparison of Inmate Mother Responses According to Length of Sentence	72
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	
Summary	83
Conclusion	87
Recommendations	89
Implications for Further Research	91
VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY	93
VII. APPENDIX	95

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Agencies Direct Services for Children	44
II. Percentâge of Children Who Have Unmet Needs According to Perceptions of Inmate Mothers	52
III. Children's Living Arrangements: Prior to Mother's Arrest Since Mother's Incarceration	65 65
IV. Number of Children's Moves Since Mother's Arrest or Incarceration	66
V. Frequency of Mother Child Visitation Within the Correctional Facility	67
VI. Inmate Mother Perceptions of the Effect of Maternal Incarceration on the Children	70
VII. Inmate Mother Perceptions of Children's Problems Since the Incarceration	70
VIII. Numbers of Inmate Mothers According to Category of Sentences and the Numbers of Children Represented	73
IX. Children's Unmet Needs Comparing Perceptions of Inmate Mothers in Jail and Prison	78
X. Children's Unmet Needs Comparing Perceptions of Inmate Mothers According to Category of Sentence	80

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background Information

Recent research has focused attention on the female lawbreaker. Yet the children of the female offender remain nearly a neglected issue. This thesis investigates one aspect of the problem -- the services provided by the criminal justice and social service agencies in Douglas County, Nebraska for children of inmate mothers.

Children of inmate mothers became a concern of the investigator while working in a local residential facility for female inmates during 1974 to 1976. Several observations were made during this time. First, when sentencing a woman to a correctional facility, criminal court judges rarely exhibited concern over the whereabouts of the children. Many mothers began serving a sentence without making adequate preparation for the care of their dependents because judges had overlooked the situation of the children. Second, many inmate mothers were not aware of what, if any, public and private agency services were available for their children. Some agencies were unaware that children being served had mothers living in jail or prison. There was an apparent lack of communication and planning between social service agencies, inmate mothers and correctional personnel. Third, many children were not receiving services or financial assistance because the mother or caretaker were not cognizant of what public aid was available to the children. Therefore, some children had unmet financial, medical or other social service needs. Fourth,

no single or combined agencies existed in Douglas County to oversee the welfare of inmates' dependents. Services and provisions for the children were fragmented and arbitrary. From the above concerns, this thesis has evolved.

Overview of the Thesis

The Problem

The problem is twofold -- to learn the legal responsibilities, policies and services of criminal justice and social service agencies in Douglas County for children of inmate mothers. To discover the perceptions of inmate mothers relative to the policies and services available to their children.

Research Objectives

The first major objective will focus on policies and services of the Douglas County criminal justice and social service agencies regarding the welfare of children of inmate mothers. The following objectives have been set:

1. To identify Nebraska Statutes regarding services for dependent children that relate to the role of the criminal justice and social service agencies in Douglas County.
2. To identify policies and services regarding the welfare of children of inmate mothers provided by the criminal justice and social service agencies.
3. To determine the extent of communication and coordination of services for children among the agencies and the extent of input that is solicited from the inmate mothers about the children.

4. To determine agency personnel perceptions regarding:
 - a) the need for inmate mothers to be granted a time period between sentencing and incarceration to make arrangements for the children,
 - b) the need for a central agency to coordinate services for inmates' children,
 - c) public and private agencies' responsibility for intervention with inmates' children,
 - d) what needs to be established to provide better services for children of inmate mothers.

The second major objective will focus on inmate mothers' perceptions in relation to agency policies and services for their children. The following objectives were set:

1. To determine the perceptions of inmate mothers regarding the extent of services provided for their children by criminal justice and social service agencies.
2. To determine how inmate mothers perceive the communication and coordination of services by the agencies for their children.
3. To determine if inmate mothers' input has been solicited by the agencies when decisions are made and services provided for the children.
4. To determine the extent of unmet needs of the children as perceived by the inmate mothers.
5. To determine whether inmate mothers perceive a need for:
 - a) time to be granted to defendant mothers between sentencing and incarceration in order to make arrangements for their children,

- b) a central agency to coordinate services for inmates' children.
- 6. To determine inmate mothers' perceptions of what needs to be established to provide more effective services for their children.
- 7. To determine the differences in perceptions of inmate mothers serving sentences at the jail and inmate mothers serving sentences at the prison.

Method of Determination

This study is entirely descriptive in nature.

The sample was divided into two groups, criminal justice and social service agency personnel and inmate mothers sentenced to the jail or prison from Douglas County who had minor dependents residing in the county.

Data was collected by means of pre-arranged interviews which employed a pre-coded questionnaire and standard procedures. Two questionnaires were developed, one for agency personnel and the other for inmate mothers.

A comparison of the responses, utilizing a frequency distribution, was done in order to describe the responsibilities, policies and perceptions as outlined in the objectives.

Collateral Issues

The Female Offender

FBI statistics report that women constitute slightly more than

16% of all arrests in the major crime categories¹ (Uniform Crime Reports, 1975). The pattern of female criminal behavior has been changing. Between 1960 and 1975 women's arrest rates rose 253%. Also, women are being arrested for an increasing number of traditional male types of crime, such as burglary and auto theft. Most arrests of females occur as a result of property crimes.

There has been a great deal of speculation as to why women's arrest rates are climbing. Freda Adler (1975) suggests that the women's liberation movement and increasing female arrest rates are directly related. Simon (1975) hypothesizes that increased employment opportunities for females have provided women more opportunity for crime commission, such as fraud. Kelin and Kress (1976) contend that the economic deprivation faced by women who are heads of households is a primary factor in crime commission.

Ruth Glick's publication A National Study of Women's Correctional Programs (1977) is the most recent and comprehensive source on female inmates. The data gathered from 57 jails and prisons in 14 states, including Nebraska, provides the following demographic profile on the female inmate.

The typical female inmate is about 27 years old, poor, under-educated and the mother of two children. She is generally non-white -- 51% are black, 35% are white, 10% are Hispanic, 4% are Indian and

¹Major crimes are homicide, robbery, rape, burglary, motor vehicle theft, arson and larceny over \$50.

1% are other. If she is convicted for a misdemeanor, the offense is generally a property crime. Drug offenses and crimes of violence are the second and third most likely offenses for which women are sentenced to jail. On the average, a female jail inmate will serve about three months. If she is sentenced to prison, the convicting offense is most often a violent crime. Property crimes and drug offenses, respectively, are the next most predominate type of offense for which women are sent to prison. Somewhere between 13 and 24 months is the average length of time a women will serve for a felony. Male prison inmates comparatively are of about the same age, educational level and financial background (Senna and Siegal, 1978). Yet, most men in prison are white, about 51%; 47% are black and 2% are of other ethnic origins. Males serve on an average of 3.5 years in prison.

Women's Correctional Facilities

Varying estimates indicate that there are between 15,000 and 16,000 women currently incarcerated in state and federal institutions, county and municipal jails (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978; Rock, 1977).

There are about 8,000 women presently confined in jail (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978). This figure represents about 5% of the total U.S. jail population. Jail facilities for women and men alike are overcrowded, understaffed and severely lacking in recreational and educational programs.

Local jails and lockups represent the worst of the correctional system. They are especially injurious to women because they subject women to facilities planned for and supervised almost exclusively by men and they provide even fewer services for women than for men.

Neither the physical arrangements nor the personnel allow for wholesome contact between mothers and children (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978, p.12).

Phone calls and visiting privileges in jails are limited and in some detention facilities are prohibited (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978). Some jails ban visitors under the age of 14, 16 or 18, thereby many parents in jail have no opportunity to see their children.

Thirty-five states have separate correctional facilities for women. The remaining states house their female felons in a section of a male prison or contract with other states to maintain their female prisoners.

Women's prisons generally, like many male prisons, are located in rural areas. The rural locality often hinders the opportunity for visits from family and friends, since most inmates are from metropolitan regions. It has been found that many inmate mothers rarely see their children or their children's caretakers because of transportation difficulties to the institution (Zalba, 1964; McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978).

There are three striking differences between female and male prisons: size, appearance and quality of programming. Women's correctional facilities are smaller than men's simply because of demand. Structurally, the prisons differ between the general high security fortress style of male institutions and the campus-like setting of women's prisons. Male inmates are usually confined in cell blocks while women prisoners reside in cottage or small dormitory structures. The more pleasant surroundings of a woman's correctional facility has

been coined as a false benevolence (Klein and Kress, 1976). What goes on inside a female institution is less opportunistic than a male prison. Women's facilities offer an average of 2.7 vocational training programs as compared to an average of 10 vocational programs available to male inmates. Male prisoners may have access to training for more lucrative fields such as welding, electronics or data processing, while typically female inmates are offered training in food service, cosmetology and secretarial skills.

The literature on female correctional facilities firmly establishes that such institutions have been oppressive and neglectful in their function of rehabilitation (Burkhart, 1973; Gibson, 1976; Klein and Kress, 1976). Standard 11.6 of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals recommends that state correctional agencies confining females should re-examine their procedures, policies and programs in order to make them more suitable for the needs of women.

A particular need that has been established among female inmates is that parenting and child development courses, together with increased contact with offspring and their caretakers, be provided (Zalba, 1964; McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978). Even if an institution undertakes the responsibility of preparing a woman for successful community reintegration it should not deny the needs of her parenting role.

Children of Inmate Mothers

About 75% of the estimated 16,000 women incarcerated are mothers

(Rock, 1977). The average number of dependents is two (Glick, 1977; McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978). Figures suggest that there are about 24,000 children whose mothers are imprisoned on any given day.

During the month of May, 1978 there were eight inmate mothers in the Douglas County jail and 27 inmate mothers sentenced from Douglas County in the Nebraska Center for Women². These 45 women left a total of 93 children behind upon incarceration.

When a state or county restricts a mother's freedom through incarceration it also affects her parental responsibility. Her children are innocent of criminal activity and should not be subject to "punishment" because of the mother's criminal offense. The state or county should assume the responsibility of meeting the child's financial, medical and other social needs created by the legal separation of mother and offspring. If the mother and child are separated due to findings of neglect or abuse in juvenile court, there will be intervention of appropriate agencies to meet the child's needs. If a mother's criminal activity separates her from her child, the intervention of the appropriate agencies is doubtful. The lack of agency intervention with inmate mother's children exists either because no agency has considered the problem or the issue has never been raised by advocates for inmate mothers.

Maternal Deprivation

Maternal deprivation has been evaluated where there has been

²Mary Fessler, Administrative Secretary, Nebraska Center for Women; Jim Clark, Program Director, Douglas County Department of Corrections, Omaha, Nebraska.

separation of mother and child due to divorce, hospitalization, travel and death. When the mother has been the primary caretaker prior to the separation, the child may experience feelings of insecurity, inability to relate to others, lack of identity, feelings of rejection or abandonment and/or social maladjustment (Goldstein, et.al., 1973, Joint Commission on Mental Health, 1969). The likelihood of such effects is greater when the child is forced to live in numerous households or has no previous relationship with the temporary caretaker (Rutter, 1972).

Incarceration of a caretaking mother is another crisis leading to maternal deprivation. However, it has not been researched extensively. One recent pilot study concerned with the effects of parental imprisonment found that children of male inmates experienced an increase in behavioral problems during the father's incarceration (Sack, et.al, 1976). Another study focusing on inmate mothers and their children suggests that many children exhibit anxiety, anger, rejection and shame over their mother's incarceration (LaPoint, 1977). According to the researcher, "...Children become identified with, and stigmatized by, the status of the imprisoned mother. The child becomes a part of the process by which the mother is punished and, in many ways, is socialized into prisoner status" (p.281).

There are several unexplored aspects of maternal deprivation due to incarceration. On the one hand the consequences for the child may be numerous, including a distorted role perception of a parent. Some children may be unable to discern the reality of the situation,

fluctuating between the feeling that "My mom is a crook" and angry at what the system has "done to my mom and all of us". Some children may have serious problems renewing their relationship with the mother upon her release. On the other hand, some children may be better off separated from their mother. It is unrealistic to romanticize that every inmate mother entered jail or prison as an adequate parent.

Nebraska Statutes on Children and Youth

Dependency

There are no Nebraska statutes that apply directly to the welfare of the prisoners' dependents. Some statutes address the problems of dependent children and are relevant to this study.

The definition of a dependent child, as it applies to eligibility for aid, is stated in section 43-504 as follows:

- (1) Dependent child means any child under age 18, or under age 21 if a student, who is deprived of parental support or care because of the death, continued absence from home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent, or partial or total unemployment of the supporting parent and who is living with his or her father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, brother, sister, stepfather, stepbrother, stepsister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew or niece in a place maintained by one or more relatives as his or her own home... (A Compendium of Nebraska Laws Concerning Children and Youth p.216).

Further, section 43-510 states that the child must be a resident of the state to be eligible for aid and section 68-1020 provides medical assistance for dependent children. Dependents are also entitled to social services as stated in section 60-1203. According to section 43-512 either the child or the relative may take application for

assistance. If it is determined through an investigation by the local county board of welfare that the caretaker is unable to support the child, aid may be provided in specified monthly payments. Section 43-515 states that after application and investigation by the county board of welfare "each applicant shall be notified as to the disposition of the application, amounts awarded, and discontinuance of payments" (A Compendium of Nebraska Laws Concerning Children and Youth, p.221).

In summary, these statutes establish that prisoners' dependents, living with relatives defined in Section 43-504, may make application for financial assistance. If they are eligible for such assistance, they are also entitled to medical assistance and social services. Applicants and recipients must be notified of eligibility findings and any change in the disposition.

Although assistance to dependent children has been provided by statute, inmate mothers and/or caretakers may not be aware of the children's eligibility for assistance since there is no mechanism of conveying this information. Caretakers may not receive aid unless they are advised informally or take the initiative to inquire. Consequently, some children may have unmet financial and medical needs due to lack of awareness of eligibility for aid. Some means of supplying the caretaker with this information should be provided. For example, the County Welfare Department could provide this information to inmate mothers at the onset of their incarceration. Such information should be supplied with the understanding that assistance does not threaten

loss of custody by the caretakers or mothers.

Section 43-504 is discriminatory in that it provides that the child must be living with a statutorily defined relative. Some inmate mothers do not have relatives to leave their children with during their incarceration or may choose to leave their children in the care of a friend. Children being supervised by a non-related caretaker should not be denied eligibility for assistance.

The County Welfare Department has no systematic means of notifying a recipient of a change in the disposition of assistance. Nearly all inmate mothers who had received AFDC prior to their incarceration reported that they never received any notification, but assistance was terminated eventually after they were imprisoned. Some of these women also reported that related caretakers had eventually made new application for assistance, but that several months passed between termination and renewal of payments. One mother in jail reported that after her sentencing, she phoned her social worker to advise her of her incarceration, and was told that her AFDC payments would be suspended for three months because she was not living with her children. The woman's sentence was for 30 days and the children were being cared for temporarily by her father. The mother stated that the social worker did not inquire as to the children's whereabouts and that no investigation was conducted. Another inmate mother in jail reported that her social worker had no knowledge of her incarceration and that the AFDC check had been mailed regularly to her home while she was in jail. The County Welfare Department needs to

establish some standard means to notify inmate mothers of the termination of welfare benefits. Some system must also be developed so that children are not denied assistance unnecessarily at the onset of a parent's incarceration.

Administration of Assistance, Power and Duties

The administration of general relief is the County Board of Public Welfare, as defined in section 68-707. This section provides that the County Board of Public Welfare may delegate the responsibility of the administration of relief to the County Director of Welfare, as is done in Douglas County. Among the powers and duties of the County Board of Public Welfare are (to) "investigate the family circumstances of reported cases of dependent, destitute, neglected, delinquent, defective, or physically handicapped children to determine needed care, supervision or treatment and report the same to the Director of Welfare" (Section 43-506, p.217). Since investigation into the needs of a child is conducted only on reported cases, many prisoners' dependents will not receive assistance because there is no application for assistance or report of suspected neglect or abuse. Some method of reporting prisoners' dependents to the County Welfare Department needs to be developed so that a determination of their needs can be made.

Services Available to Douglas County Dependent Children

At present, it appears that there is no criminal justice agency within Douglas County which provides services for children whose parents have been criminally charged or sentenced.

