

## **Socioeconomic Impact of Imprisonment on Prisoner's Family: A Study of Central Prisoner, Dharwad of Karnataka State**

**\*Chandrakala T Halemani<sup>1</sup>, Dr. G.S. Venumadhava<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Research Scholar, DOS in Criminology & Forensic Science, Karnatak University Dharwad.*

<sup>2</sup>*Assistant Professor & Co-ordinator (I/C), DOS in Criminology & Forensic Science, Karnatak University Dharwad.*

*Corresponding Author: \* Chandrakala T Halemani*

---

**ABSTRACT:** This research demonstrated the impact of imprisonment on families of prisoners imprisoned in the central prison of Dharwad in Karnataka state. In the present study it has been revealed that the families of prisoners are a highly vulnerable group. The prisoners involved in long-term crime were having much younger relatives as compared to those involved in short-term crime. And for both long-term prisoners and short-term prisoners it was always a female, either wife or mother, staying in touch and waiting for their return, as most of the prisoners were sole breadwinners resulting in the financial crippling of the family. Long-term prisoners were mostly from a local background of agriculture, poverty and illiteracy, which might have forced them to take up a crime. Short-term prisoners may have been involved in petty crime due to poverty and unable to find a job. The neighbours of the incarcerated family often force them to vacate their house, which leads to frequent shifting and instability. Their earning capacity also drastically reduced as the convict was the sole breadwinner of the family, thus the additional financial burden came on the shoulders of wives. Daughter or other family member's marriage broke up because of the relative's imprisonment. However, it is crucial to recognize that it is not easy to untangle the impact of imprisonment from the pressures to which prisoners and their families are subjected due to imprisonment.

**Key words:** Incarceration, Prisoners, Family, Social, Economic

---

Date of Submission: 19-07-2017

Date of acceptance: 14-08-2017

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The impacts of imprisonment are felt not only by prisoners themselves but also their family members. Prisoners may be alone in a cell or on trial but most have families and friends that often feel as though they are imprisoned along with their loved ones. Families suffer the pain of separation but also feel the impact of imprisonment in other ways, such as loss of income, loss of home, shame, problems with transport and anti-social behaviour by children in distress. Unfortunately, prisoners' families have been little studied in their own right. The effects of imprisonment on families and children of prisoners are almost entirely neglected in academic research, prison statistics, public policy and media coverage. However, we can infer from prisoners' backgrounds that their families are a highly vulnerable group. Limited research to date suggests that imprisonment can have devastating consequences for partners and children.

### **II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study aims to identify the socioeconomic effects of incarceration of convicts on their family members, who are frequently overlooked by the system of criminal justice while penalizing convicts, with special reference to Central Prison Dharwad of Karnataka State. The present study is empirical in nature as it aims to assess the impacts of incarceration on families of convicts by proving or disproving hypotheses. The present study is exploratory in nature as it intends to investigate the magnitude of a particular occurrence, i.e., changes in the family dynamics of the incarcerated as a result of incarceration, in order to identify alternate solutions to the problem and to lay the groundwork for future studies which will help in determining the final solution, i.e., protection of family members of incarcerated (Sandhusen, 2000) The present study is also descriptive in nature as it records detailed observations regarding 'what', 'where' and 'when' of the research problem using established scientific methods in a precise and reproducible manner (Ethridge, 2004).

In order to serve the following **objectives**, a descriptive study was carried out in the present research

- To report the characteristics of families of the incarcerated. For instance, their monthly income, monthly expenditure, reduction in income post incarceration, etc.

- To compare the effects of short term and long term incarceration on the family members

**Research instrument**

Research instruments refer to the tools used for obtaining data related to the research questions. In the present study, self-administered questionnaires were used as the research instrument for the purpose of collecting data from a selected group of target sample drawn from a larger population

**Variables included in the study**

**Dependent variable**

- Length of incarceration of the convicts

**Independent variables**

- Socioeconomic effects

**Levels of measurement used:**

Scale	Example variables	Statistics
Nominal	Gender, Marital status, Educational qualification, Mother tongue, Employment status, etc.	Chi-square Mann-Whitney's U Test Frequency distribution
Interval	Monthly income, Monthly expenditure, Period of sentence, Number of visits in a month, etc.	Correlation, Regression
Ratio	<b>Binary</b> 'Have you taken a new partner?', 'Has your earning capacity reduced after relative's incarceration?' 'Was the convict was the sole breadwinner of the family?'	Regression
	<b>Likert</b> Socio-economic impacts of incarceration	

**Data collection**

The study uses primary and secondary data for analysis. Collection of primary data was carried out by administering questionnaires to family members of incarcerates. Secondary data were gathered with the help of journals such as Journal of Criminology, Journal of Contemporary Justice, etc. Internet sources such as Scopus, Google Scholar, etc. and books pertaining to the topic were verified for the collection of secondary data.