The Douglas County Department of Social Services provides assistance to dependent children within four divisions. The Aid for Dependent Children division provides financial assistance. Foster Care places children in foster homes and evaluates their progress. Child Protective Services investigates suspected cases of child neglect and abuse. Income Maintenance makes the determination and evaluates the ongoing need for financial assistance.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Limited Research

The past decade has witnessed a revived interest in the female offender. Research attributed to female criminality and women's prisons have brought the female offender somewhat out of the category of forgotten offender. Much of the research has identified specific problems unique to women lawbreakers such as discriminatory sentencing, lack of vocational skills and training opportunities and employability (Klein and Kress, 1976; Simon, 1975; Temin, 1973). The recent research and findings focus on the more visible problems of the female offender. A less visible problem, but of no less significance, is that of the children of female offenders. The children have been the victims of almost total inattention by those involved in studying women criminals. Therefore, the literature review is brief in relation to the limited availability of published materials on the children of female offenders.

The literature is divided into two categories, research relating to the problems and needs of inmate mothers' children and works in reference to innovative programs for inmate mothers and their children.

Effects of the Mother's Criminal Process on the Children

Not much has been established about the effects of the mother's criminal process, prior to incarceration, on the children. What has been found though is that the entire criminal process leaves an in-

delible impression on the children (LaPoint, 1976; McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978).

The abrupt pre-trial separation of mother and children may last several hours, days or indefinitely. Children experience a great deal of stress and confusion during this time (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978). They often are attended by relatives or friend who are unprepared for their care. Some children are not only separated from their mother but siblings and familiar surroundings. The stress of the separation is magnified by the unknown outcome of the mother's status.

Children who attend their mother's court proceedings witness accusations and judgement against the parent. Although the children may not comprehend the legal terminology they can perceive their mother's humble position. One source of study concluded that the trial does not adversely affect the children because it may help them to understand the separation (Sack, 1976, studies from offspring of male inmates only). Case studies of the mother's criminal process indicate that the court proceedings and trial are a painful and emotional ordeal for children present (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978; Burkhardt, 1973).

Deficiencies Within the System

According to McGowan and Blumenthal (1978, p.5), "Perhaps the most striking finding of our study was the severity and range of problems experienced by children and families because of the lack of concern and appropriate services for this population at every point in the criminal justice process."

The above authors found that police rarely consider an alleged offender's offspring at the time of arrest unless children are present. They determined that detention facilities hinder mother and child communication by restricting visiting policies and limiting phone calls. Their research found that attorneys direct attention toward the children only in so far as their dependents will increase a mother's chances for pre-trial release or alternative sentencing. McGowan and Blumenthal also discovered that pre-sentence investigating officers probe the family situation and report it to the judge but their intervention with the children is not guaranteed. Their study also concluded that judicial decision making is influenced by a mother's responsibility for offspring "only in borderline cases" (p.15). Additionally, the authors found that social welfare agencies do not provide adequate services for children of female inmates.

To resolve the deficiencies in the system, McGowan and Blumenthal (1978) propose that criminal justice and social welfare agencies should be given specialized training in relation to the needs and risks of children who are separated from their mother by arrest or incarceration. They also recommend that the agencies should maintain guidelines for intervention with the children of female offenders.

The Effects of the Mother's Incarceration

Some mothers and caretakers choose to explain the mother's absence as being away at school or hospitalized (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978; Zalba, 1964). If the children visit the mother, the facility is portrayed as an acceptable institution. Most children don't believe

the deception and all eventually discover the truth (LaPoint, 1977). Children misled about their mother's locality are confused and have difficulty in accepting the mother's status.

Some caretakers deceive the children about their mother's whereabouts against the mother's will. This disagreement creates conflict between mothers and caretakers (Zalba, 1964). Still, some children are instructed by caretakers never to reveal to outsiders the mother's incarceration (LaPoint, 1977). Children under these circumstances must lie about their mother's absence. They feel shame and anger over the mother's status.

Most incarcerated mothers tell their children they are in jail or prison. However, explanations are usually vague (LaPoint, 1977; Sack, 1976; McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978). Mothers feel guilty and anxious about the incarceration. Children often take on their mother's feelings and experience the same psychological conflicts about the imprisonment. Mother-child discussions over the explanation for absence are less stressful and more open when a third party, staff member, is present for support (LaPoint, 1977). Counseling should be available for mother-child discussions to enhance communication and resolve conflicts.

The quality of the relationship between mother and children during incarceration is generally an indicator of the relationship prior to the legal separation (LaPoint, 1977). However, the psychological emotions that children and mothers suffer, such as anger, resentment, and shame, as a result of the incarceration, can adversely affect the relationship (Daehlin and Hynes, 1974). Regular communication and

visits between mothers and children are essential for the maintenance and improvement of family relationships. '

Most children of inmate mothers are too young to maintain contact with the mother by mail or telephone conversations. Visits may be the only means of contact.

Some mothers prefer not to see their children during their incarceration to avoid shame and embarrassment (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978; Zalba, 1964). Yet some mothers are prevented from seeing their offspring because caretakers may disapprove, the correctional facility bans minor children from visiting, or the institution location is inconvenient.

Jail visitation, as compared to prison, is generally more restrictive. Children who are permitted to visit with a jailed parent usually communicate through a screen or a telephone if there is a glass partition. Physical contact is thereby prohibited. Children undergo a great deal of trauma seeing their mother this way and not being able to touch her (Burkhart, 1975). Telephone calls between mothers and family are also limited in number and length. Jails should establish more liberal visiting and telephone policies to increase communication between inmates and children (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978).

Physical contact between mothers and children is commonly permitted in prisons (Burkhart, 1973). Some institutions have inadequate visiting facilities; a room with tables and chairs (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978). Some prisons accommodate children with toys, games

and playground equipment. A few women's prisons now allow overnight visiting for inmates and children and at least two permit infants to reside with their mother for a few months (Potter, 1978).

Special visiting programs enhance mother-child relationships (Burkles and LaFazia, 1973). Correctional facilities should encourage contact between mothers and children by allowing convenient visiting schedules and providing adequate accommodations (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978).

Lack of transportation has been found as the barrier to inmate-offspring visiting (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978; Sack, 1976; Zalba, 1964). The rural location of most prisons makes transportation difficult and costly. Jail locations are also sometimes inconvenient. Young children cannot be placed on a bus or train without supervision so caretakers must incur the travel expense for children and themselves. Some caretakers resent the inconvenience and expense so they limit or deny visiting opportunities.

Agencies as a rule do not provide transportation for visiting. Correctional facilities, welfare agencies and volunteers should provide transportation services for inmates' families (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978).

Limited Services for Children of Inmate Mothers

Children of inmate mothers have unique needs and problems. They face the stigma of having a mother in jail or prison, an image society portrays as bad (LaPoint, 1977). The forced separation sometimes leaves them without the support of the sole parent who provided for

them (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978). Some are shuffled among various households awaiting reunion with the mother. For some children this means loss of sibling and peer contact (Zalba, 1964). The emotional distress children experience has been identified; no one knows the real extent. Many physical needs are often left unattended. Some children do not have adequate clothing, food, medical attention or recreational outlets because caretakers cannot afford their maintenance (Zalba, 1964). The various needs of these children often go unmet because no agency adopts responsibility for their welfare (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978).

The need for appropriate services for children of women prisoners was first empirically established in 1964 after an investigation was conducted regarding social welfare services for the children in California (Zalba, 1964). The study found that many physical and social needs of the children were unmet. Inmate mothers were unable to make arrangements for their children and caretakers were generally unaware of available community resources.

Agency services for some children were limited to financial assistance and foster care placement. Agency involvement with the children was considered inadequate. Contact between mothers and agencies was rare. Subsequently, there was very little planning by mothers, caretakers and agencies. Most mothers felt that no services were being provided to meet the needs of the children and themselves.

This research also revealed that communication and coordination of services between agencies, including the prison, was minimal.

Communication that did exist was typically in relation to data sought for agency files. The conclusion was that services for children of inmate mothers were not only rare, but fragmented and uncoordinated.

To resolve the problems, several recommendations were offered by the research staff. Two innovations, in particular, would serve to alleviate some of the problems identified. First, welfare agencies should provide emergency services and follow up evaluations to mothers, children and caretakers at the time of the mother's arrest. Identification of the persons and problems involved at the onset of the mother's criminal processing would serve to diminish further problems. Second, an interagency liaison committee should be appointed for the purpose of improving services and communication among agencies. It seems that the application of these recommendations would be neither costly or complex.

Zalba's (1964) study depicts the problems of children and agency services in California in the mid 1960's. It may be speculated that these findings are not applicable to inmate mothers across the country, since, at the time of the study, the California Institution for Women was the most heavily populated women's prison in the United States. Women in less populated women's prisons may not have such extensive problems and needs because the lower numbers may effectuate better services. It could also be argued that the increased awareness and concern over female offenders in the past decade has reduced the problems encountered by women prisoners and their families. Yet a national study in the mid 1970's reveals that the situation for in-

mate mothers and their children has not changed (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978).

A recent study revealed that the children have a wide range of problems and needs that are almost totally neglected because they are not the special concern or responsibility of any agency. "The idea that the criminal justice system should take responsibility for what happens to children of offenders is foreign to the traditional concepts of law enforcement, the judiciary and corrections" (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978, p.2). Social service agencies too do not assume responsibility for fulfilling the needs of the children. Rather, the agencies are designed to handle certain social problems such as neglect, abuse or delinquency, none of which categorically define prisoner's children. Consequently, "these children are allowed to fall into the gaps between social programs" (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978, p.2).

Needs of inmate mothers are also neglected (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978). These women are treated in their temporary role as inmate while their permanent role as mother is ignored. They need a great deal of assistance in preparing for the resumption of their maternal responsibilities.

The results of McGowan and Blumenthal's (1978) nation-wide study are numerous recommendations, many of which have already been cited. These recommendations are based on the principle that the state has the responsibility to insure the welfare of the children. Therefore, criminal justice and social welfare agencies should undertake the

responsibility for intervention with the children and maintain policies and guidelines for coordination of services. Every effort should be made to identify and meet the needs of the children. Mothers should be involved in family oriented planning. Parenting courses and support services should be available to inmate mothers. Innovative mother-child programs should be established and coordinated with community helping agencies. McGowan and Blumenthal (1978) emphasize, "that the importance of attending to the needs of inmate mothers and their children should not be minimized" (p.94).

Innovative Programs for Inmate Mothers and Their Children

A few prisons have established innovative programs designed to meet the needs of inmate mothers and their children.

National Programs

The Federal Correctional Institution at Pleasanton, California recently initiated an experimental residential program for female inmates and infants (Omaha World-Herald, April 26, 1979). Mothers and babies reside together in a community center away from the prison. The success of this program will be an indicator for further development of mother-offspring residential programs.

The Purdy Treatment Center for Women in Washington has traditionally included inmate mother-offspring programs as a priority in their rehabilitative design (Potter, 1978). Children are permitted to visit daily and counseling is available for mothers. The institution's vocational training program encompasses a nursery school where inmates work and learn as classroom aides. Community children attend the

school and inmates' children may be in attendance one day a week (Rock, 1977). The prison works with the child welfare agency in placing children of requesting parents in foster homes near the institution (Burkles and LaFazia, 1973). Mothers and foster parents meet regularly to discuss the children's progress and plan for the future. Prison and foster care personnel coordinate planning and services with mothers and foster parents. This program is considered successful in reducing the damaging effects of maternal incarceration and foster care placement for children. Mothers have been found to be more accepting of their children's placement and their involvement with children has increased.

In 1972 the Family and Children's Service of Minneapolis contracted with the Minnesota Department of Corrections for the development of a maternal education and self help project at the women's prison (Daehlin and Hynes, 1974). Two representatives of the social service agency act as educators, group facilitators and community liaisons for a group of incarcerated females.

The program has been instrumental in helping mothers to cope with the separation of their children and preparing them to better assume their maternal role. Agency intervention has served to strengthen relationships between mothers, their children, agencies and prison staff.

The Oregon Women's Correctional Center initiates and coordinates services for inmate mothers and their children between a correctional and welfare personnel team. Community resources are

depended upon for services. One of the team members acts as a liaison between mothers and caretakers, schools, courts and helping agencies. Counseling is provided for mothers and their families.

The New York Women's Prison at Bedford Hills has a nursery facility which allows infants to reside with their mother for as long as one year (Potter, 1978). The prison also permits conjugal visits between inmates and husbands. Trailers are used to accommodate inmates and family during visits.

The South Forty Corporation, a private organization, works with inmates in maintaining family relationships and advocating community services for families of prisoners (McGowan and Blumenthal, 1978).

Nebraska Programs

Information about inmate mother-offspring programs was obtained during the data collection.

The Douglas County Department of Corrections is the only jail administration in Nebraska to offer programs for female inmates. Some women inmates are granted work or educational release privileges. The department depends on community resources for a variety of informational services for inmates. Different agency and organization representatives rotate information meetings and group discussions with women prisoners every three to five weeks. Inmates are encouraged to attend the meetings but their involvement is not required. The majority of the resources provide information about child care and parenting. Correctional staff feel that this service gives the women an opportunity to become familiar with the types of assistance they

can acquire for themselves and their families.

About seven agencies or organizations come to the women's jail on a regular basis, three others come occasionally. Some of the topics that inmates are exposed to are family planning by Planned Parenthood, child abuse by Parent's Assistance Line, alcoholism by COPING and inter-communication skills by Personal Crisis Service.

The jail also gives each inmate a community sponsored catalog which provides a description and phone number of various resources in the metropolitan area. These resources range from utility companies to counseling agencies.

The visiting policy at the jail allows inmates to meet with approved visitors once a week on Sunday from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. There is no age restriction for visitors. The inmates' day room is used for visiting. The room is large and contains tables, chairs, a television and vending machines. Visitors are allowed to bring the inmate clothing, reading material and money for the inmate's jail account.

The state women's correctional facility, the Nebraska Center for Women, in York, Nebraska, provides a variety of services and programs for inmates. All of the women are assigned to one of two counselors with whom they meet with at least weekly. There are several self-help organizations which meet regularly. These groups are discussion sessions about alcoholism, drugs and forgery.

The institution also maintains educational and vocational training programs. Most women are involved in this training, but participation

is voluntary.

A special innovation for inmate mothers, the Mother-Offspring Living Development (MOLD) program, was initiated in 1973. At its inception, the purpose was to improve mother-offspring relationships by allowing children occasional overnight visits on grounds with the mother. The prison's social service worker coordinated this opportunity for the women. A course in child care and development was also made available to the mothers.

Since that time, the program has expanded and in 1976 a MOLD Director was added to the correctional staff. A classroom style cottage has been constructed for the operation of the program.

MOLD now offers six parent-child related courses for inmate mothers who choose to participate. The courses are rotated, two run for six weeks. The instruction is informal. Classes often lead into rap sessions on the mutual problems of parenting. The participation average is five women each course session, about one fifth of the inmate mother population. Parental counseling is available to all women through the program.

The MOLD program is not coordinated with any agency that deals with children of inmate mothers. Occasionally contact is made with the Foster Care agency regarding visits. The MOLD Director considers the lack of coordination and communication between the agencies, which results in no family planning, a major problem. Planning for a mother's release is difficult when services for the children are uncertain or unknown.

Inmate mothers are permitted overnight visits with children. Visits may be as frequent as monthly and for as long as five days. Boys over the age of 12 are not allowed overnight visits. All mothers must pay 65¢ a day per child for meals. Mothers and children are encouraged to use the MOLD recreational facilities, toys, books and playground equipment.

Regular visiting days are Tuesday, week-ends and holidays. Exceptions are permitted to accommodate visitors accessibility to the institution. Open visiting is permitted in a large room in the recreational building. Visiting children and mothers may use the MOLD facilities.

The Nebraska Center for Women provides pleasant facilities and frequent opportunities for visiting. However, transportation to the rural prison limits inmate visits. Neither the institution nor any other agency provides transportation for inmates' families and friends.

Summary

The literature indicates that, as a result of maternal incarceration, children undergo unusual distress which may affect their welfare. Intervention is essential to reducing the damaging effects experienced by children.

Inmate mothers are negatively affected by the legal separation from their children. They need assistance in coping with the separation and in preparing for their eventual reunion with the children.

The need for intervention by criminal justice and social service agencies is emphasized throughout the literature. What is lacking is

strong empirical data on the needs of children and inmate mothers. Although needs will vary according to the circumstances, priorities should be determined so that services are designed appropriately. This thesis, in part, will attempt to outline the needs of children as perceived by inmate mothers. There is an awareness of inmate mothers' needs. However, the focus of this research is the children.

Innovative inmate mother programs seem to promote better mother-child relationships. Regrettably, these programs are few and not a nationwide phenomenon in correctional settings.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This research explores two aspects of the condition of the children of incarcerated women. First, it seeks to identify the official policies of the relevant criminal justice and social service agencies. This includes formal policy statements, informal policies and specific programs and services provided to inmate mothers. Second, it explores the perceptions of the inmate mothers regarding their children's treatment by the various criminal justice and social service agencies.