**Sample population**

The sample frame for the present study constitutes the family members of incarcerates who were sentenced to Central Prison Dharwad of Karnataka for short or long durations of imprisonment.

**Sample size**

One relative of every convict was chosen as a sample for the study. A sample of 280 relatives was drawn, out of whom 30 cases were removed due to difficulties in locating them and due to incomplete responses from them. The 250 relatives remaining were treated as the final sample for the study. The respondents were distributed in such a way that the ratio of the number of relatives of short term incarcerates to relatives of long term incarcerates was 1:1.

**Sampling procedure**

Purposive sampling method was adopted by the study, which refers to a non-probability selection of respondents based on the objectives of the study (Babbie, 1973). In the present study, relatives of the incarcerate held in Central Prison Dharwad of Karnataka State were selected as the sample population. The study also adopted convenience sampling, which refers to selection of respondents based on their proximity, availability, willingness to participate and other such practical criteria (Dornyei, 2007).

**Data analysis**

In the present study, data analysis was carried out using SPSS software. The study was conducted by separating the respondents into two groups: relatives of short term incarcerate and relatives of long term incarcerate in order to compare the effects of incarceration between the groups.

**Time frame of the study:** Data was collected for a period of twelve month January to December 2016

**Objectives of the Study:**

- To study the socio-economic impact of incarceration of an individual on the family.

**Hypotheses framed in the study**

- Hypothesis 1<sub>a</sub>: The length of incarceration of an individual has a negative impact on the socioeconomic well-being of the family members.

## **Operational definitions**

### **Incarceration**

Incarceration refers to the process of sentencing offenders to hard labor and confinement within jails as a corrective measure.

### **Socioeconomic status**

Socioeconomic status refers to the overall social standing of the individuals in terms of their occupation, income and education.

## **III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

This is the reviews research on the impact of imprisonment on prisoner's family as a context for a more detailed discussion of the socioeconomic impact of imprisonment on prisoner's family. Literature on prisoners' family is very limited and more so in Indian context. Most of the literature available, however describes the situation as it pertains in Europe, the United States of America and other developed countries.

As Roger Shaw pointed out almost 20 years ago, if we do not attend to the effects of imprisonment on children, we face the possibility of punishing innocent victims, neglecting a seriously at risk group, and possibly causing crime in the next generation (Shaw 1987).

By far the most comprehensive study of prisoners' wives was conducted by Pauline Morris, who interviewed 825 imprisoned men in England and 469 of their wives (Morris 1965). Morris found that imprisonment of a husband was generally experienced as a crisis of family dismemberment rather than a crisis of demoralisation through stigma or shame. Stigma was experienced almost exclusively by wives whose husbands were imprisoned for the first time, and then only at the initial stages of the separation. Among the most common problems reported, 63 per cent of wives said they experienced deterioration in their financial situation; 81 per cent some deterioration in their work; 46 per cent deterioration in present attitude to marriage and future plans; 63 per cent deterioration in social activity; 60 per cent deterioration in relationships with in-laws; and 57 per cent deterioration in relationships with friends and neighbours.

Since Morris's early work, other studies of prisoners' partners and wives have found remarkably similar themes across the UK, the US, Ireland and Australia. Studies consistently report that loss of income is one of the most important difficulties faced by partners of male prisoners (Anderson 1966; Ferraro *et al* 1983; McEvoy *et al* 1999; Noble 1995; Richards *et al* 1994; Schneller 1976).

Sharp and Marcus-Mendoza (2001) found that imprisoning mothers also caused a drastic reduction in family income. Loss of income is compounded by additional expenses of prison visits, mail, telephone calls (especially if prisoners call collect, as in the US) and sending money to imprisoned relatives.