The Sample

The universe under study was limited to Douglas County, Nebraska because this county has the largest representation of agencies and female inmates in the state. The sample was divided into two components, criminal justice and social service agencies and inmate mothers. Sample size was determined by the voluntary participation of those involved.

Agencies

The criminal justice agencies selected for study included those involved in the process of separating mother and children or who had some effect on the relationship of mother and offspring after the woman's incarceration. Initially, thirteen judicial and correctional agency personnel were solicited for interview; eleven agreed; two refused. All four of the social service agency personnel asked to participate agreed. The sample of 15 personnel included:

Courts

1. Two Douglas County District Court Judges assigned to the Criminal Court Bench, Two Douglas County Municipal Court Judges assigned to the Criminal Court Bench
2. The Assistant Douglas County Public Defender
3. The Douglas County Chief Adult Probation Officer
4. Three Juvenile Court Judges

Corrections

1. The Director of the Douglas County Department of Corrections (the administrator of the Douglas County Women's Center)
2. The Director of the Mother-Offspring Living Development Program at the Nebraska Center for Women

Douglas County Department of Social Services

An administrative representative from each of the following divisions:

1. Aid for Dependent Children
2. Income Maintenance
3. Foster Care Services
4. Child Protective Services

Inmate Mothers

The sample of inmate mothers was defined as women who had been sentenced from Douglas County to either the Douglas County Women's Center or the Nebraska Center for Women who had minor dependents residing in the county. A total of 35 women met this criteria, five

from the jail and 30 from the prison. Twenty-four inmate mothers agreed to participate, four women in the jail and 20 women in the prison. One inmate at the jail refused as did two women at the Nebraska Center for Women. Further attrition was accounted for by absence at the institution due to hospitalization, furloughs and community work assignments among five women; three inmate mothers were confined in the reception center and restricted from contact with visitors.

The Questionnaire

Two standardized questionnaires were developed as interview guides, one for agencies and the other for inmate mothers to obtain appropriate data from the two groups (see Appendix A and B). The same set of similar questions was applied to both samples. The exception was with the agency questionnaire in which question seven applied only to the Probation Department and Public Defender and question 22 applied to the Criminal Court Judges and Probation Department. Both questionnaires were pre-tested and revisions were made accordingly.

Each questionnaire form consisted of pre-coded items and a final open-ended question. The interviewer recorded all responses and any additional comments by the participants. Individual reactions such as eye contact or emotional distress were also recorded.

Data Collection

The researcher conducted all interviews. Each interview was pre-

ceeded by standard introductory remarks stating the purpose of the study. Time span for each interview ranged from 20 to 30 minutes for both groups.

Data was collected from agency personnel between May 25 and July 12, 1978. Participants were solicited and appointments for interviews were made by telephone. Interviews were conducted at the individual agency's office. One interview was transacted over the telephone because the participant was unable to set an appointment date but was anxious to be included in the data collection.

Letters seeking permission to interview inmate mothers were sent to the administrators of the Douglas County Women's Center and the Nebraska Center for Women. Both agreed to provide access to inmate mothers. Interview request forms were distributed to the women by correctional staff (see Appendix C).

The jail administrator for the Douglas County Women's Center and the researcher agreed that the overall time range for data collection would not exceed 30 days, from June 1 to June 30, 1978. It was arranged that the researcher would contact the jail matron every other day to determine if a new inmate had been admitted and agreed to be interviewed. Interviews were subsequently scheduled after the woman had completed at least three to five days of her sentence. Two interviews were conducted on June 6th, one on June 12th and one on June 19th.

The setting for the interviews was the day room at the Center. Jail matrons were respectful of the confidential nature of the study by allowing the door to the room to be closed. There were no inter-

ruptions or time restraints.

Two dates were scheduled for data collection at the Nebraska Center for Women, to accommodate the 20 inmate mother volunteers. Eleven women were interviewed on July 7th, nine were interviewed on July 12, 1978.

Interviews were conducted in the Mother-Offspring Living Development (MOLD) cottage. This cottage serves as an instructional classroom and recreational facility for visiting children. Research interviewing was the only activity scheduled in the cottage on these two days.

The MOLD director summoned each woman to the cottage according to the inmate's availability on grounds. The MOLD director remained present during the interviews, seated at her desk approximately five feet away from the interview table. The presence of a staff member did not seem to inhibit the inmate's responses and comments.

The interviewer was unable to control for any discussion of the interview content between inmate mothers who had been interviewed and those awaiting interview. Communication among the women would not seem to create any significant hindrance to the data collection since the questions pertained to the women's children and individual perceptions.

The researcher had prior contact with five of the inmate mothers during her previous employment at a residential correctional facility in which these women resided. Initially there was some skepticism about the willingness of their participation and how the previous

relationship would affect the data collection. Only one of these five women refused participation. That rejection was attributed to the former relationship with the researcher. The other women were exceedingly cooperative.

Cooperation among all of the inmate mothers was exceptional. Rapport with the women was easily established. They were eager to talk about their children and the problems that had been encountered since incarceration. Many women expressed the hope that their input would eventually result in better services for all children of inmates.

Measurement

The researcher recorded all responses on a code sheet. Responses were measured by frequency and association. A comparison of responses across and within the categories of agencies and inmates was made.

Limitations of the Research

The research had some limitations. The sample size, particularly of inmate mothers, was small and there was no random sampling. The refusal rate among agency personnel was 15%; 11% of the available inmate mothers refused to participate. However, the overall time range for data collection imposed by corrections officials created the restriction of inmate mother sample size.

Data secured from inmate mothers regarding the types and extent of services their children were receiving from various agencies was not verified with agencies or children's caretakers.

Another limitation was the exclusion of Omaha Police Division

personnel from the criminal justice sample. This agency was eliminated in the initial sample selection in order to keep the overall data collection within a practical timeframe. This agency probably could have provided valuable information in regard to how they deal with children who are present at the time of a mother's arrest and what type of referrals are made for the children.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The research findings will be presented in five sections. The first section is the data that was gathered from agency personnel regarding policies and services for children of inmate mothers. The second section is the perceptions of inmate mothers relating to the services and unmet needs of their children. The third section is an analysis of the similar questions posed to agency personnel and inmate mothers. Section four is information about the sample of inmate mothers and their children. The fifth section is a comparison of mother's responses according to length of sentence.

Agencies, Policies and Services

The criminal justice personnel, excluding Juvenile Court Judges, were asked what percentage of their cases involved women with children. The Nebraska Center for Women was the only agency that maintained exact data so most responses were estimates. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents replied that between 40 and 60% of their cases involve women with children. The remaining responses were lower percentages.

The Juvenile Court Judges and the social service agency representatives were asked what percentage of their cases involved children of inmate mothers. Two of the social service agency personnel provided exact data, all others gave estimates. All but one of the participants stated that between 1% and 20% of their clients were children of inmate

mothers, one person had no idea of a percentage.

These findings indicate that about half of the females processed through the criminal justice system have minor dependents. At most, about one fifth of the clientele receiving some type of service from the juvenile court and social service agencies are children of inmate mothers (see Appendix 1).

A major objective of this thesis was to determine the policies maintained by criminal justice and social service agencies regarding the welfare of defendant/inmate's children. Only two agencies, the Nebraska Center for Women and Income Maintenance have written policy guidelines about the children. The prison policy is in relation to visiting. The social service agency policy contains guidelines for distribution of financial assistance to prisoner's children.

In addition to the visitation policy for the Nebraska Center for Women outlined on page 30, inmates may be granted community furloughs as frequently as every 60-90 days for the purpose of strengthening family ties. Women must complete 90 days of incarceration before being eligible. Furloughs (generally 12 to 24 hours) must be approved by the prison Superintendant, Director of Corrections and the Nebraska Board of Parole.

Income Maintenance is the department in the Douglas County Welfare Office that determines the financial need for the disadvantaged, i.e., elderly, handicapped, dependent children. The financial assistance awarded by this agency provides Aid for Dependent Children, Food Stamps, medical assistance and emergency services such as shelter and clothing.

The written policy of this agency regarding prisoner's children is as follows:

Financial assistance shall not be terminated if the incarceration of the responsible parent does not exceed 90 days. If the incarceration of the responsible parent exceeds 90 days, temporary custody of the children must be awarded by the Juvenile Court to either the children's caretaker (regardless of relationship) or to the Douglas County Department of Welfare for payment of financial assistance.

In effect, this policy means that parents who are incarcerated for three months or less should not expect termination or denial of financial assistance for their children. Yet, one inmate mother in jail for a 10 day sentence reported that her AFDC payment was suspended for one month after she, on her own initiative, called her social worker and advised her of the jail term. An investigation into this incident by the researcher resulted in an explanation by agency personnel that the social worker was a new employee and had been confused about guidelines for termination.

In addition, the effect of the policy for parents incarcerated more than 90 days (some in jail, all in prison) results in the loss of temporary custody of their dependents if public financial assistance is necessary. The Income Maintenance agent assured the researcher that the transfer of custody is only temporary and that the mother's custody is easily reassumed after her release. However, the loss of child custody, if only temporary, may be threatening enough for some mothers to discourage the children's caretakers from seeking

or continuing financial assistance.

Some agency participants stated that they maintained informal policies regarding the welfare of children of inmate mothers. The informal policies were found to be unwritten codes which generally depicted the individual's attitude about the children's welfare. Below is a description of the informal policies as explained by the agency personnel.

A District Court Judge: "My informal policy is to direct the Pre-Sentence Investigation Officer to make referrals for the children to the appropriate agencies for assistance."

Municipal Court Judge: "I question the mother on everything, searching every nook and cranny trying to establish the motivation for the crime. If she had been on AFDC or is just downright broke, I take that into consideration. If she stole a pair of earrings, it is one thing, if it was bread and milk for the kids, it is another. Then I weigh whether or not the crime and the mother's history are serious enough to separate her from her kids."

Adult Probation Office: "The informal policy is part of the pre-sentence investigating officer's duty, to investigate and report on the defendant's family situation. If it appears that the children's welfare is at stake, another agency may be contacted or it might be suggested to the children's mother or caretaker that they seek help from a particular agency.

Douglas County Department of Corrections: This agency defines their informal policy as the lack of an age restriction for visitors so that

children can visit with mothers in jail during the weekly two hour visiting session.

Foster Care: The informal policy of this agency is the allowance of visitation at the Nebraska Center for Women between inmate mothers and their children who are in foster care homes. The agency does not provide transportation to the prison.

Agency policies, written and informal, are limited. None alone nor all together insure the welfare of prisoners' children.

Agency services for children of inmate mothers were found to be minimal. The services afforded these children are in most cases the actual function of the agency rather than innovations designed for inmates' children. The only exception found was some visiting provisions granted to the children by Foster Care and the two correctional agencies.

The most common type of service was referral to another agency cited by 63% of the criminal justice agency personnel and 25% of the social service personnel (see Appendix 1.1). This service may be considered as indirect since it does not constitute interaction between the agency and the child. One could interpret this service as being a valuable means of initiating other services. A look at the actual services provided by agencies and compared to services received by the children leads to the conclusion that effectiveness of the referrals is questionable.

Slightly more than one fourth (27%) of the criminal justice agencies and all of the social service agencies provide direct services

that are available to children of inmate mothers. The following table describes the agencies' services.

Table I
Agencies Direct Services for Children

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Services</u>
Juvenile Court	Child placement, custody decisions
Nebraska Center for Women	Visitation
Douglas County Department of Corrections	Visitation
Aid for Dependent Children	Financial assistance for food, clothing shelter and medical expenses
Foster Care Services	Child placement and supervision, visitation provisions for children of inmate mothers
Child Protective Services	Child placement and counseling
Income Maintenance	Financial assistance and determination of ongoing financial need

It is clear that these services are the regular functions of the agencies. No agency has special services which anticipate the needs and problems encountered by children of inmate mothers. Two of the social service personnel told the researcher that prior to the interview, they had never considered the fact that some of the children they provided services for have parents in prison.

Agency intervention with the children of inmate mothers was considered to be anything from referring the children to another agency to actually providing a direct service. Agency personnel were asked to define how their intervention was initiated. Some persons cited more than one source.

The most common means of initiation of agency intervention stemmed from referrals. This finding indicates that agencies communicate with one another. Inmate mothers and children's caretakers were also found to be a source of agency intervention with the children. Only two of the respondents claimed their intervention was self-initiated and three stated that they did not intervene with the children in any way (see Appendix 1.2).

Unless the situation of inmate mother's children is investigated their needs cannot be totally identified and acted upon. Consequently, the children's welfare cannot be guaranteed. Data was obtained from the agencies to determine the frequency of the investigation into the children's situation. Regrettably, the extent of the investigation was not determined (see Appendix 1.3).

Agency investigation regarding the children's situation is not a regular practice among the agencies. A third of the respondents claimed to investigate the situation all of the time. A fifth of the sample stated that they probe the situation about 25% of the time. Nearly one-half of the respondents, 47%, reported that they never investigate the children's situation. This group represents 45% of the criminal justice sample and 50% of the social service sample. The consensus of this group was that investigation into the children's situation was not their responsibility. This dilemma was summed up by one participant who stated,

Everybody seems to assume that everyone else is looking into the children's situation when actually no one really is.

The agencies were asked to cite the extent and frequency of their communication with other agencies regarding the children of defendant/inmate mothers. The extent of communication was primarily limited to information that agencies were seeking about the mother's status or some information about the children for their records. For example, the Juvenile Court, when dealing with inmate's children, may seek information from the Nebraska Center for Women about the mother's expected release date.

The judicial agencies are communicated with more frequently by the other agencies than are the correctional agencies. The order of agencies most frequently communicated with by all the other agencies are as follows:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1) Public Defenders Office | 4) Criminal Court Judges |
| 2) Probation Department | 5) Douglas County Department of Corrections |
| 3) Juvenile Court | 6) Nebraska Center for Women |

The social service agencies that are communicated with most frequently by the other agencies are the Foster Care and Child Protective Services divisions that provided more immediate intervention with children. The other agencies, in order of frequency of communication, are Aid for Dependent Children and Income Maintenance (Appendix 1.4).

Inter-agency coordination of services is not a regular practice. The coordination that does exist is generally between social service agencies and the juvenile court. This coordination stems from an

order directed by the juvenile court to the agency to provide some service for the children. The only other coordination of services was found to occasionally occur between Child Protective Services and Foster Care. Coordination of visiting between children and mothers and Foster Care and the Nebraska Center for Women was rare.

The overall lack of coordinated services indicates that agencies operate as separate entities yet with related goals. Lack of coordinated services also suggests that agencies deal with children and mothers individually rather than as a family unit. One agency representative expounded on the lack of coordination between the agencies:

There is no coordination, consistency or follow up for services for children or mothers. There is too much break down. In fact, you can't even say that one agency picks up where the other left off.

Over half of the total agency participants (60%) stated that their agency had not made any effort to improve communication and coordination of services for the children. Slightly over a third of the criminal justice personnel and half of the social service agency respondents said that they had made such an effort (see Appendix 1.5).

Agency personnel were asked if they perceived the need for a liaison to improve agency communication and coordination of services for children. Even though few have made an effort to improve this, less than half (46%) perceive the need for a liaison to coordinate services for the children (see Appendix 1.6).

No one agency in Douglas County is accountable for intervention with children of inmate mothers. The agency representatives in the

sample were asked to identify where they felt the responsibility for intervention with the children rests. This determination was made by posing two questions to the sample; one relating to public agencies and the other to private agencies.

All of the agency personnel were in agreement that the Douglas County social service agencies have a responsibility for intervention with children of inmate mothers. Some of the respondents felt that the extent of the agencies' intervention should include assistance in placement, providing financial and medical assistance, supervision and counseling, follow up services and regular contact with the inmate mother.

Agency personnel were less inclined to consider criminal justice agencies as having a responsibility for intervention with the children, as indicated by a third of the sample (all criminal justice participants). Agency personnel responding in the affirmative to this question felt that the extent of intervention should encompass identifying and referring the children to helping agencies and increasing opportunities for children to visit with inmate mothers.

Agency personnel were also asked if they perceived intervention with inmate mothers' children as the responsibility of a state public agency. The responses were almost evenly divided, eight said yes, seven said no. The extent of intervention was cited as financial assistance and mother-child programs at the state prison.

Agency personnel tend to consider intervention with the children as the responsibility of public agencies rather than private agencies.

About half of the respondents felt that Urban League and the Big Brothers/Big Sisters Association have a responsibility for intervention with the children. A fourth of the personnel stated that religious organizations such as Catholic Social Services and the Salvation Army should intervene with the children of inmate mothers (Appendix 1.7).