Imprisonment of a partner can also cause home moves (Noble 1995), divorce and relationship problems (Anderson 1966; Ferraro *et al* 1983; McEvoy *et al* 1999) and medical and health problems (Ferraro *et al* 1983; McEvoy *et al* 1999; Noble 1995). Partners with children face single parenthood at a particularly vulnerable time (Peart and Asquith 1992).

In a US study published in 2004, Donald Braman found that the annual financial cost for a family of having a family member in prison was \$12,680.

Rose Smith, Roger Grimshaw, Renee Romeo and Martin Knapp explain despite the different social policy contexts in the US and the UK, a study on poverty and disadvantage amongst prisoners' families in England, published in 2007, revealed a similar level of economic cost arising from imprisonment. It found that families were often forced to depend upon welfare benefits and that the loss of a prisoner's or partner's earnings 'averaged £6,204 over a six-month period ... the average personal cost to the family and relatives was estimated at £1,050 over a six-month period'

## **IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Duration of Incarceration**

The respondents were asked about the duration of imprisonment of their family member. This question was included as a primary tool to understand the fact that for how many years they are undergoing through these difficulties and social stigmas. It was found that in the case of long term prisoners family member of 90 respondents were imprisoned for more than 7 years. Whereas out of other 35 respondents 33 member were imprisoned for 5-7 years remaining 2 for around 2-4 years. (Table 1, Figure 1). Survey also revealed that 68.8 % of respondents who were related to short term prisoners said that the duration is around 2-4 years. Another 16% responded that they are going through this situation for around 5-7 year. 10.4 % responded that the duration is more than 7 years and for the remaining 4.8%, the duration is less than 1 year. The probability value which determines the significance of the comparison is measured as 0.000. This value (which is less than reference value 0.05) makes the comparison significant.

### **Period of sentence**

The survey was conducted among the relatives of short term prisoners to understand the length of the imprisonment. According to the survey 40.8% of the respondents answered that their relatives were sentenced to 5-7 years. Another 32.2 % responded that period of sentence is between 2-4 years. Also there exists a remaining 26.4% whose relatives are sentenced for more than 7 years.

### **Impact on the family of the incarcerated**

#### **Number of persons in the household**

The number of persons in the household was measured to find the impact of incarceration on the family members. Among the relative of the long term prisoners the majority (63.2%) of the family members in a house was 6-8 persons. At the same time among the respondents related to short term prisoners the frequency is vertically divided with 50.4% answered that their family contained more than 8 persons in their house and 49.6 % answered that number of persons in their house was in between 6 -8 persons. In the case of long term prisoners, 25.6% respondents answered that number of persons in their house hold is greater than 8 and in the case of another 11.2 %, the number lies within the bandwidth of 2-5 persons. The comparison between the two groups was significant at  $p$  value = 0.000.

#### **Number of Children to the prisoner**

According to the study, a majority of the respondents in both groups (62.4% of long and 72.9% short term prisoners, respectively) comes within the group of 1-3 children. Around 29% of respondents related to long term prisoners answered that they have no children with the prisoner whereas it was just 3.4% in the case of spouses of short term prisoners. This indicates a sharp contrast. Again the percentage of spouses having 4-6 children with long term term prisoners is just 8.3% whereas it is a sizable 23.7% in the case of spouses of short term prisoners. The contrast also evident in the case of spouses who offered 'no response', the percentage was considerably high (52.8%) in the case of spouses related to short term prisoners and it was quite nominal (12.8%) in the case of spouses related to long term prisoners. The difference between the two groups were significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

#### **Children are informed about the father/mother/relative's imprisonment**

The results of the study reveal that the children who are the most affected need to be informed. The majority of the respondents had informed the children about the parent's incarceration, for instance, 82.3% of long term and 96.4 of short term, respectively. Out of 125 respondents 29 (23.2%) related to long term prisoners and 70 (56%) related to short term prisoners offered no response. The comparison between the two groups is significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

#### **Place of residence**

The survey included this question to understand the social background of the respondents. Majority of the respondents in both groups (71.2% and 84 %) answered that they were residing in rented houses. Only 28.8% and 16% responded that they possess self owned houses. The difference between respondents related to long term and short term prisoners were significant.