The reader should be aware of some related issues that surfaced during the study. What emerged, apart from the data, was a confirmation that the criminal justice system is a non-system. Each component under study was generally unfamiliar and to some extent unconcerned with the operations of the other components. This is not to say that the individual components were totally oblivious to the function of another component. Rather, each was detached in that they were only cognizant of another component's theoretical function instead of actual practice. As a result, it became easy to pass the buck; or more appropriately, pass the child.

The social service system was also found to operate as a non-system. The inter-agencies of the social service body are in some respects like the criminal justice body. Divisions function as separate entities with uncoordinated, yet related, services and goals. The breakdown in the social service agencies did not appear to be as extensive as in the criminal justice agencies. Possibly, this is attributed to the helping role of social services rather than the investigative and/or punitive role of the criminal justice agencies.

Inmate Mother's Perceptions of Services Received by the
Children and the Children's Unmet Needs

Data was collected from the women on the actual figures of children (N = 63) who had received services from the criminal justice and social service agencies. Including visitation as a service, 87% of the children had received some type of service. Excluding visitation as a service, 57% (N = 36) of the children had received some service from the various agencies (see Appendix 2).

Aid for Dependent Children was the most common service received by the children. Nearly two thirds of the mothers reported that over half of the children were AFDC recipients. Three mothers in jail represented seven of the children; 12 mothers in prison represented 29 of the children. The proportion of children in jail receiving AFDC was greater than the proportion of children whose mothers were in prison, the latter group being separated from their children for a longer period of time. This phenomenon might be affected by the Income Maintenance policy regarding financial assistance and custody of the children.

AFDC was the only service for children cited by mothers in jail. The remaining services were accounted for by inmate mothers in prison.

Foster care services had been provided for 15.8% (N = 10) of the children according to four mothers in prison. This figure was verified with exact data given by the agency.

The Juvenile Court had provided some service for eight children, 12.6% of the total as reported by five mothers.

Three inmate mothers stated that Child Protective Services had provided some service for nine children, 14.2% of the total children.

None of the mothers indicated that Income Maintenance had provided a service for their children. However, the representative from this agency had exact data on the number of children, seven, of inmate mothers that had received some service from this agency.

Visitation, as a service to the children in Foster Care and the correctional agencies, was experienced at least once by 52% of the children, 30 children had not visited with their mother at the time of data collection. Two of these children were residing in foster care homes. Four of the women preferred not to see their children during incarceration, eight children in total. Most mothers cited transportation difficulties as an obstacle to visits at the institution.

The data indicates that half of the children of mothers interviewed were receiving AFDC benefits during the mother's incarceration. This monetary assistance furnishes the children with the necessities, food, clothing and shelter. Few children were receiving services and thereby having their needs met by other agencies. Only 12.5% of the mothers, representing 11% (N = 7) of the children, perceived all of the needs of the children as being met during the separation (see Appendix 2.1).

The children have a wide range of unmet needs. Financial, supervision, and sibling unity were found to be the most paramount, according to mothers. The following table indicates the numbers of children who have particular unmet needs.

Table II
The Percentage of Children Who Have Unmet Needs According to
Inmate Mother's Perceptions

* Total number of minor dependents is 63

Unmet Needs	Children	
	N	%
Financial	28	44
Supervision	28	44
Sibling Unity	22	34.9
Assistance in Placement	19	30
Medical	19	30
Counseling	18	28.5
Academic Assistance	15	23.8
Stability of Living Arrangement	13	20.6

The broad range of children's unmet needs is a concern of imprisoned mothers. Two-thirds of the women stated that they preferred more assistance for their children from the criminal justice and social service agencies (see Appendix 2.2).

Responses to Similar Questions Posed to Agency Personnel and Inmate Mothers

Some similar questions were posed to agency personnel and inmate mothers. The analysis resulted in some definite parallels. The differences might be explained by the bias of the two groups, agencies represent the system's perception of children's problems and mothers represent their perceptions of the children's problems.

Agencies and mothers alike were in fairly close agreement that there needs to be an intake referral service at the jail for the purpose of referring children to the appropriate agencies at the time of the mother's arrest. Of the agency personnel about three-fourths of each sample agreed with this proposal. All but one of the inmate mothers replied in the affirmative to this question (see Appendix 3).

One-fourth of the sampled inmate mothers had been granted time to make arrangements for their children between the time of sentencing and incarceration. All of the inmate mothers interviewed agreed that some time to make arrangements for the children was needed before incarceration. Two-thirds of the agency sample (64% of the criminal justice and 75% of the social service participants) felt that sentenced mothers should be granted time to make arrangements for their children (see Appendix 3.1).

All of the agencies in the sample deal with the children of inmate mothers in some respect, whether it be referring them to another agency, allowing the children to visit with their inmate mother or providing a direct service. In the opinion of agency personnel and inmate mothers the social service agencies are more effective in their dealings with the children than the criminal justice agencies. However, the interviewee's perception of agencies' effectiveness with the children should not be considered overwhelming. Slightly over half (53.4%) of the agency personnel felt that the social service agencies were effectively dealing with the children, 20% said they were not and 26.6% stated that they didn't know. None of the inmate

mothers in jail felt that the social service agencies were dealing effectively with the children, 5% of the mothers in prison were of the opinion that they were.

According to 40% of the agency respondents, criminal justice agencies were effectively dealing with the children; 13.3% said they were not and 46.6% said they didn't know. Not a single inmate mother was of the opinion that criminal justice agencies were effectively dealing with the children (see Appendix 3.2).

Communication and coordination of services for children of inmate mothers between criminal justice and social service agencies is inadequate according to the perceptions of over half (53%) of the agency personnel and nearly all of the incarcerated mothers. Four criminal justice agency personnel and one inmate mother considered the communication and coordination of services to be adequate; others stated that they didn't know (see Appendix 3.3).

Agency personnel and inmate mothers in general did not agree on the need for a central agency to coordinate services for inmate's children. A third of the agency sample agreed that there is a need for a central agency, almost half (46.6%) said there is not and 20% stated that they didn't know. Opposition to a central agency was stated by 45% of the criminal justice respondents and 50% of the social service agency participants. All of the inmate mothers were in agreement that there is a need for a central agency for the children (see Appendix 3.4).

Criminal justice personnel, excluding juvenile court judges, were asked how frequently they solicit input from the defendant/inmate mother when making decisions about her. Juvenile court judges and social service agency participants were asked how frequently they solicit input from the mother when making decisions about the children. The findings indicate that input from the mother regarding her children is not regularly solicited by criminal justice and social service agency personnel when decisions are made about the woman or her children.

When judges do pose questions to the mother about her children, it is most often done at the preliminary hearing or at the time of sentencing. The types of questions judges ask are in relation to the children's location, caretaker and ages. Judges were found to never ask a mother about the children's means of support (see Appendix 3.5).

The reader should be cautioned that a direct comparison between the data gathered from judges and the data drawn from inmate mothers cannot be made because some of the women were adjudicated by judges who chose not to be interviewed. However, the findings do suggest the frequency and extent of input that is derived from the mother regarding her children.

The agency participant from the Public Defender's office claimed that public defenders never solicit input from the mother about her children. This claim is in conflict with what was learned from inmate mothers. Slightly over half (54%) of the inmate mothers interviewed were represented by a public defender. Of these 13 women, 76%

stated that their attorney asked them questions about their children. According to 11 women, represented by private attorneys, 54% of the mothers in this group had been solicited input about their children from their lawyer.

The children of defendant mothers are mentioned to the judge in the woman's defense on a fairly regular basis by public defenders more often than are the children of women represented by private attorneys.

The findings indicate that public defenders tend to give more consideration to the children of defendant mothers than do private attorneys. However, 33% of the inmate mothers stated that their children were never mentioned by their attorney prior to or during their defense (see Appendix 3.6).

A pre-sentence investigation is conducted on convicted defendants by a probation officer. The investigation report is used by the judge in determining the defendant's sentence. The adult probation office reports that input from the mother is solicited all of the time during the pre-sentence investigation. This finding pertains only to inmate mothers in prison (felons). The pre-sentence investigating officer for the municipal court cases, misdemeanants, who would have conducted investigations on women in jail, was not available for interview.

About two-thirds of the inmate mothers in prison reported that the pre-sentence investigating officer asked them questions about their children; 35% said their input was never solicited. Half of the mothers in jail stated that the probation officer doing their

pre-sentence investigation asked them about the children; one was not asked and the other could not recall.

The adult probation office also advised that information about the children is always included in the pre-sentence investigation report that is prepared for the sentencing judge (see Appendix 3.7).

Both the Douglas County Women's Center and the Nebraska Center for Women have programs for inmate mothers. These programs range from classes, discussion groups to visiting with the children in the correctional facility. Input from the mother should be a priority in the design of such programs so that their needs and the needs of their children remain foremost.

The Douglas County Department of Corrections reports that input from the mother is never solicited when mother-child programs are established at the jail. The Nebraska Center for Women claims to always solicit the mother's input. Yet only one-fourth of the women in prison stated that their input was asked for by correctional staff (see Appendix 3.8)

All of the juvenile court judges interviewed stated that they always solicit input from the mother when making decisions about the children. Of the inmate mother sample, 20.8% of the women, all inmates in prison, had contact with the juvenile court regarding their children since their incarceration. Only 2 of these five women stated that their input was solicited by the juvenile court judge when a decision was made about the children (see Appendix 3.9).

Input from the mother should be an influential factor when decisions

are made and services provided for the children. It seems only reasonable that agencies should be concerned with such matters as the mother's future plans for the children after her release, if she is able to provide some financial support for the children during her incarceration, or in the case of foster care what type of home she feels the children would be best suited in during her absence. However, the findings show that social service agencies rarely solicit input from the mother when making decisions for the children.

Only one social service agency, Child Protective Services, claimed to solicit input from the mother all of the time. The office of Aid for Dependent Children reports that input from the mother about the children is solicited most of the time. Foster Care and Income Maintenance agency personnel stated that they never solicit input from the mother about the children.

Three of the inmate mother (12.5% of the women) stated that information about the children was sought from them by one social service agency each. The three agencies that solicited input from an inmate mother were Child Protective Services, Aid for Dependent Children, and Foster Care. None of the mothers had been contacted by the fourth agency, Income Maintenance (see Appendix 3.10).

The final open-ended question posed to agency personnel and inmate mothers, "What needs to be done to provide better services for the children?", resulted in a variety of responses.

The most common suggestions supplied by agency personnel related to better planning for the children.

Four of the criminal justice respondents stated that they didn't know what was needed or what could be done to provide better services for the children. One criminal justice participant stated that he perceived the services for the children to be sufficient at present. The following recommendations were offered by six of the criminal justice agency personnel.

- 1) Planning
 - a) Pre-planning for the children should be done before the mother is incarcerated.
 - b) Family oriented planning, rather than planning for mother and children separately, should be done so that breakdown of the family unit is avoided.
 - c) Pre-release planning needs to be done more extensively so that when mother and children are reunited, the adjustment is not too complex and services are continued as needed.
- 2) Consistency in the services provided for the children. All services should be followed up.
- 3) Better coordination among the agencies of services for children.
- 4) Better communication among the agencies.
- 5) Establish a crisis center for inmate mothers' children and their caretakers.
- 6) Replace the Nebraska Center for Women with small community correctional centers in the eastern, middle and western regions of the state so that children have a better opportunity to see their mothers and mothers can maintain closer ties with their family and helping agencies.

Social service agency personnel provided the following suggestions:

- 1) Planning
 - a) Pre-planning for the children should be done more effectively before the mother is incarcerated.
 - b) Interim planning should be done for the children as the mother goes through each stage in the criminal justice process.
- 2) A pamphlet should be written and distributed to the mothers and the caretakers explaining the services available for the children.

- 3) Better relations between the social service agencies and the mothers should be established so that mothers will be more receptive of the agencies and not consider them a threat to the custody of their children.
- 4) An intake referral service at the jail which would question newly arrested mothers and ascertain which children needed services. This service should do a follow up on all referrals made on the children.
- 5) Better coordination of services among the agencies.

Recommendations by inmate mothers stress the need for strengthening family relationships. Transportation for the children to the prison for visits was the most frequent recommendation by mothers at the Nebraska Center for Women. Mothers in jail most often suggested that the number and length of phone calls with children be extended.

Mothers in prison gave the following recommendations concerning their children:

- 1) Transportation for children to the prison.
 - a) Volunteers should be requested to transport inmate mothers' children to the prison.
 - b) The Foster Care agency should take the responsibility for transporting children to the prison.
 - c) Agencies should allocate funds to pay children's transportation to the prison.
- 2) Increased Contact Between Mother and Children
 - a) Visiting time between mothers and children should be expanded.
 - b) More privacy with the children during institutional visits.
 - c) No age restriction for overnight institutional visits with male children.
- 3) Planning
 - a) Pre-planning for the children before the mother is incarcerated.
 - b) Family oriented planning.
- 4) More judicial concern for the welfare of the children. Judges should also consider the mother's motivation for the crime -- if she stole to provide for her children.
- 5) More overall agency concern for the welfare of the children.

- 6) Better communication between social service agencies and mothers. Written communication from agencies to mothers when services are provided or terminated.
- 7) More maternal input regarding decisions that are made for the children by agencies.
- 8) More contact between mothers and foster parents and the foster care caseworker.
- 9) More effort by the prison staff to help mothers strengthen family ties.
- 10) More assistance in child placement when the mother is arrested.
- 11) More phone calls and visits with the children while the mother is in the county jail.
- 12) Sibling unity -- a greater effort by all the involved agencies in keeping siblings together.

Inmate mothers at the Douglas County Women's Center made the following suggestions:

- 1) Increased contact between mothers and children.
 - a) Mothers need to talk over the telephone with their children daily rather than the three ten minute phone calls that are granted weekly.
 - b) More opportunities for visiting with children rather than the weekly two hour visitation period.
- 2) Planning
 - a) Time for mothers to make arrangements for their children before incarceration.
 - b) Judges should be required to have a written plan for the children before sending a mother to jail.
- 3) Lawyers should not mislead defendants into believing that they will get probation rather than a jail sentence.

Inmate Mothers and Their Children

The data provides the following demographic profile of inmate mothers. The average respondent was between 21 and 28 years of age, Black, unmarried, a high school graduate and the mother of three

children under the age of eight. Prior to incarceration, she was the head of the household, unemployed and had all of her children living with her. Her criminal conviction stemmed from a property offense and she was serving approximately a two year sentence (see Appendix 4).

The age distribution of the sample ranged from 21 to 37 years. The majority, 66.6%, fell between the 21 to 28 year age bracket.

Black women constituted 79% of the sample, followed by 16.7% Whites and one Mexican-American.

Most inmate mothers (79.2%) were unmarried. Over half had been married at one time; one-third were separated or divorced.

All of the sample had achieved some level of education above grade school. Half of the sample had completed high school and 12% had completed some college.

Over half of the sample of inmate mothers claimed their occupation, prior to incarceration, to be homemakers. Employment history among the remaining half of the sample ranged from accountant to factory worker.

The majority of women reported that they were the head of the household prior to incarceration. Nearly one-third of the sample shared this responsibility with either a spouse or a relative in an extended family living situation.

The sample of inmate mothers may be considered non-violent offenders. Over three-fourths of the sample were convicted for property crimes. Two women were convicted for a drug offense and two for a violent crime.

Sentences among the inmate mothers ranged from five days (jail inmate) to a maximum indeterminate sentence of 15 years. Jail inmates were serving an average sentence of 13 days. Most inmate mothers in prison were serving a term between one and three years.

One-fourth of the sample stated that they were unable to post bond after arrest. These women stated that their inability to make bond created problems of care for their children. Nearly one-half of the inmate mothers were able to post bond and close to one-third of the sample were released on their own recognizance.

An unexpected finding regarding the ability to post bail was that the group that was unable to post bond had a much lower average of bond set, \$5,583. as compared to the group that posted bond which had an average of \$14,954. per woman.

Very few of the inmate mothers were serving a sentence for their first arrest. Frequency of prior arrests ranged from one to eight among 87% of the sample. One prior arrest was cited by 12.5% of the women, 37.4% of the mothers had been arrested two to four times previously and 37.5% had been arrested five or more times before.

Half of the sample responded that they had served time at the county level prior to the current incarceration. Slightly over 40% had previously served time in a state institution. These figures indicate that half of the inmate mothers had been separated from their children, due to incarceration, probably one time before this conviction.

In addition to the data that was obtained from the sample, it was also found that inmate mothers are not fully aware of their parental

rights. Many mothers expressed the misconception that incarceration takes away their rights as parents. One obviously distraught mother relayed her fear of losing custody of her children. She was scheduled for a custody hearing in the juvenile court the day following the interview and felt sure that the children would be permanently taken away because she was incarcerated. However, Nebraska statutes do not specify incarceration as a sufficient reason to deny parental custody or parental rights.

The misconception among inmate mothers that incarceration negates their parental rights seems to foster an attitude of helplessness among the women. This problem is compounded by the fact that agencies do not consult inmate mothers when making decisions regarding services for the children.

The children of inmate mothers typically are young, move once during the maternal separation, have irregular contact with the mother and have a wide range of unmet needs.

The twenty-four inmate mothers reported having a total of 63 children under the age of 18. Two-thirds of the children were age eight and under; age distribution ranged from infancy to 17. The findings indicate that a large percentage of children had been separated from their mothers, due to maternal incarceration, during the formative years when a relationship and identity with the mother may be crucial to their development (see Appendix 4.1).

At the time of the arrest, most children were living with the mother. A few of the children were living with the mother in an extend-

ed family living situation. Following the arrest and/or incarceration of the mother, most children experienced one move, often it was to the home of a relative.

Table III
Children's Living Arrangements
Prior to Mother's Arrest Children Living With:

	N	%
Mother	44	69.8
Grandparents	4	6.3
Father	2	3.2
Other Relatives	3	4.8
Foster Care	2	3.2
Extended Family	8	12.6
	63	99.9%

Children's Living Arrangements Since the Mother's Incarceration:

Residing with:	N	%
Grandparents	36	57.1
Father	7	11.1
Other Relatives	6	9.5
Friends of Mother	2	3.2
Foster Care	10	15.8
Other (Omaha Home for Boys)	2	3.2
	63	99.9%

Table IV
Number of Moves Since Mother's Arrest or Incarceration:

	N	%
No Moves	19	30.1
One Move	37	58.7
Two Moves	4	6.3
Three Moves	3	4.8
	63	99.9%

Most mothers considered the current living situation satisfactory. One such mother expressed her feelings, "I'd say the arrangement is satisfactory because it is better than having her in a foster home, but even though she is living with my sister, she is not a part of the family and she knows it."

Dissatisfaction with the children's living arrangement was expressed by mothers whose children were separated among two or more households; 16.7% of the women preferred their children to be relocated. Four mothers reported to have children in foster care homes; one mother was satisfied with that arrangement. The common complaint among the mothers of children in foster care was lack of communication with the children, the foster parents and the agency caseworker. One mother was particularly concerned over her inability to keep abreast of her children's progress and development while in foster care, complaining that agency reports were too vague. The mother was surprised to learn from the interviewer that she could maintain regular communication with the foster parents by mail via the caseworker. No one had advised her of a means of obtaining current information about the children.

The entire sample of inmate mothers intended to re-establish a home with their children after the release from jail or prison. The majority of women planned to reunite with the children immediately after release, 16% anticipated the reunion after some period of readjustment in the community.

The extent of visitation between mothers and children ranged from once a week to none at all. Less than half of the mothers saw their children at least once a month; 37.5% had no visits with offspring at the time of data collection. Mothers in prison, as compared to mothers in jail, had significantly more visits with their children.

Table V
Frequency of Mother-Offspring Visits Within the Correctional Facility

Frequency		Mother's Responses			
		N	%	Total N	Total %
Once a Week	NCW	1	5	2	8.3
	DCWC	1	25		
Twice a Month	NCW	3	15	3	12.5
	DCWC	0			
Three Times a Month	NCW	1	5	1	4.1
	DCWC	0			
Once a Month	NCW	4	20	4	16.7
	DCWC				
Once Every Three Months	NCW	4	20	4	16.7
	DCWC	0			
Twice a Year	NCW	1	5	1	4.1
Not at All	NCW	6	30	9	37.5
	DCWC	3	75		

* NCW -- Nebraska Center for Women
DCWC -- Douglas County Women's Center

The comparable extent of visitation is accounted for in the explanation given to the children for their mother's absence. Half of the jail inmate sample reported that they told their children they were out of town; 5% of the prison sample used this explanation. Hospitalization, as an excuse for absence, was given to the children of one jailed mother. Therefore, 75% of the jail sample were unable to see their offspring due to a deceiving explanation for the separation (see Appendix 4.2).

Most mothers in prison (95%) expressed a greater need for additional contact with their children, as compared to 50% of the mothers in jail. The majority of mothers in prison cited transportation difficulties as an obstacle to frequent offspring visitation. At one time, the Nebraska Center for Women transported inmate mothers to their original community for home visits with the family. A common practice for the home visits was to bring the individual mother's children or other women's children back to the institution for overnight visits. A few months prior to data collection this practice was discontinued due to the institution's limited travel budget. Several inmate mothers stated that since this means of transportation was curtailed, their offspring visits had been drastically reduced. Many mothers complained that Urban League and county social service agencies were no longer transporting children to the Center as they had done over a period of years.

Prison mothers, in general, expressed the importance of offspring visitation in order to maintain an ongoing relationship. The children were typically young so mail and telephone communication was in-

effective in strengthening family ties. However, not every mother in prison encouraged frequent visits with offspring. One mother explained, "It hurts me too much when she leaves, she clings to me and cries. It is best if she doesn't visit."

The effect of maternal incarceration on the children vary and is dependent upon numerous factors. This study explores the effect only in terms of the mothers' perceptions. Inmate mothers were asked whether or not they considered their incarceration as having a damaging effect on the children, either very much, somewhat or not at all. Over half of the sample indicated very much, less than a third said somewhat and less than a fifth stated not at all.

Several of the mothers perceived their children as experiencing additional problems as a result of the maternal incarceration. Two-thirds of the women felt that their children had undergone problems of adjustment. Almost half of the inmates stated that their children had exhibited additional behavior problems since the mother-child separation. Negative pressure from peers and medical problems among the children were not considered extensive according to the women.

The accuracy of the mothers' perceptions is difficult to determine. One mother explained her entanglement in assessing her child's welfare. She said,

You just keep on telling everyone that things are cool with your kid because you're afraid somebody going to find out different and snatch 'em away. Pretty soon you start believing that everything is OK, because if you didn't you'd lose your mind for sure.

The line of questioning regarding the effects of incarceration on the children aroused emotional display among many respondents. Most mothers avoided eye contact with the interviewer when approached on the subject; many cried. One tearful mother spoke of herself and her daughter,

I feel really bad for putting her through all of this.
She has become so withdrawn. She's only four years old
but it has affected her a lot.

Table VI
Inmate Mother Perceptions of the Effect of Maternal Incarceration on the Children

Damaging Effects of the Incarceration

		N	%	Total N	Total %
Very Much	NCW	11	55	13	54.1
	DCWC	2	50		
Somewhat	NCW	7	35	7	29.1
	DCWC	0			
Not at All	NCW	2	10	4	16.7
	DCWC	2	50		
				24	99.9%

Table VII
Inmate Mother Perceptions of Children's Problems Since the Mother's Incarceration

		N	%	Total N	Total %
Adjustment Problems	NCW	14	70	15	62.5
	DCWC	1			
Behavior Problems	NCW	10	50	10	41.6
	DCWC	0			
Negative Peer Pressure	NCW	4	20	4	16.6
	DCWC	0			
Medical Problems	NCW	3	15	3	12.5
	DCWC	0			

To ascertain a priority of services for children of inmate mothers the sample was asked to identify specific needs of their offspring. Inmate mothers were presented a list of possible needs from which they were asked to respond yes or no. Over half of the sample stated that their children had financial needs. Many women commented that caretakers, particularly relatives, had undergone financial strain supporting the children. Yet, the majority of caretakers, 62.5%, were receiving AFDC benefits for the children, according to the women.

Supervision was the second most essential category of unmet needs identified by the sample. This category was defined as appropriate day care, evaluations and overall guidance. Many mothers felt that their children were in need of supervision in addition to that given by the caretakers. Some mothers stated that caretakers were elderly and did not provide the stimulation and guidance their children required.

The third category of unmet needs most frequently identified by mothers was counseling. Many women commented that their children needed someone, other than themselves, to talk over the problems of the separation.

The fourth priority of unmet needs according to a third of the mothers was medical attention. Some of these mothers stated that their offspring had not had a physical examination or immunizations since the mother's incarceration.

Sibling unity and academic assistance were equally cited as unmet needs by over a fourth of the inmate sample. A fourth of the mothers felt that their offspring needed some assistance in placement during

the maternal absence. A fifth of the women stated that the children's living arrangement needed to be stabilized (see Table IX).

Comparison of Inmate Mother Responses
According to Length of Sentence

Two comparisons of mothers' responses were made according to the length of sentence the women were serving. One is the comparison between inmates in jail and prison. The second comparison is where the length of sentence is more narrowly divided. In this comparison, the women were grouped into jail inmates and inmates in prison serving light, moderate and heavy sentences. The following table explains the group comparisons and the numbers of children represented by mothers in each category.

Table VIII
Numbers of Inmate Mothers According to Category of Sentences and
the Numbers of Children Represented

<u>Jail Sentence</u>	N	<u>Low Sentence</u>	N	<u>Moderate Sentence</u>	N	<u>Heavy Sentence</u>	N
5 Days	1	1 Year	3	1-3 Years	3	3-5 Years	1
10 Days	2	18 months	1	1-5 Years	1	3½-8 Years	1
30 Days	1			2 Years	1	4-6 Years	1
				2-3 Years	1	4½-9½ Years	1
				2-4 Years	3	5, 5 CC	1
						5-10 Years	1
						3-15, 7CC	1
Total	4		4		9		7
% of Jail Sample	100%	% of Prison Sample	20%	% of Prison Sample	45%	% of Prison Sample	35%
Children	100% (9)	Children	24% (13)	Children	38.8% (21)	Children	37% (20)
% of Total Inmate Mothers							
N = 24	16.6%		16.6%		37.5%		29.1%
% of Total Children							
N = 63	14.2%		20.6%		33.3%		31.7%

All of the jailed mothers were living with all of their offspring prior to incarceration as compared to about two-thirds of the prison mothers who had been residing with all of their children.

The living arrangements of mothers serving low and moderate sentences were approximate; three-fourths lived with all of the children and about 25% lived with some of the children. Mothers serving

heavy sentences lived with their offspring less frequently than other women, 42.8% lived with all of them as had 42.8% lived with some of them. One mother serving a heavy sentence did not live with her child at all before imprisonment (see Appendix 5).

The findings indicate that the women serving more lengthy sentences were less likely to live with their offspring before incarceration.

Children of inmate mothers in jail are moved as a result of the mothers' incarceration, to nearly the same extent as children of prison mothers. Three-fourths of the jailed mothers reported that their children were moved one time as did 70% of the prison mothers.

Most children of inmate mothers moved one time during the mother's absence. One mother serving a moderate sentence and one mother serving a heavy sentence reported that their dependents had moved several times (see Appendix 5.1).

All inmate mothers planned to reunite with their children after release. A few prison mothers (four) planned to reunite with their offspring after some period of adjustment in the community. All others planned the reunion immediately upon termination of incarceration.

Over half (57.1%) of mothers serving heavy sentences planned to reunite with the children after some period of adjustment; all else planned the reunion immediately after release.

Children of inmates in jail visit with their mother less often than children whose mothers are in prison. This phenomenon might be expected to be the reverse. However, visits by children of jailed mothers were less frequent because 50% of the mothers chose not to

see the children during the incarceration. These mothers felt that their whereabouts could be concealed from the children since their absence was short term. One of the mothers was unable to see her offspring because the children's caretaker had told them their mother was hospitalized.

The frequency order of mothers who had regular visits with the children were those women serving low sentences (50%), then those serving moderate terms (33.3%) and jailed mothers (25%). Most mothers serving heavy sentences (71.4%) had only occasional visits with the children as did 33.3% of the mothers serving moderate and 25% of the women serving low sentences. Mothers having no visits with the children were most frequently jailed mothers (75%), then mothers serving moderate sentences (33.3%). Mothers serving low sentences (25%) and those serving heavy terms (28.5) had no visits with the children at the time of data collection (see Appendix 5.2).

Although prison mothers had more visits with children than those women in jail, the prison mothers (95%) preferred more contact with the children than did half of the jail mothers.

All of the mothers serving low and moderate terms wanted more contact with the children. Mothers serving heavy sentences and jailed mothers were less inclined; 85.7% of the women under heavy sentences and half of the jailed mothers preferred more contact with the children (see Appendix 5.3).

All of the jailed mothers wanted their children to remain in the present location while a fifth of the inmate mothers in prison preferred

that their children be relocated.

Mothers in jail and mothers serving low sentences did not want their children relocated as compared to a third of the mothers serving moderate sentences and 14.2% of the women with heavy sentences who did. Mothers with longer sentences appear to be less satisfied with the children's living arrangements (see Appendix 5.3).

A fourth of the jailed mothers preferred more contact with the children's caretaker. On the other hand, most prison mothers (85%) wanted more contact with the person in charge of the children.

All of the mothers serving moderate sentences preferred more contact with the children's caretaker as did three-fourths of the mothers serving low terms. Nearly three-fourths (71.4%) of the women serving heavy sentences and a fourth of the women in jail expressed the same desire (see Appendix 5.3).

Half of the mothers in jail felt that they should have more input on decisions made for the children by social service and criminal justice agencies as compared to 70% of prison mothers who wanted more input.

More mothers serving moderate sentences (88%) and low sentences (75%) preferred more input about decisions made for the children than did jail mothers (50%) and women with heavy sentences (42.8%) (see Appendix 5.3).

Mothers in prison perceive their children as encountering a greater extent of problems than mothers in jail.

The only particular problem of the children of jailed mothers

was adjustment as indicated by one mother in that sample. Women serving moderate and heavy sentences perceived their children as experiencing adjustment and behavior problems more than did mothers serving low sentences. A few of the mothers serving moderate and heavy sentences considered their children to undergo medical problems and negative pressure from peers as a result of their incarceration (see Appendix 5.4).

Children of prison mothers were receiving a wider range of services than children of mothers in jail. The only service received by jail mother's children was AFDC. However, more children, proportionately, of jailed mothers were receiving this benefit as compared to dependents of mothers in prison.

The range of services, although not necessarily as frequent, was broader for children of mothers serving heavy sentences, then those of mothers with moderate terms, then low sentences and finally jailed mothers.

All of the mothers with low sentences and three-fourths of the jailed mothers said that AFDC was being provided for the children. AFDC was being received less frequently by children whose mothers were sentenced for longer terms. Two-thirds of the women under moderate sentences and 28.5% of the mothers serving heavy sentences reported that their children were receiving this type of aid.

Foster care services for the children was cited by women serving the longer sentences. Three (42.8%) of the women with heavy sentences and one with a moderate sentence had children in foster care.

Child Protective Services had been provided for children whose mothers were serving heavy and low sentences according to at least a fourth of the mothers in each group; a total of 12.5% of all inmate mothers.

A third of the mothers serving moderate sentences and 28.5% of the women with heavy sentences were the only ones to report that their children had received some service from the Juvenile Court; 20.8% of the total inmate mother sample.

None of the mothers indicated that the Income Maintenance agency had intervened with the children (see Appendix 5.5).

The range of unmet needs of the children of jailed mothers was nearly as wide as the needs of prison mothers' children. The only need not identified by jailed mothers was counseling. However, the frequency of unmet needs indicated by mothers in jail was not as great as the frequency of needs for children of prison mothers.

Table IX
Children's Unmet Needs Comparing Perceptions of Mothers in Jail and Prison

<u>Jailed Mothers</u>	<u>Prison Mothers</u>	
Assistance with placement	Financial	(60% of mothers)
Sibling Unity	Supervision	(55% of mothers)
Stability of living arrangement	Counseling	(45% of mothers)
Academic assistance	Medical	(35% of mothers)
	Assistance, Sibling	
	Unity	
(Above cited by 50% of mothers)	Academic	(25% of mothers)
	Assistance	
	Assistance with	(20% of mothers)
	placement	
Financial	Stability of	(15% of mothers)
Supervision	living arrangement	
(Above cited by 25% of mothers)		

Overall mothers serving moderate sentences followed by women serving heavy terms, cited more needs of the children that were unmet than mothers serving jail terms and low sentences. The range of needs of children of jailed mothers was greater than the range of unmet needs cited by women serving low terms.