#### **Number of years in the current residence**

One of the social problem is that a person when convicted, the neighbors of the incarcerated family often force them to vacate their house. In order to find the effect of social problem, the respondents were asked for how long they lived in the same house. It was observed that 41.6% of respondents of long term prisoners and 37.6% of respondents of short term prisoners lived in the current residents for 2-4 years. The percentage of respondents who responded that they are residing in the current place for 5-7 years was 25.6 and 45.6, respectively. Another 28.8% relatives of long term prisoners and 15.2% of short term prisoners answered that they are staying in the current place more than 7 years. A considerably small percentage (4% and 1.6%) responded that they are living in the current place for less than 1 year. The difference between the two groups was not significant. This results suggest that the family of the incarcerated whether long term or short term are not affected by the social problem.

#### **Number of houses shifted in the last year**

This question included as an annexure to the previous question. The question is aimed to understand the social problems that the respondents were facing due to the imprisonment of their relatives. Only those who were staying for less than one year in the current residence were made to respond to this question. The answer revealed a clear division between two groups: 51.2% relatives of persons who are sentenced for long term imprisonment responded that they were forced to shift 1-3 times in the last year, while 20% responded that they

had shifted 4-6 times and another 16.8% answered that they had to shift 5 times last year. Among the respondents related to short term sentenced persons a large number of respondents (72.8%) responded that they had to shift their houses 1-3 times last year. It was followed by 15.2 % respondents who responded that they were forced to shift 5 times last year and another 12% who were forced to shift 4-6 times. Again another 12% (15 persons) out of 125 persons among the respondents related to long term sentenced persons offered 'no response'. The difference between the long and short term prisoners was significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). The data shows that the families of long term prisoners were affected more than the family of short term prisoners.

### **Monthly income**

Knowing monthly income is an integral part of this survey as it directly reveals the social living status of the respondent. In the case of respondents related to long term sentenced persons 53.6% fell within the salary bandwidth of Rs.4000-6000 per month. The 40% had the income between Rs.7000-9000 and another 6.4% had the income more than Rs.9000. However, 60.8% respondents who were related to short term sentenced persons fell in the salary bandwidth of Rs.7000-9000 per month. It was followed by 38.4% persons who lived with the monthly income of Rs.4000-6000 per month. A very nominal percentage (0.8%) had the income less than Rs.1000. However, the monthly income of these two groups did vary significantly.

### **Monthly expenditure**

Monthly expenditure, just like monthly income, is also an important factor that determines the social living status of the respondents. As per the survey, the majority of the respondents related to long term sentenced persons had monthly expenditure either Rs.7000-9000 (39.2%) or more than Rs.9000 (38.4%). In the case of respondents related to short term sentenced persons it was 41.6% (Rs.7000-Rs.9000) and 51.2% (> Rs.9000). Around 22% of respondents who were related to long term sentenced persons and 6.4% of respondents related to short term sentenced persons responded that their monthly expenditure was in between Rs.4000 and 6000. 1 person (0.8%) who was related to long term prisoner responded that the expenditure was in between Rs.1000 and 3000 and a similar percentage in the case of short term sentenced persons responded that the expenditure was less than Rs.1000. The relatives of short-term prisoners were more compared to the long term prisoners family, which was significant at  $p < 0.05$ .

### **Reduction in the earning capacity after relative's incarceration**

Respondents among both the groups gave a similar sort of answer to this question. 98.4% relatives of long term prisoner's and 100% relative's of short term prisoners responded that their earning capacity has reduced after relative's incarceration. Only a few (1.6%) related to long term imprisoned persons responded that their income was unaffected by the relative's incarceration. Both the relatives of long and short term incarceration faced reduction in earning capacity, and the difference was not significant.

### **Convict as the sole breadwinner of the Family**

The survey included this question because it will give the direct in sight about the impact of the imprisonment on relatives and family members. The answer was exactly similar to that of the previous question. Cent percentage relative of the short term prisoners and 98.4% relatives of the long term prisoners responded that the convict was the sole bread winner of the family. 1.6% who were related to long term imprisoned persons responded that the convict was not the sole breadwinner in their family. There was no significant difference between the two groups.

### **Reliability and Validity analysis**

#### **Reliability analysis**

Replication capability of the data is important for any research to be meaningful and successful. Reliability tests refer to what degree the outcome of the study could be replicated under the same conditions of research, such as using the same methodology.

**Table: Reliability of Long term incarceration**

	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
Socioeconomic factors	.659	13

**Table: Reliability of Short term incarceration**

	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Socio economic factors	.773	15

#### **Validity analysis**

**Long term**

Factor analysis extracted ten factors with Eigen value more than 1 that explained 76.45% of the variability of the data. The extracted factors were then rotated using Varimax (variance maximizing method) rotation. These rotated factors with their variable constituents and factor loadings are given in Table for better reading of the results factor loadings below 0.40 are suppressed in the table. Those items that were loaded less than 0.40 were deleted from the data.

Three constructs were extracted for socioeconomic factor together they explained 54.94% of the variation in the socioeconomic factor. The most important construct that was extracted was Economic impact which explained more than half of the variance (26.76%). This factor was represented by four items, namely, *Our economic conditions have deteriorated after the relative's incarceration* (factor loadings = .870), *Government and Non-governmental organizations did not provide other assistance* (factor loadings = .793), *Our repayment ability of loan has decreased after the relative's incarceration* (factor loadings = .791), and *Family members did not provide support* (factor loadings = .685). The factors and their loadings are represented in Table 4.—

**Table: Factor analysis for Socio impact factor of Long term incarceration**

	Factor loadings	Initial Eigen values	
		% of variance	Cumulative %
<b><i>Economic impact</i></b>		<b>26.759</b>	<b>26.759</b>
Our economic conditions have deteriorated after the relative's incarceration	.870		
Government and Non-governmental organizations did not provide other assistance (e.g., housing, schooling, etc.)	.793		
Our repayment ability of loan has decreased after the relative's incarceration	.791		
Family members (outside the immediate circle, e.g., aunts, uncles, etc.) did not provide support	.685		
<b><i>Impact on children</i></b>		<b>16.516</b>	<b>43.275</b>
Children were called names in school (e.g., prisoner's relative, etc.)	.974		
Children's schooling got affected by the relative's imprisonment	.963		
Children from new partner (from second marriage) have better acceptance in society	.530		
<b><i>Attitude of friends relatives and neighbours</i></b>		<b>11.669</b>	<b>54.944</b>
Friends did not continue to be in contact	.796		
Shopkeepers viewed family members as criminals and did not serve us	.774		
Neighbours are no longer cordial and helpful	.644		
Female relatives feel unprotected when going out alone	.591		
We faced threat of eviction from home and/or neighbourhood	.533		
We faced sexual harassment from employers and neighbours	.473		

**Factor analysis of Short term incarceration**

Factor analysis was conducted for Short term incarceration based on the four factors that were also used for long term. All the factors had similar constructs loaded on them as in the case of long term incarceration.

The three constructs that loaded for socioeconomic factor was Economic impact and Impact on friends' relatives and neighbors. These three factors together explained 56.04% of variance in the socioeconomic factor. Individually, Economic impact contributed to 32.77%, Impact on friends relatives and neighbors to 14.42% and Impact on children to 8.85%.

The relative of both Long term and Short term incarcerated felt that the major adverse reaction occurred was Economic impact. However, the order of importance changed with the next two factors, with short term incarcerated relatives giving importance to Attitude of friends' relatives and neighbors', and then Impact on children. The result suggests that the Attitude of friends' relatives and neighbors may have led to not only economic impact but only to emotional needs.

**Table: Factor analysis for Socio impact factor of Short term incarceration**

	Factor analysis	Initial Eigen values	
		% of variance	Cumulative %
<b>Economic impact</b>		32.769	32.769
Our repayment ability of loan has decreased after the relative's incarceration	.946		
Our economic conditions have deteriorated after the relative's incarceration	.945		
Our loan amount has increased after the relative's incarceration	-.913		
Government and Non-governmental organizations did not provide other assistance (e.g., housing, schooling, etc.)	.880		
Family members (outside the immediate circle, e.g., aunts, uncles, etc.) did not provide support	.644		
<b>Impact on friends relatives and neighbours</b>		14.422	47.192
Female relatives feel unprotected when going out alone	.729		
Shopkeepers viewed family members as criminals and did not serve us	.685		
We faced sexual harassment from employers and neighbours	.629		
Friends did not continue to be in contact	.481		
We faced threat of eviction from home and/or neighbourhood	.453		
We faced job loss	.948		
We faced threat to job security	.947		
Neighbours are no longer cordial and helpful			
<b>Impact on children</b>		8.848	56.040
Children were called names in school (e.g., prisoner's relative, etc.)	.526		
Children's schooling got affected by the relative's imprisonment	.725		
Children from new partner (from second marriage) have better acceptance in society	-.486		