Table X

Children's Unmet Needs Comparing Perceptions of Mothers According to Category of Sentences

Jailed Mothers		Low Sentences		Moderate Sentences		Heavy Sentences	
Need % of Inmates	50%	Need % of Inmates	100%	Need % of Inmates	66.6%	Need % of Inmates	57.1%
Placement	50%	Financial	100%	Financial	66.6%	Supervision	57.1%
Sibling Unity	50%	Medical	75%	Counseling	66.6%	Sibling Unity	42.8%
Stability of Living Arrangement	50%	Supervision	50%	Supervision	55.5%	Financial	28.5%
				Academic	33.3%	Placement	28.5%
Academic Asst.	50%			Medical	33.3%	Counseling	28.5%
Financial	25%			Sibling Unity	22.2%	Academic	28.5%
Supervision	25%			Placement	11.1%	Stability of Living Arrangement	28.5%
				Stability of Living Arrangement	11.1%	Medical	14.2%

All of the mothers in jail and 95% of the prison mothers perceived criminal justice and social service agency communication and coordination of services as inadequate.

One mother serving a moderate sentence perceived communication and coordination of services as adequate as compared to all other mothers who said it was inadequate.

Mothers in prison preferred more assistance for their children from the criminal justice and social service agencies than did jailed mothers.

Mothers preferring more assistance from the agencies were those who were serving moderate and low sentences respectively. Women serving heavy sentences followed by mothers in jail indicated less of a preference for assistance than other mothers (see Appendix 5.6).

Mothers in jail and prison were in overall agreement that the criminal justice and social service agencies were not effectively dealing with the children.

One mother who was serving a moderate sentence felt that the social service agencies were effectively dealing with the children.

The overall responses of mothers in jail suggest that the problems besetting their children were not as critical as the problems besetting the prison mothers' children. Mothers serving moderate sentences gave the greatest indication that their children's welfare was at risk.

The responses of jailed mothers were more similar with women serving low sentences as were the resemblances of responses between mothers serving moderate and heavy sentences in questions that related

to the number of moves the children had made, the problems that the children experienced, the need for relocation of the children, the range of services provided for the children and the range of unmet needs of their offspring.

Interestingly, the group of women serving moderate sentences indicated at several points that the situation of their children was more critical than mothers serving heavy sentences. These women were living with their children, prior to incarceration, more often than were women serving heavy terms. Probably the former group was more familiar with their offsprings' needs and problems. The only universal characteristic about all of the inmate mothers is that they planned to reunite with their children.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The purpose of the research, in brief, was to describe what is being done at present for inmate mothers' children residing in Douglas County, Nebraska and to determine what needs to be done further.

Summary

The following summary is in accordance with the findings established.

Nebraska Statutes on Children and Youth

There is no specific state law pertaining to the welfare of inmates' dependents. Children of inmates, without the support of the responsible parent, fall into the classification of dependency. The dependency of many inmate mothers' children goes unreported because there is no formal mechanism of identifying and referring this group of persons to appropriate agencies.

Inmate Mothers and Their Children

The sample of inmate mothers were typically non-violent offenders; conviction was most often the result of a property crime. The 24 women interviewed had a total of 63 children. All of the inmate mothers planned to eventually reunite with their children after their incarceration was terminated.

The children of inmate mothers were very young. The children generally moved one time as a result of the mother's incarceration. Children did not visit with their mother on a regular basis. About

half of the children had not seen their mother since her imprisonment.

Agencies' Policies and Services

A total of ten agencies, six criminal justice and four social service, were chosen for investigation. According to the agency personnel, about half of the women processed through the criminal justice system have minor dependents. At most, one-fifth of the clientele receiving services from the social service agencies and the juvenile court are children of inmate mothers.

Two of the agencies, the Nebraska Center for Women and Income Maintenance in the Department of Welfare, maintain a written policy in relation to the children. The prison policy defines special visiting opportunities to improve mother-child relationships. The social service agency policy states the guidelines for distribution of assistance to inmates' dependents.

The primary service for inmate mothers' children is referral from one agency to another. Five agencies, Juvenile Court, Aid for Dependent Children, Foster Care, Child Protective Services and Income Maintenance, reported that they provide some direct service that might be received by inmate mothers' offspring. With the exception of overnight visits with children at the women's prison, services for the children are the regular function of specialized agencies. No unique services are available for children of inmate mothers.

Services Received by the Children

The most common service received by the children, according to inmate mothers, was Aid for Dependent Children. Children of mothers in prison had been afforded a wider range of services than children of mothers in jail. Few of the children had received services from any other agency.

Children's Unmet Needs

Nearly all of the mothers felt that their children had some unmet needs during the separation. A wider range of unmet needs was perceived by mothers in the state correctional facility as compared to mothers in jail. At least half of the mothers cited financial assistance and supervision as children's unmet needs. Over a third of the mothers felt that their dependents needed counseling. Other needs, in order of frequency of identification by mothers, were medical assistance, academic assistance and sibling unity, assistance with placement and stability of the living arrangement.

Recommendations by Agency Personnel and Inmate Mothers to Enhance Services for the Children

The most common recommendation offered by agency personnel to enhance services for the children of inmate mothers was improved planning. Other recommendations made by agency participants were to improve communication and coordination of services. Agency participants also suggested better coordination of service and improved communication about the children among the agencies. It was also recommended that a crisis center be established for children of inmate mothers and their caretakers; the women's prison should be replaced

with community treatment centers and a pamphlet describing the available services of the agencies should be distributed to inmate mothers.

The typical recommendations provided by inmate mothers focused on increased contact with the children. Transportation services for the children to increase visitation was the most frequent suggestion made by the women. Increased communication with agency caseworkers was also recommended. Inmate mothers felt that more input on their part regarding agency decisions for the children would improve services. Many women recommended that more careful planning for the children throughout the mother's criminal processing and incarceration would improve the children's situation.

Other Related Findings

The following outline is a summary of several other findings that emerged from the research.

- 1) Initiation of services for the children is generally the result of a referral from one agency to another, the mother or the children's caretaker. Agency services are rarely self-initiated.
- 2) Agency investigation into the situation of inmate mother's children is not a regular practice among the agencies.
- 3) The mother's input regarding the children is rarely solicited by the agencies.
- 4) Communication and coordination of services for the children between the agencies is inadequate.
- 5) Communication between the agencies regarding the children is generally in relation to informational data sought for agency records.

- 6) Less than half of the agency personnel had made an attempt to improve communication with other agencies regarding the children.
- 7) Slightly over half of the agency respondents perceived a need for an inter-agency liaison to improve communication and coordination of services for the children of inmate mothers.
- 8) There is a need for an intake referral service at the police detention facility for the purpose of referring children to appropriate agencies at the time of the mother's arrest.
- 9) Some time should be granted to mothers between sentencing and incarceration for them to make arrangements for their children.
- 10) The need for a central agency to coordinate services for inmates' children was found to be essential by inmate mothers. Agency personnel were less inclined to perceive such a need.
- 11) Social service agencies are considered to deal somewhat more effectively with inmate mothers' children as compared to criminal justice agencies.
- 12) All agency respondents perceived the county social service agencies as having a responsibility for intervention with the children of inmate mothers; most felt that the criminal justice agencies also had a responsibility to become involved. Personnel were less inclined to consider intervention with the children the responsibility of a state public agency or private community agencies.

Conclusion

The results of this research indicate that children of incarcerated women have special problems. The risk for their future adjustment

is apparent when a few of the findings are considered -- the children's separation from the head of household mother is forced; children are uprooted from their home to another; they do not have regular contact with the mother and they have a wide range of unmet needs. The only beneficial aspect of the children's situation is that most are residing with relatives rather than unfamiliar guardians. However, residence with extended family members does not ensure the children's well being. Children living with kin have a variety of unmet needs according to the perceptions of inmate mothers.

There are no state statutes pertaining to the well being of inmates' dependents. No public agency undertakes responsibility for the children. There is considerable need for intervention with the children of inmate mothers in Douglas County; at every stage in the mother's criminal processing and incarceration.

Public agencies have a responsibility for contributing to the welfare of inmates' dependents. The criminal justice and social service agencies in Douglas County have neglected the welfare of inmate mothers' children. The disregard is not considered intentional, but rather circumstantial. The children's plight is not the focal concern of these specialized agencies. Until agencies are made aware of the children's needs and held accountable for their welfare, the disregard will not diminish.

There is no simple solution to resolve the hardships that children of inmate mothers encounter. Likewise, a multitude of programs and services can never totally guarantee the well being of these children.

There are too many individual factors that cannot be controlled. However, innovation and intervention may enhance their welfare.

Recommendations

The following recommendations have been formulated in relation to the findings of this research.

1) A state statute should be enacted pertaining to the welfare of inmates' dependents. The law should:

a) define responsibilities of criminal justice and social service agencies for intervention with the children.

b) mandate accountability by requiring agencies to maintain policies and guidelines for intervention as well as coordination of services.

2) Public agencies should be made aware of the potential adverse affects for children and parents, as a result of parental incarceration, which has been established by empirical research.

3) An emergency intervention service should be maintained at detention facilities to identify and provide for the particular needs of arrested parent's children.

4) Defendant parents should be given a pamphlet or handbook outlining parental rights and all of the community resource agencies.

5) Detention facilities should allow inmate mothers additional phone calls so that mothers can make temporary arrangements for their children.

6) Criminal justice and social service agencies should be encouraged to solicit input from the mother regarding her children. Personnel should be conscientious about the children's living conditions, care-

taker and means of support.

- 7) Agency personnel should make an effort to interview children so that their needs and problems are more adequately assessed.
- 8) Criminal justice and social service agencies should actively make efforts to improve communication about the children and effectively coordinate services.
- 9) Agencies should establish more extensive services to meet the needs of children of inmate mothers.
- 10) Consideration should be given toward the creation of a central agency which would initiate, coordinate and evaluate services for dependents of inmates.
- 11) Mothers who do not pose a high risk of absconding should be granted some period of time between sentencing and incarceration to make arrangements for the children.
- 12) Correctional agencies should expand opportunities for mother-child contact. The jail should extend visiting hours and days for inmate mothers and should permit the mothers to have regular telephone communication with their children. Transportation services should be provided for children to the Nebraska Center for Women by agencies and/or volunteers.
- 13) Considering the potentially damaging effects of incarceration for children, non-violent defendant mothers should be diverted from the criminal justice process or given an alternative sentence.

Implications for Further Research

This study has presented some of the issues surrounding the children of incarcerated women. There are other issues that require investigation.

First, it is essential that more evidence be established regarding the damaging effects experienced by children as a result of the mother's criminal processing and incarceration. This issue should be a priority of research design because until we are reasonably sure of the various adverse affects appropriate measures cannot be taken to prevent or minimize the occurrence.

Second, the unmet needs of the children should be explicitly discerned. This determination should flow somewhat from the findings of the first issue. To define the adverse affects would indicate some of the children's unmet needs.

Third, specific services for the children should be carefully planned. Measurement of the effect of the services should be built into program design. Justification for services should be the result of the findings that emerge from the first two issues.

Comprehensive research must include data from every possible resource. When it is possible children should be interviewed. Significant persons to the children, parents, relatives, teachers, should be questioned.

The children of inmate mothers has been the focus of this research. The children of imprisoned fathers, separated from their supportive parent, should also be acknowledged. It is appropriate in the best

interest of all inmates' offspring and in this, the Year of the Child, that further research to enhance the children's welfare be encouraged.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Freda. Sisters in Crime. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975: 13-29.
- Burkart, Katherine W. Women in Prison. New York: Doubleday, 1973: 45-53, 260-264, 425-438.
- Buckles, Diane and LaFazia, Mary. "Child Care for Mothers in Prison." Social Work Practice and Social Justice, edited by Bernard Ross and Charles Chireman. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1973: 43-50.
- Daehlin, Diane and Hynes, Jane. "A Mothers' Discussion Group in a Women's Prison." Child Welfare. Vol. LIII, 1974: 464-470.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. U. S. Department of Justice. Uniform Crime Reports for the United States, 1975. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1975.
- Gibson, Helen. "Women's Prisons: Laboratories for Penal Reform." The Female Offender, edited by Laura Crites. Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1976: 86-92.
- Goldstein, Joseph, Freud, Anna and Solnit, Alfrid. Beyond the Best Interests of the Child. New York: Free Press, 1973: 32-33.
- Glick, Ruth. National Study of Women's Correctional Programs. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1977: 17-25.
- Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. Crisis in Child Mental Health: Callenges for the 1970's. New York: Harper and Row, 1969: 316.
- Klein, Dorrie and Kress, June. "Any Woman's Blues: A Critical Overview of Women, Crime and the Criminal Justice System." Crime and Social Justice, no. 5, Spring/Summer, 1976: 34-49.
- LaPoint, Velma. "Mothers Inside, Children Outside: Some Issues Surrounding Imprisoned Mothers and Their Children." American Correctional Association, Annual Meeting, 1977. Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1977: 274-284.
- McGowan, Brenda and Blumenthal, Karen. Why Punish the Children? New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1978: 2-23, 32, 72-95.
- "Motherhood for Inmates Getting Trial," Omaha World-Herald, April 26, 1979: 8.

- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.
Corrections. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office,
1973.
- Nebraska Committee for Children and Youth. A Compendium of Laws
Concerning Children and Youth. Lincoln, Nebraska: Nebraska
Committee for Children and Youth, 1977: 216-217, 219, 221, 279.
- Potter, Joan. "In Prison, Women are Different." Corrections Magazine,
Vol. IV, no. 4, December, 1978: 14-24.
- Rock, Shirley. "An Introduction to the Female Offender." Woman Offender.
Lincoln, Nebraska: Contact Inc., 1977: 9-15.
- Rutter, Michael. Maternal Deprivation Reassessed. Baltimore: Penquin,
1972: 64-78.
- Sack, William, M.D., Seidler, Jack and Thomas, Susan. "The Children of
Imprisoned Parents." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 46,
no. 4, October, 1976: 618-628.
- Senna, Joseph J. and Siegel, Larry J. Introduction to Criminal Justice.
St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1978: 392-393.
- Simon, Rita James. The Contemporary Woman and Crime. Monograph Series,
Crime and Delinquency Issues, National Institute of Mental Health,
Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C., 1975: 34-48, 64-69,
84-88.
- Temin, Carolyn. "Discriminatory Sentencing of Women Offenders: The
Argument for ERA in a Nutshell." American Criminal Law Review,
Vol. II, no. 2, Winter, 1973: 358-372.
- Zalba, Serapio. Women Prisoners and Their Families. State of California:
Department of Welfare and Department of Corrections, 1964: 6-30,
45-103.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW-AGENCIES

Agency:

Date:

1. Criminal Justice Agencies: What percentage of all of your criminal cases involve women with children?

1%-20% 20%-40% 40%-60% 60%-80% 80% and above

2. Social Service Agencies: What percentage of your cases involve children of inmate mothers?

1%-20% 20%-40% 40%-60% 60%-80% 80% and above

3. Does your agency maintain written policy guidelines regarding the welfare of prisoners' children? Yes No

3A. If yes, what is the policy? (Attach to separate page)

3B. If no, is there an informal policy? Yes No

3C. What is the informal policy?

4. At what point in the mother's criminal process does your agency generally become aware of the dependent children?

Arrest	Bond Setting	Preliminary Hearing	Jail Detention
Arraignment	Trial	Sentencing	Incarceration

5. How often do you investigate the situation of defendant/inmate mothers' children? 100% 75% 50% 25% 0%

6. How is your agency intervention regarding children of defendant/inmate mothers initiated?

Self/Agency Initiated	Referral from other agency
Request from mother	Request from children's caretaker
Other (Specify)	

7. Pre-sentence Investigating Officer and Public Defender only:
Do you include information regarding the children of defendant mothers in your pre-sentence investigation report/defense?