**Association between Relationship with incarcerated and the Socioeconomic factors**

This study has shown that the incarceration of a family member adversely affects the others in the family. Hence the association between the socioeconomic factors and the Relationship between the respondent and the incarcerated was studied. Cross tabulations were made between the Relationship with incarcerators and socioeconomic factor to find out how the respondents perceive the effect of socioeconomic factor on different facets of their life. The association of each of the factors is given in the subsequent sections.

**Relationship with incarcerated and the Social factors**

The effect of incarceration on the social factors of the respondents was evaluated through three different aspects: (i) economic impact, (ii) impact on children, and (iii) attitude of friends, relatives and neighbors.

Economic impact on the family was explored the respondent's ability of pay loan, deterioration of economic condition, economic support from relatives, and assistance from government, NGOs, etc. Impacts on children were investigated through effect on schooling and how they were treated in school. Attitude of friends relatives and neighbours on how they viewed the family members, feeling unprotected, sexual harassment from employers and neighbours, threat of eviction from home and/or neighbourhood, friends did not want to be in touch, and neighbours not being cordial and helpful.

The relationship between the Relationship with incarcerated and the Social factors was investigated. The relationship with incarcerated was grouped into spouse, parents and others, which included children and siblings. Out of the 250 people, who took part in the survey, 113 respondents were spouse of the incarcerators,

100 were parents and only 37 were siblings or children. Spouse and Parents were found to be equally affected socially with 92.9% of the Spouse either agree or strongly agree to being affected and 92% of the Parents agree or strongly agree. On the other hand, though the siblings/children are affected, the rigour has been considerably lesser than the Spouse or Parents. Hence the difference between these three groups was not significant ( $\chi^2=7.858, p>0.05$ ).

**Cross tabulation of Relationship with incarcerated and the Social factors**

			Social			Total
			Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	
Relationship	Spouse	Count	8	87	18	113
		% within Relationship	7.1%	77.0%	15.9%	100.0%
	Parents	Count	8	82	10	100
		% within Relationship	8.0%	82.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	Siblings/ Children	Count	7	28	2	37
		% within Relationship	18.9%	75.7%	5.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	23	197	30	250
		% within Relationship	9.2%	78.8%	12.0%	100.0%

$(\chi^2 = 7.858, p > 0.05)$

**Association between Imprisonment length and the Socioeconomic factor**

Imprisonment length is expected to bring about a change in the lives of the respondents and how they are treated by the society. Hence an association between the variables socioeconomic factor on the Imprisonment length of stay in prison was examined.

**Imprisonment length and social factors**

From the data, it can be observed that out of the 250 respondents, there were only 6 whose relative were in prison for less than one year, while 88 were in prison for 2-4 years, 53 for 5-7 years and 103 for more than 7 years in prison. The relatives of all of the incarcerated were affected socially by the imprisonment. In the group <1 year of imprisonment, all of them agreed that they were affected socially, followed by 2-4 years and 5-7 years (98%) each, who either agreed or strongly agreed on social effect. Around 80% of relatives of >7 years imprisonment reported that they were affected socially. This result suggests that as the time increases, they may be slowly accepted by the society; hence the ostracization by the society reduces. The difference between these groups were highly significant ( $\chi^2 = 33.051, p = .000$ ).

**Table: Crosstabulations on Imprisonment length and Social factors**

			Social			Total	
			Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree		
Imprisoned length	<1 years	Count	0	6	0	6	
		% within Imprisoned length	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
	2-4 years	Count	1	78	9	88	
		% within Imprisoned length	1.1%	88.6%	10.2%	100.0%	
	5-7 years	Count	1	40	12	53	
		% within Imprisoned length	1.9%	75.5%	22.6%	100.0%	
	>7 years	Count	21	73	9	103	
		% within Imprisoned length	20.4%	70.9%	8.7%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	23	197	30	250
			% within Imprisoned length	9.2%	78.8%	12.0%	100.0%

$\chi^2 = 33.051, p = .000$



**4.1. Hypotheses testing**

To conduct the regression analysis, the average of the items in the constructs was used. Hypotheses are considered to be true when standardized co-efficient ( $\beta$ ) are significant, i.e., the p value should be less than 0.05 at 95% confidence level.

*Hypothesis 1: The length of incarceration of an individual has a negative impact on the socio-economic wellbeing of the family members.*

**4.1.1. Impact of length of incarceration Socio economic factor**

*Hypothesis 1: The length of incarceration of an individual has a negative impact on the socioeconomic wellbeing of the family members.*

Linear regression was conducted to find the impact of length of incarceration on the socioeconomic well-being of the family members. The results suggest that short term imprisonment affected the respondents more than the long term imprisonment. With r2 value as 0.103, it could be reported that 10.3% of the variation that arises in the socioeconomic well-being of the respondents related to short term imprisonment. This relationship was also found to be significant at  $p=0.000$  ( $F = 14.081$ ). Further, the beta coefficient value of .138 suggest that for an increase in one unit of Imprisonment term would increase .138 times of socioeconomic factor. On the other hand, the long term imprisonment had a r2 value of 0.004 and was also not significant.

Model Summary										
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change	F
Long term	.064 <sup>a</sup>	.004	-.004	.32657	.004	.499	1	123	.481	
Short term	.320 <sup>a</sup>	.103	.095	.29738	.103	14.081	1	123	.000	

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
Long term	(Constant)	3.900	.223		17.520	.000
	Imprisoned_term_LT	.042	.060	.064	.706	.481
Short term	(Constant)	3.326	.089		37.163	.000
	Imprisoned_term_ST	.138	.037	.320	3.752	.000

**V. CONCLUSION: SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACT**

After the imprisonment of prisoners, their family members often get pushed to take on multiple responsibilities and roles, especially if the imprisoned family member used to play an active financial role in the household (Dickie, 2013).

Spouse and parents were found to be equally socially affected, in terms of relationship, with wives being slightly more affected. They had informed the children about the parent's incarceration. On the other hand, though the siblings/children are affected, the rigour has been considerably lesser. Spouses of long-term prisoners had taken new partner, as long-term incarceration might have put pressure on the spouses to look for means to support their families in terms of financial, emotional and physical support, which could have made them get associated to a new partner. But, in case of respondents of short-term prisoners, the rate was very low which could be due to the short duration of the imprisonment. In terms of length of imprisonment, the relatives of prisoners with less than one year of imprisonment were more affected socially. But with an increase in length of imprisonment there was seen less effect on the social factors, as they might be slowly getting accepted by the society, hence the ostracisation by the society reduced.

Family members, especially wives, often experience family discord, poverty, police contact, domestic violence, substance abuse, and other criminal behaviour (Johnston, 1995). Thus, incarceration further worsens a relationship which was already troubled. The incarceration of partner gives a spouse an opportunity to break ties with the prisoner, with whom there was already a history of issues (Johnson & Waldfogel, 2002). A study in accordance with the present study showed that many prisoners lose contact with their families as they do not want to be in touch with them during their incarceration and many of married inmates got either divorced or separated (Salmon, 2007).

Most of the respondents of both long-term and short-term incarcerated were living in a rented house, showing weak financial stability. One of the social problem is that a person when convicted is often forced by

the neighbours of the incarcerated family to vacate their house. Most of the relatives of the incarcerated with long-term imprisonment were forced to shift houses 1-3 times in the last year. Among the respondents related to short-term sentenced persons, a large number of respondents said that they had to shift their houses 1-3 times in the past year. Similar finding was observed by Noble (1995) which showed that imprisonment of a partner cause home move by the family resulting in instability.

The majority of respondents related to long-term term sentenced persons fell within the salary bandwidth of Rs.4000-6000 per month, while in case of short-term prisoners' respondents the salary bandwidth was between Rs.7000-9000 per month. Although, the monthly expenditure of most of the respondents of both long-term and short-term prisoners had monthly expenditures more than their monthly income. Their earning capacity has drastically reduced after relative's incarceration as the convict was the sole breadwinner of the family, thus the additional financial burden came on their shoulders.