All of the time Most of the time Some of the time Rarely Never

8. Do you solicit input from the mother regarding her children when making a decision about her/children?

All of the time Most of the time Some of the time Rarely Never

9. How frequently does your agency communicate with the following regarding the children of defendant/inmate mothers?

Rank:

All of the time (1) Most of the time (2) Some of the time (3)
Rarely (4) Never (5)

District Court Judges Municipal Court Judges Public Defender's Office Adult Probation Office (PSI Officer) Juvenile Court DC Department of Corrections Nebraska Center for Women DC Foster Care DC Child Protective Services DCAFD DCIM Children's Caretaker Mother's Relatives Mother's Friends Mother's Neighbors

10. How frequently does your agency coordinate services with any of the following?

Rank:

All of the time (1) Most of the time (2) Some of the time (3)
Rarely (4) Never (5)

District Court Judges	Municipal Court Judges
Public Defender's Office	Adult Probation Office (PSI Officer)
DC Department of Corrections	Juvenile Court
DC Women's Center	Nebraska Center for Women
DC Child Protective Services	DC Foster Care Services
DC AFDC	Children's Caretaker
DC IM	

11. Is there adequate communication and coordination of services between criminal justice and social service agencies in relation to the children of inmate mothers? Yes No
12. Has your agency initiated any efforts to improve communication and coordination of services for children of inmate mothers? Yes No
13. Is there anyone assigned responsibility for improving inter-agency communication and coordination of services for children of inmate mothers? Yes No
14. Do you perceive a need for a formal inter-agency liaison? Yes No

15. What direct services does your agency provide for children of inmate mothers?

Placement Financial Medical Counseling Foster Care Supervision
(day care, evaluations, etc.) Referral Other (Specify) None

16. What types of referrals does your agency make regarding children of inmate mothers?

Placement Financial Medical Counseling Foster Care Supervision
(day care, evaluations, etc.) Other (Specify) None

17. Do you feel that the criminal justice agencies are effectively dealing with the children of inmate mothers? Yes No

18. Do you feel that the social service agencies are effectively dealing with the children of inmate mothers? Yes No

19. Do you feel that there is a need to create an intake referral service at the jail designed to meet the needs of inmate mothers' children and refer them to the appropriate agencies at the time of the mother's arrest? Yes No

20. Do you feel that there is a need to create a central agency in Douglas County designed to coordinate services for prisoners' children? Yes No

21. Do you consider inmate mothers' children to have special needs? Yes No

22. Criminal Court and County Court Judges and PSI Officer Only
Do you feel that you afford some leniency to defendant mothers with minor children?

All of the time Most of the time Some of the time Rarely Never

23. Do you feel it is necessary for women with children to be granted a time period between sentencing and transfer to jail/prison in order to make arrangements for their children? Yes No

24. Of the following private community agencies/organizations which do you feel has some responsibility for dealing with children of inmate mothers?

Urban League 7th Step Big Brothers/Big Sisters
Mayor's Commission on the Status of Women Other (Specify)

25. Do you feel there is a responsibility for intervention concerning the welfare of prisoners' children by any of the following?

State Public Agency DC Criminal Justice Agencies
DC Social Service Agencies

- 25A. If yes, to what extent? Assistance in Placement Financial
Medical Supervision Other (Specify)

26. How can more effective services for children of inmate mothers be provided?

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW
INMATE MOTHERS

Date;
Location;

The purpose of this interview is to acquire some information about your children. Some questions will be asked about you personally in order to make the study complete. All of the information that you offer will be kept confidential.

I will read the questions followed by pre-determined answers. Please tell me which answer is appropriate for your situation.

The following questions are specifically in regards to you and your children.

1. Age: 17-20 21-24 25-28 29-32 33-36 37 and above
2. Race: Black Caucasian Indian Mexican-American Other (Specify)
3. Marital Status: Single Married Divorced Separated Common Law
4. Education: Grade School Some High School High School
 Some College College
5. Employment Prior to Sentencing:
6. Prior to incarceration, were you the head of the household in which you lived?
7. How many dependent children (under 18) do you have? _____
8. What are the ages of those children? _____
9. At the time of arrest which children, according to ages, lived with you? _____

_____ with grandparents?
_____ with their father?
_____ with other relatives?

_____ with friends?
_____ in foster care?
_____ other (specify)

10. Today, which children, according to ages, live with

_____ with grandparents?
_____ with their father?
_____ with other relatives?

_____ with friends?
_____ in foster care?
_____ other (specify)

11. Following sentencing, were you allowed time before your transfer to the Center to make arrangements for your children? Yes No
- 11A. If no, do you feel that some time to make arrangements would have been necessary for the welfare of your children? Yes No
12. How often do you see your children during your incarceration?
- Once a week Twice a month Once a month Once every three months ' Not at all.

If not at all, go on to 13.

12A. What explanation did you give them for your separation?

<input type="checkbox"/> Incarceration	<input type="checkbox"/> Away at School
<input type="checkbox"/> Employed out of town	<input type="checkbox"/> Hospitalization
<input type="checkbox"/> Out of Town	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
	<input type="checkbox"/> None

If none, go on to 13.

12B. Is the explanation that you have given your children for your separation the same explanation given to them by the person caring for them now? Yes No Don't Know

13. How often are you in communication with the children's caretaker since your incarceration?

Once a Week Twice a Month Once a Month Once Every Three Months
Not at all

The following questions deal with various agencies:

Police

14. Which children according to ages, were with you at the time of arrest? _____

If none, go on to 17.

15. Did the police treat your children courteously? Yes No

16. When you were arrested, did the police:

<input type="checkbox"/>	allow you to make arrangements for your children?
<input type="checkbox"/>	allow you to take the children to the police station?
<input type="checkbox"/>	call for assistance with the children?
<input type="checkbox"/>	do nothing about the children?

Lawyer

17. Was your lawyer a:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Defender?
<input type="checkbox"/>	Private Attorney

18. Did your lawyer ever ask you any questions about your children? Yes No

19. Did your lawyer mention your children to the judge? Yes No

20. Did your lawyer have contact with any agency regarding the welfare of your children? Yes No

20A. If yes, what agencies?

Probation Officer

21. Did the probation officer who made your pre-sentence investigation report:

_____ ask you about your children?
 _____ question the person caring for the children, if other than you?

22. Did the probation officer who made the pre-sentence investigation have contact with any agency regarding the welfare of your children? Yes No

22A. If yes, what agencies?

Judges

23. Did the judge ask you any questions about your children at:

_____ Bond Setting _____ Trial
 _____ Preliminary Hearing _____ Sentencing
 _____ Arraignment

If no to all, go on to 24.

- 23A. Did the judge ask you about the children's

_____ ages? _____ caretaker?
 _____ location? _____ other (specify)
 _____ means of support?

24. Did the judge have any contact with any agency regarding the welfare of your children? Yes No

24A. If yes, what agencies?

25. Do you feel that the judge granted you some leniency because you are a mother at

_____ Bond Setting? _____ Sentencing?

26. Do you feel that the Court is concerned about the welfare of your children? Yes No

Juvenile Court

27. Have you had any contact with the Douglas County Juvenile Court in regards to your children since your incarceration? Yes No

If no, go on to 30.

28. Did the Juvenile Court Judge ask you any questions when making a decision about your children? Yes No

29. Did the Juvenile Court Judge have any contact with any agency regarding the welfare of your children? Yes No

- 29A. If yes, what agencies?

Corrections Center

30. Are there any special programs here for inmate mothers and their children? Yes No

- 30A. If yes, do you participate in any such program? Yes No

31. Do the Center staff ask you questions when they are developing programs for inmate mothers and children? Yes No

32. Do the Center staff have any contact with any Douglas County agency regarding the welfare of your children? Yes No

33. Do you feel that the criminal justice and social service agencies are effectively dealing with the children? Yes No

34. Do you feel that there is adequate communication and coordination of services for your children among the criminal justice agencies? Yes No

Social Service Agencies

35. Has a representative from any Douglas County social service agency contacted you about your children? Yes No

- 35A. If yes, what agencies?

36. Which of your children are receiving services from the following agencies (according to ages)?

_____ Douglas County Aid for Dependent Children
 _____ Douglas County Foster Care Placement
 _____ Douglas County Child Protective Services
 _____ Douglas County Income Maintenance

If no to all, go on to 37.

36A. Which of the following agencies has asked you questions when making decisions about your children?

- ☐ Douglas County Aid to Dependent Children
- ☐ Douglas County Child Protective Services
- ☐ Douglas County Foster Care Placement
- ☐ Douglas County Income Maintenance

37. Do you feel that there is adequate communication and coordination of services for your children between the Douglas County Social Service agencies and the Douglas County Criminal Justice agencies?

38. Which of the Douglas County Criminal Justice and/or Social Service agencies should improve their communication and coordination of services for your children?

39. Do you feel that there is a need to create an intake referral service at the Omaha city jail (police station) for the purpose of referring children to the appropriate helping agencies at the time of a mother's arrest? Yes No

40. Do you feel it is necessary to create one central agency in Douglas County that would coordinate services for inmates' children? Yes No

41. Do you feel that your incarceration has had damaging effects on your children? Very Much Somewhat Not at All

42. I will read the following and please tell me which needs you consider your children as having during your incarceration.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Assistance in Placement
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial
<input type="checkbox"/> Medical
<input type="checkbox"/> Supervision (day care, evaluations)
<input type="checkbox"/> Help with School | <input type="checkbox"/> Stability of living arrangement
<input type="checkbox"/> Staying with brothers and sisters |
|---|--|

43. Would you prefer that:

- ☐ the children had more contact with you?
- ☐ the children be relocated?
- ☐ you have more contact with the children's caretaker?
- ☐ the children had more assistance from the CJ agencies?
- ☐ the children had more assistance from the SS agencies?
- ☐ you have more to say about the decisions made for your children?

44. Do you plan on reuniting with the children?
_____ immediately after release?
_____ after some period of adjustment? _____ not at all?
45. Since your incarceration do you feel that your children have under-
gone
_____ problems of adjustment?
_____ additional behavior problems?
_____ additional medical problems?
_____ negative pressure from friends?
46. What should be done to provide better services for your children while you are here?
47. Offense for which you were sentenced:
- | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| <u>Misdemeanor</u> | <u>Felony</u> | |
| Prostitution | Larceny | Burglary |
| Drugs | Drugs | Other (Specify) |
| Forgery | Embezzlement | |
| Larceny | Assault | |
| Burglary | Robbery | |
| Auto Theft | Murder | |
| Other (Specify) | Auto Theft | |
48. Bond: ROR Posted Bail Unable to Post Bail Amount _____
49. Sentence: 1 day to 6 months 6 months to 1 year 1 year
 1-2 years 1-3 years 4 years 4-6 years 6-10 years
 10 years or more
50. Number of prior arrests as an adult? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more
51. Number of prior convictions? Misdemeanor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more
Felony 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more
52. Have you ever been on probation? Yes No
53. Have you ever served time at the county level before? Yes No
54. Have you ever served time at the state level before? Yes No
55. Are you here for a violation of:
_____ probation?
_____ parole?

APPENDIX C

Your cooperation in a study regarding children of inmate mothers is requested. The study is restricted to women who were sentenced in Douglas County, Nebraska and who have children 18 years of age and younger.

The information for this study will be used for a Masters Thesis (a research paper) by a graduate student at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Interviews will be scheduled in the near future. All participants will remain anonymous, neither your name or the names of your children will be asked or used in the study. Your cooperation is highly encouraged.

Please check the box below indicating whether or not you agree to be interviewed. Sign your name and return the form to the office as soon as possible. One of the staff will keep this form and later notify you of the date and time you will be interviewed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ginny Burns

Ginny Burns
Graduate Student
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Nebraska
at Omaha

- ☐ I agree to be interviewed and understand that all information will remain confidential.
- ☐ I do not wish to be interviewed for this study.

Name

APPENDIX ONE

APPENDIX ONE

Data Gathered From Agencies1. Percentage of Cases Involving Women with Children

	1-20%	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100%	Don't Know
<u>Agency Personnel</u>						
District Ct. Judge			X			
District Ct. Judge			X			
Municipal Ct. Judge	X					
Municipal Ct. Judge		X				
Public Defender			X			
Probation	X					
DC Dept/Corrections			X			
NCW			X			
Total % of Respondents	25%	12.5%	62.5%			

Percentage of Cases Involving Children of Inmate Mothers

	1-20%	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100%	Don't Know
<u>Agency Personnel</u>						
Juv. Ct. Judge	X					
Juv. Ct. Judge	X					
Juv. Ct. Judge	X					
AFDC						X
FC	X					
CPS	X					
IM	X					
Total % of Respondents	85.7%					14.2%

1.1 Agency Services for Children of Inmate Mothers

Respondents:	Placement	Financial	Medical	Counseling	Supervision	Referral	Other
Dist. Ct. Judge						X	
Dist. Ct. Judge							
Mun. Ct. Judge							
Mun. Ct. Judge							
Juv. Ct. Judge	X					X	
Juv. Ct. Judge	X					X	
Juv. Ct. Judge	X					X	
Probation						X	
Public Defender						X	Visits
DC Dept./Corr.						X	Visits
NCW							Visits
Foster Care	X				X		
CPS	X			X			
AFDC		X	X				
IM		X	X				

Total	5 (33%)	2 (13.3%)	2 (13.3%)	1 (6.1%)	1 (6%)	8 (66.6%)	3 (20%)
-------	------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	-----------	--------------	------------

Abbreviations: Dist. Ct. Judge - District Court Judge
Mun. Ct. Judge - Municipal Court Judge
Juv. Ct. Judge - Juvenile Court Judge
DC Dept./Corr. - Douglas County Department of Corrections
NCW - Nebraska Center for Women
FC - Foster Care
CPS - Child Protective Service
AFDC - Aid for Dependent Children
IM - Income Maintenance

1.2 Agency Initiation of Intervention with the Children

	Source of Intervention			
	Self	Referral	Mother	Children's Caretaker Other
Respondents:				
Dist. Ct. Judge		X		
Dist. Ct. Judge				
Mun. Ct. Judge	X	X		
Mun. Ct. Judge				
Juv. Ct. Judge		X	X	X
Juv. Ct. Judge		X		X
Juv. Ct. Judge		X		
Public Defender			X	
Probation Dept.		X		X
DC Dept./Corr.				
NCW			X	
CPS		X	X	X
FC		X		
AFDC		X	X	X
IM		X	X	X
Total	1	10	6	6

Judge's referrals came from the pre-sentence investigating officer's report.
 Juvenile Court Judges got their referrals primarily from the County Attorney's office.
 Child Protective Services got referrals from the police and the county attorney's office and the juvenile court.
 Foster care referrals stemmed from the juvenile court.
 AFDC got referrals from clergy and the juvenile court.
 Income Maintenance got referrals from the juvenile court.

1.3 Frequency of Agency Investigation into the Children's Situation

	All of the Time	Most of the Time	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Respondents:					
Dist. Ct. Judge					X
Dist. Ct. Judge					X
Mun. Ct. Judge	X				
Mun. Ct. Judge			X		
Juv. Ct. Judge	X				
Juv. Ct. Judge					
Juv. Ct. Judge					X
Public Defender			X		
Probation Dept.	X				
DC Dept./Corr.					X
NCW					X
CPS			X		
FC					X
AFDC	X				
IM					X
Total	5 33.3%		3 20%		7 46.6%

1.4 Frequency of Communication Between the Agencies Regarding the Children

0 - All of the Time 1 - Most of the Time 2 - Some of the Time
3 - Rarely -- No code means no communication

Frequency of Communication with the CJ Agencies

Respondents:	CCJ	MCJ	PD	Prob.	Juv. Ct.	DC Dept./Corr.	NCW
Dist. Ct. Judge			0	0		3	
Dist. Ct. Judge			0	0			
Mun. Ct. Judge			0	1	2		
Mun. Ct. Judge				0			
Juv. Ct. Judge	1		2	0		2	2
Juv. Ct. Judge	3		0			0	0
Juv. Ct. Judge			0				
Public Defender	0		0			3	
Probation	0		0		0		
DC Dept./Corr.	2						
NCW	2				2		
CPS	3		2	2	0	2	2
FC			3		0	1	
AFDC			2		0	1	
IM					1		

Frequency of Communication with Social Service Agencies

Respondents:	ADC	FC	CPS	IM
Dist. Ct. Judge				
Dist. Ct. Judge				
Mun. Ct. Judge	3	3	3	3
Mun. Ct. Judge				
Juv. Ct. Judge	2	0	0	2
Juv. Ct. Judge		0	1	3
Juv. Ct. Judge				
Public Defender	3			
Probation	0	0	0	0
DC Dept./Corr.	3	0	0	
NCW	2	2	2	2
CPS	0	0		
FC	1		1	1
AFDC		0		
IM		1	1	

1.5 Efforts to Improve Communication

Respondents:	YES	NO
Dist. Ct. Judge		X
Dist. Ct. Judge		X
Mun. Ct. Judge	X	
Mun. Ct. Judge		X
Juv. Ct. Judge	X	
Juv. Ct. Judge		X
Juv. Ct. Judge		X
Public Defender		X
Prob. Dept.	X	
DC Dept./Corr.		X
NCW	X	
CPS	X	
FC		X
AFDC		X
IM	X	
Total	6 40%	9 60%

1.6 Need for Inter-Agency Liaison

	YES	NO
Dist. Ct. Judge	X	
Dist. Ct. Judge	X	
Mun. Ct. Judge	X	
Mun. Ct. Judge	X	
Juv. Ct. Judge		X
Juv. Ct. Judge		X
Juv. Ct. Judge		X
Public Defender		X
Prob. Dept.		X
DC Dept./Corr.	X	
NCW	X	
CPS	X	
FC		X
AFDC		X
IM		X
Total	7 46.6%	8 53.3%

1.7 Responsibility for Intervention with Children of Inmate Mothers

	Agencies									
	DC	CJ	DC	SS	State	Urban League	Big Brothers/Sisters	Others		
Dist. Ct. Judge			X							
Dist. Ct. Judge			X							
Mun. Ct. Judge			X							
Mun. Ct. Judge			X			X				
Juv. Ct. Judge		X	X		X	X				
Juv. Ct. Judge			X		X	X				
Juv. Ct. Judge		X	X							
Public Defender		X	X		X	X		X		
Prob. Dept.		X	X		X	X		X		
DC Dept./Corr.			X		X	X		X		
NCW		X	X		X					
CPS		X	X							
FC		X	X		X	X		X		
AFDC		X	X		X	X		X		
IM		X	X			X		X		
Total	9	15	7	8	8	8	4	26.6%		
	60%	100%	46.6%	53.3%	53.3%	53.3%	26.6%			

APPENDIX TWO

APPENDIX TWO

Mother's Perceptions of Services and Children's Unmet Needs

Abbreviations: NCW - Nebraska Center for Women
 DCWC - Douglas County Women's Center

2. Agency Services Received by the Children, According to Mothers

<u>Children:</u>	<u>Visits</u>	<u>FC</u>	<u>CPS</u>	<u>ADC</u>	<u>IM</u>	<u>Juv. Court</u>
Mothers:						
NCW	31					
(13)						
DCWC						
(1)	2					
NCW		10				
(4)						
DCWC						
(0)						
NCW				29		
(12)						
DCWC				7		
(3)						
NCW						7
(4)						
DCWC						
(0)						
<hr/>						
Total	52.3%	15.8%	1.5%	57.1%		11.1%
Children	33	10	1	36		7
Receiving						
Services						

*Total number of children is 63, 20 mothers in prison had a total of 54 children, four mothers in prison had a total of nine dependents.