Imprisonment imposes a financial struggle on the prisoners' families by reducing the family income, but increasing family expenditure due to court trials, costly phone calls and prison visits, and handing in money for them. Imprisonment, thus, can further aggravate already existing socioeconomic disadvantage (Houchin, 2005). This situation is further compounded by the non-cooperation of other relatives and neighbours who are reluctant to help them. The financial impact is not limited to the immediate family members. The grandparents who take care of the children of the inmates also experience severe financial problems (Codd, 2008).

### **Policy implications of the research**

- Since it is evident from the study that the respondents faced economic distress post incarceration of the family member, programs for educating the prisoners and work programs that allow the prisoners to work during their prison time, which will help them in supporting themselves as well as supporting the economic condition of their homes are required.
- It is seen from the study that the consequences of incarceration extend to all social members associated with the convict. Therefore, policies relating to remanding the prisoners should be in such a way that the delinquent detention of prisoners for extended periods of time can be avoided.

### **REFERENCE**

- [1]. Codd, H. (2008). *In the Shadow of Prison: Families, Imprisonment and Criminal Justice*. Willan, Cullompton, Devon.
- [2]. Houchin, R. (2005). *Social exclusion and imprisonment in Scotland*. Glasgow: Glasgow Caledonian University.
- [3]. Johnson, E., Waldfogel, J. (2002). Parental incarceration: Recent trends and implications for child welfare. *Social Services Review*, 76 (3), 460-479.
- [4]. Salmon, S. (2007). *Memorandum submitted by Action for Prisoners' Families*. Selected Committee on Home Affairs. Written evidence, June 2007. <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200607/cmselect/cmconst/467/467we02.htm>.
- [5]. Johnston, D. (1995). Parent-child visits in jails. *Children's Environments*, 12, 25-38.
- [6]. Dickie, D. (2013). Families Outside. The Financial Impact of Imprisonment on Families. Available from: <http://www.familiesoutside.org.uk/content/uploads/2013/10/financial-impact-imprisonment-families.pdf>.
- [7]. Shaw, R. (1987) *Children of Imprisoned Fathers*. Bungay, Suffolk: Richard Clay Publishing.
- [8]. Morris, P. (1965) *Prisoners and their Families*. Woking: Unwin Brothers.
- [9]. Anderson, N.N. (1966) *Prisoners' Families: A Study of Family Crisis*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota.
- [10]. Ferraro, K., Johnson, J., Jorgensen, S. and Bolton, F.G. (1983) 'Problems of prisoners' families: The hidden costs of imprisonment', *Journal of Family Issues*, 4, 575-591.
- [11]. McEvoy, K., O'Mahony, D., Horner, C. and Lyner, O. (1999) 'The home front: The families of politically motivated prisoners in Northern Ireland', *British Journal of Criminology*, 39 (2), 175-197.
- [12]. Noble, C. (1995) *Prisoners' Families: The Everyday Reality*. Ipswich: Ormiston Children and Families Trust.
- [13]. Richards, M., McWilliams, B., Allcock, L., Enterkin, J., Owens, P. And Woodrow, J. (1994) *The Family Ties of English Prisoners: The Results of the Cambridge Project on Imprisonment and Family Ties*. Cambridge: Centre for Family Research, Cambridge University.
- [14]. Schneller, D.P. (1976) *The Prisoner's Family: A Study of the Effects of Imprisonment on the Families of Prisoners*. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates.
- [15]. Sharp, S.F. and Marcus-Mendoza, S.T. (2001) 'It's a family affair: Incarcerated women and their families', *Women and Criminal Justice*, 12, 21-50.
- [16]. Peart, K. and Asquith, S. (1992) *Scottish Prisoners and their Families: The Impact of Imprisonment on Family Relationships*. Glasgow: Centre for the Study of the Child and Society, University of Glasgow.

- [17]. Donald Braman,. (2004) *Doing Time on the Outside: Incarceration and Family Life in Urban America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- [18]. Rose Smith, Roger Grimshaw, Renee Romeo and Martin Knapp, *Poverty and Disadvantage among Prisoners' Families*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2007, p. 70.

IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) is UGC approved Journal with Sl. No. 5070, Journal no. 49323.

Chandrakala T Halemani. "Socioeconomic Impact of Imprisonment on Prisoner's Family: A Study of Central Prisoner, Dharwad of Karnataka State." *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* , vol. 22, no. 8, 2017, pp. 20–30.