2.1 Mother's Perception of Children's Met and Unmet Needs

	Some Needs Not Met	All Needs Met
Mothers:		
NCW	19	1
DCWC	2	2
Total	21 87.5%	3 12.5%

2.2 Mothers Who Preferred More Assistance for Children from the Agencies

Mothers:	CJ Agencies		SS Agencies	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
NCW	70%	30%	75%	25%
	14	6	15	5
DCWC	50%	50%	25%	75%
	2	2	1	2
Total	66.6%	33.3%	66.6%	33.3%
	16	8	16	8

APPENDIX THREE

APPENDIX THREE

Data on Similar Questions Posed to Agency Personnel and Inmate Mothers

Abbreviations: CJ - Criminal Justice Agencies
 SS - Social Service Agencies

3. Need for Intake Referral at the Jail

Respondents	YES	N	%	Total N	Total %	NO	N	%	Total N	Total %
CJ	8	72.7		3	27.2					
SS	3	75	11	73.3		1	25	4	26.6	
NCW	19	95		1	5	1	4.1			
DCWC	4	100	23	95.9						

3.1 Need for Mothers to be Granted Time to Make Arrangements for Children Between Sentencing and Incarceration

	YES	N	%	Total N	Total %	NO	N	%	Total N	Total %
CJ	7	64		4	36					
SS	3	75	10	66.6		1	25	5	33.3	
NCW	19	95		1	5					
DCWC	4	100	23	95.9		1	4.1			

3.2 Agencies' Effectiveness w/Children of Inmate Mothers
Criminal Justice Agencies' Effectiveness with the Children

	YES	N	%	Total N	Total %	NO	N	%	Total N	Total %
CJ		5	45			1	9			
SS		1	25	6	40	3	75		2	13

DON'T KNOW

	N	%	Total N	Total %
CJ	5	45		
SS	2	50	7	46

YES	NO	N	%	Total N	Total %
NCW	20	100			
DCWC	4	100	24	100	

Social Service Agencies' Effectiveness with the Children

YES	N	%	Total N	Total %	NO	N	%	Total N	Total %
CJ	5	45			2	18			
SS	3	75	8	53.4	1	25		3	20

DON'T KNOW

YES	N	%	Total N	Total %	NO	N	%	Total N	Total %

YES	N	%	Total N	Total %	NO	N	%	Total N	Total %
NCW	3	15			17	85			
DCWC			3	12.5	4	100		21	87.5

3.3 Perceptions of Communication and Coordination of Services Between Criminal Justice and Social Service Agencies

<u>Respondents:</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Inadequate</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Dist. Ct. Judge		X	
Dist. Ct. Judge			X
Mun. Ct. Judge		X	
Mun. Ct. Judge			X
Juv. Ct. Judge	X		
Juv. Ct. Judge		X	
Juv. Ct. Judge		X	
Public Defender	X		
Probation Dept.	X		
DC Dept./Corr.	X		
NCW		X	
CPS		X	
FC		X	X
AFDC			
IM		X	
Total	4 26.6%	8 53.3%	3 20%

<u>Inmate Mothers</u>	<u>Adequate</u>	<u>Inadequate</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
NCW	1	15	4
DCWC		3	1
Total	1 4.1%	18 75%	5 20.8%

3.4 Need for a Central Agency

Respondents	YES	N	%	Total N	Total %	NO	N	%	Total N	Total %
CJ		4	36	5	33.3		5	45	7	46.6
SS		1	25				3	75		
<hr/>										
DON'T KNOW										
CJ		2	18	3	20					
SS		1	25							
<hr/>										
	YES	N	%	Total N	Total %	NO	N	%	Total N	Total %
NCW		20	100	24	100					
DCWC		4	100							

3.5 Input Solicited from the Mother

Respondents	Always		Most of the Time		Some of the Time		Never	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
District Criminal Court Judges							2	50
Municipal Court Judges	1	25						

Inmate Mothers who were asked Questions by the Judge About Their Children								
	YES		NO					
	N	%	N	%				
NCW	5	25			15	75		
DCWC	1	25			3	75		
Total N and % of Total Inmate Mothers	6	25%			18	75%		

Point in the Criminal Process Judges ask Mothers about Children

	Bond Setting		Pre-Hearing		Arraignment		Trial		Sentencing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NCW			3	15	1	5	1	5	4	20
DCWC									1	25
Total N and % of Total Inmate Mothers			3	12.5%	1	4.1%	1	4.1%	4	16.7%

Types of Questions about Children Judges ask Inmate Mothers

Children's:	Ages		Location		Means of Support		Caretaker		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NCW	1	5	4	20			3	15		
DCWC	1	25	1	25			1	25		
Total N and % of Total Inmate Mothers	2	8.3%	5	20.8%			4	16.6%		

3.6 Public Defender

The representative from the Public Defenders Office states that information about the children is never solicited from the mother when decisions are made about her (i.e. type of plea, recommendations to the judge about the sentence).

Inmate Mother's Legal Representation

	Public Defender	N	%	Private Attorney	N	%
NCW		11	55		9	45
DCWC		2	50		2	50
Total N and Total % of Inmate Mothers		13	54.1%		11	45.8%

Inmate Mothers who were asked Questions About Children by Attorney

	Public Defender	N	%	Private Attorney	N	%
NCW		9	81.8		4	44.4
DCWC		1	25		2	50
Total N and Total % of Inmate Mothers Represented by Either Attorney		10	76.9%		6	54.5%

*The Public Defender's office was found to include information about the children of defendant mothers in the woman's defense most of the time (item #7 on the questionnaire).

Mothers who Stated Their Children were Mentioned to the Judge by the Attorney

	Public Defender	N	%	Private Attorney	N	%
NCW		7	63.6		5	55.5
DCWC		2	50		2	50
Total N and Total % of Inmate Mothers Represented by Public/ Private Attorney		9	69.2%		7	63.6%

3.7 Probation - Pre-Sentence Investigating Officer

The Adult Probation Office reports that pre-sentence investigating officers solicit input from the mother about the children when making a decision about her (i.e., recommendation for sentence) all of the time.

Inmate Mothers who were asked Questions About the Children by the Pre-Sentence Investigating Officer

	YES	N	%	NO	N	%
NCW		13	65		7	35
DCWC		2	50		1	25 (one could not recall)
		15	62.5%		8	33.3%

3.8 Correctional Agencies

*The Douglas County Department of Corrections official advised that input from the mother is never solicited when decisions are made about programs and services for mother's and children.

*The Nebraska Center for Women representative stated that the mother's input is always solicited when decisions are made about mother-child programs and services.

Inmate Mothers Whose Input was Solicited by Correctional Staff

Respondents:	YES	N	%	NO	N	%
NCW		5	25		15	75
DCWC		1	25		3	75
Total		6	25		18	75

3.9 Juvenile Court Judges

*All of the Juvenile Court judges reported to solicit input from the inmate mother about the children when making decisions about the children.

Inmate Mothers Who Had Contact With the Juvenile Court Since Incarceration

	N	%	% of Total Inmate Mothers
NCW	5	25	20.8
DCWC	0		

Inmate Mothers Whose Input had Been Solicited by Juvenile Court Judges

	N	% of Total
NCW	2	8.3%

3.10 Social Service Agencies

*Child Protective Services was the only social service agency that reported to solicit input from the mother all of the time when making decisions about the children.

*The agency for Aid to Dependent Children reported to solicit input from the mother most of the time.

*Foster Care and Income Maintenance agencies advised that they never solicit input from the mother when making decisions about the children.

Inmate Mothers Whose Children had Received Some Service From the Social Service Agencies

Respondents:	CPS		ADC		FC		IM	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
NCW	1	5	12	60	4	20	3	15
DCWC			3	75				
Total N and % of Total Inmate Mothers	1	4.11	15	62.5	4	16.6	3	12.5

APPENDIX FOUR

APPENDIX FOUR

Data on Inmate Mothers and Their Children4. Demographic Data on Inmate Mothers

Age of Inmate Mothers

Age	N	%
17-20	0	0
21-24	9	37.5
25-28	7	29.1
29-32	3	12.5
33-36	4	16.7
37 & +	1	4.1
	24	99.9%

Ethnic Distribution

Race	N	%
Black	19	79.2
White	4	16.7
Mexican-American	1	4.1
	24	99.9%

Marital Status

Status	N	%
Single	11	45.8
Married	5	20.8
Divorced	4	16.7
Separated	4	16.7
	24	100.0%

Education

Achievement	N	%
Some High School	8	33.3
High School	13	54.2
Some College	3	12.5
	24	100.0%

Employment Background

	N	%
Homemaker	13	54.1
Clerical	3	12.5
Factory	2	8.0
Student	2	8.0
Accountant	1	4.1
Bus Driver	1	4.1
Food Service	1	4.1
Sales	1	4.1
	24	100.0%

Head of Household

	N	%
Total	16	66.7
Responsibility		
Shared	7	29.2
Responsibility		
Not at all	1	4.1
	24	100.0%

Conviction

Offense:	N	%
Forgery	11	45.8
Larceny	7	29.2
Unlawful	2	8.3
Possession of		
Drugs		
Shooting w/	1	4.1
Intent		
Fraud	1	4.1
Arson	1	4.1
Driving w/	1	4.1
No License		
	24	99.7%

Sentences

Length:	N	%
5 days	1	4.1
10 days	2	8.3
30 days	1	4.1
1 year	3	12.5
18 months	1	4.1
1-3 years	3	12.5
1-5 years	1	4.1
2 years	1	4.1
2-3 years	1	4.1
2-4 years	3	12.5
3-5 years	1	4.1
3½-8 years	1	4.1
4-6 years	1	4.1
4½-9½ years	1	4.1
5, 5 CC years	1	4.1
5-10 years	1	4.1
3-15, 7 CC years	1	4.1
	24	99.1%

Bond

ROR	7	29.2
Posted Bond	11	45.8
Unable to Post Bond	6	25.0
Post Bond	24	100.0%

Amount of Bond Set:

Posted Bond

\$110,000
 25,000
 10,000
 5,000
 5,000
 2,500
 2,500
 2,000
 1,000
 1,000
 500

$\$164,500 - (11 (N) = \$14,954$

Unable to Post Bond

\$20,000
 7,500
 2,500
 2,500
 500
 500

$\$33,500 - 6 (N) = \$5,583$

Prior Arrests as an Adult

0 Arrests	3	12.5
1 "	3	12.5
2 "	6	25.0
3 "	1	4.1
4 "	2	8.3
5 "	3	12.5
8 "	6	25.0
	24	99.9%

Prior Convictions as an Adult

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
0 Convictions	4	16.6
1 "	5	20.8
2 "	5	20.8
3 "	2	8.3
4 "	1	4.1
5 "	3	12.5
7 "	1	4.1
8 "	3	12.5
	24	99.7%

4.1 The Children

<u>Ages:</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Infancy	3	4.8
1 year	3	4.8
2 years	5	7.9
3 "	4	6.3
4 "	6	9.5
5 "	7	11.0
6 "	3	4.8
7 "	5	7.9
8 "	6	9.5
9 "	4	6.3
10 "	3	4.8
11 "	5	7.9
12 "	2	3.1
13 "	2	3.1
14 "	1	1.6
15 "	2	3.1
16 "	1	1.6
17 "	1	1.6
	63	99.6%

4.2 Mothers' Explanation of Their Incarceration to Children

		N	%	Total N	%
Explanation					
Incarceration	NCW	15	75	16	66.7
	DCWC	1	25		
Out of Town	NCW	1	5	3	12.5
	DCWC	2	50		
Away at School	NCW	2	10	2	8.3
	DCWC	0	0		
Hospitaliza- tion	NCW	0		1	4.1
	DCWC	1	25		
None	NCW	2	10	2	8.3
	DCWC	0	0		
				24	99.9%

APPENDIX FIVE

APPENDIX FIVE

Comparison Data of Inmate Mother Responses According to Sentence Length5. Mothers Living Arrangement with Children Prior to Incarceration

Mothers Living With:	All Children	Some Children	None of Children
Jail	4 (100%)		
Low	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	
Moderate	7 (77.7%)	2 (22.2%)	
Heavy	3 (42.8%)	3 (42.8%)	1 (14.2%)
Total	17 (70.8%)	6 (26%)	1 (4.1%)

5.1 Number of Children's Moves

	One Move	Two Moves	Three Moves
Jail	3 (75%)		
Low	4 (100%)		
Moderate	6 (66.6%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (11.1%)
Heavy	4 (57.1%)		1 (14.2%)
Total	17 (70.8%)	1 (4.1%)	2 (8.3%)

5.2 Visits with Children During Incarceration

	Regular (Once a Month)	Occasional (Less than once a month)	Not At All
Jail	1 (25%)		3 (75%)
Low	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
Moderate	3 (33.3%)	3 (33.3%)	3 (33.3%)
Heavy		5 (71.4%)	2 (28.5%)
Total	6 (25%)	9 (37.5%)	9 (37.5%)

5.3 Mothers Preferring More Contact with Children, Relocation of Children and More Input with Decisions Made About Children

	More Contact w/Children	Relocation	More Input	More Contact w/Caretaker
Jail	2 (50%)		2 (50%)	1 (25%)
Low	4 (100%)		3 (75%)	3 (75%)
Moderate	9 (100%)	3 (33.3%)	8 (88.8%)	9 (100%)
Heavy	6 (85.7%)	1 (14.2%)	3 (42.8%)	5 (71.4%)
Total	21 (87.5%)	4 (16.6%)	16 (66.6%)	18 (75%)

5.4 Mothers' Perceptions of Children's Problems

	Adjustment	Behavior	Medical	Negative Peer Pressure
Jail	1 (25%)			
Low	2 (50%)	1 (25%)		
Moderate	7 (77.7%)	5 (55.5%)	2 (22.2%)	2 (22.2%)
Heavy	5 (71.4%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.2%)	2 (28.5%)
Total	15 (62.5%)	10 (41.6%)	3 (12.5%)	4 (16.6%)

5.5 Mothers' Perceptions of Services Received by Children

	ADC	Foster Care	Child Protective Services	Income Maint.	Juvenile Court
Jail	3 (75%)				
Low	4 (100%)		1 (25%)		
Moderate	6 (66.6%)	1 (11.1%)			3 (33.3%)
Heavy	2 (28.5%)	3 (42.8%)	2 (28.5%)		2 (28.5%)
Total	15 (62.5%)	4 (16.6%)	3 (12.5%)		5 (20.8%)

5.6 Mothers Preferring More Assistance from Agencies

	Criminal Justice Agencies	Social Service Agencies
Jail	2 (50%)	1 (25%)
Low	3 (75%)	3 (75%)
Moderate	7 (77.7%)	9 (100%)
Heavy	4 (57.1%)	4 (57.1%)
Total	16 (66.6%)	17 (70.8%)