



# University of HUDDERSFIELD

## University of Huddersfield Repository

Manby, Martin and Jones, Adele

COPING: Children of Prisoners, Interventions and Mitigations to Strengthen Mental Health. Perspectives of Children, Parents and Carers – Survey Analysis Results

### Original Citation

Manby, Martin and Jones, Adele (2011) COPING: Children of Prisoners, Interventions and Mitigations to Strengthen Mental Health. Perspectives of Children, Parents and Carers – Survey Analysis Results. Research Report. University of Huddersfield.

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/22476/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk](mailto:E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk).

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>



# D1.1

## Survey Analysis Results – 200 Surveys

**Nature:** Report

**Dissemination Level:** Public

### Owner

**Name:** COPING  
**Lead Beneficiary:** University of Huddersfield  
**Phone:** 00 44 (0)1484 473237  
**E-mail:** [a.d.jones@hud.ac.uk](mailto:a.d.jones@hud.ac.uk)

### Context

**Author(s):**  
**Work Package:** WP1  
**Task:** Complete Report

### Document Status

**Version:** 00.01  
**Last modified:** 01.09.11  
**Status:** Final  
**Approved by:**  
**Date Approved:**

# Table of Contents

	page
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Methodology</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Results</b>	
3. United Kingdom .....	<b>6</b>
4. Germany .....	<b>11</b>
5. Romania .....	<b>16</b>
6. Sweden .....	<b>20</b>
<b>7. Conclusions</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>27</b>
Appendix 1 UK tables	
Appendix 2 Germany tables	
Appendix 3 Romania tables	
Appendix 4 Sweden tables	

## 1. Introduction

This document comprises the final reports (*D1.1 Survey Analysis Results – 200 Surveys*) on work package 1 (WP1) - *Identification of suitable cohorts of children* – in Germany, Romania, Sweden and the UK. (In the interest of brevity the term ‘child’ is used in this report to refer to both children and young people i.e. persons under the age of 18 years.) The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the manner in which the research has progressed and the key findings emerging from the study.

The objectives of WP1 were to:

‘a) assess the mental health characteristics of the children of prisoners and b) identify a cohort of children of prisoners in the four countries for the qualitative interview process of WP2’ (*Document of Work*, p. 34).

WP1 took the form of a questionnaire-based survey among the children of prisoners and their non-imprisoned parents/carers. It was originally envisaged that WP1 would comprise administration of the Goodman *Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire* (Goodman, 1997) and the Rosenberg *Self-Esteem Scale* (Rosenberg, 1989) to children aged 11-16 years, and the collection of more general information from these children and their non-imprisoned parents/carers. This more general information was to cover: the characteristics of the imprisoned parents/carers; risk and protective factors in the lives of the children; and resilience amongst these children.

It was decided, during the planning stage of WP1, that the information collected in this phase of the research should be more wide-ranging and ambitious than was originally envisaged. This was to ensure that WP1 was as valuable as possible – in terms of the amount of data it generated – but also to ensure that sufficient analysis could be carried out of the various causes, effects and mitigating factors that might exist in the lives of children of prisoners. The categories under which information is being collected are outlined below (under Methodology).

There were a small number of other quite substantial changes to the original methodology. These changes and the reasons for them are as follows:

- The age range of the children taking part in WP1 was extended from 11-16 years to 7-17 years. The primary reason for this was to enable the COPING project to comment upon the mental health of a considerably larger section of the child population.
- A deliberate effort was made to recruit, into the survey, children who were in state care. The reason for this was that it was felt that this group might have particularly acute issues in terms of parental/carer imprisonment but might otherwise be missed if we used only the standard recruitment policy (described below).
- The target number of children taking part in the survey (in each country) was raised from 200 to 250. This was on the advice of the EC reviewers who had assessed the research proposal – their belief being that this would increase the statistical power of the study.

This stage of the COPING research has proved very demanding. This was partly due to the time it took to devise and agree the research instruments, but also the time it took to gain ethical approval. Each of these was more problematic owing to the nature of the research sample, and in particular the fact it included a) children, and b) families where there was a parent/carer in prison. This meant the sample was especially vulnerable and considerably greater care had to be taken in devising the research methodology and in gaining ethical approval. (This process has, however, been a valuable learning experience, and COPING will be disseminating this experience by means of a paper in a peer-reviewed journal. This paper – which is currently being drafted - will examine the different approaches and responses to ethical issues in the four participating countries, and across the EU more generally. It is believed that this paper will be a valuable resource to other social science researcher in the EU and beyond.)

Despite these challenges, the COPING team, have between them, gathered a substantial body of data on the mental health and the more general well-being of children, in four EU states, who have a parent/carer in prison. There are some similarities between the situation of these children in each of the four countries but also important differences. We are confident that the results of the COPING research can and will be used to raise awareness of these children's situation but also to improve policy and practice in the four countries concerned but also across the EU as a whole.

Originally, COPING was required to produce four separate deliverables for the final report stage of WP1 (D1.2, 1.4, 1.6 and 1.8). We have since been asked to produce a single document, containing all of these deliverables. This report comprises, therefore, separate reports from each country. Each of these country specific reports contains an outline of the exact methodology that was used, followed by an overview of the major findings from that country. All of the tables and figures used in this report have been placed in appendices. This is to avoid the main body of the report being overly long.

## 2. Methodology

In the interests of brevity, this section of the report provides a general outline of the methodology that was used across the whole of the COPING project but particularly in the UK (who were the work package leaders for this stage of the research). The German, Romanian and Swedish reports contain further details on the particular methodology used in their country and the way in which it has diverged from this general plan.

### 2.1 Sample

The original intention had been to select a purposive sample of children but one that was stratified according to the following criteria: children's gender; and the gender and ethnicity of the imprisoned parent/carers. In terms of children's gender, we have recruited a fairly even balance of boys and girls. We did, however, have to strive to manipulate our choice of prisons to ensure an appropriate mix of imprisoned parents/carers in terms of ethnicity and even more so in respect of gender.

Other than the above, though, we have relied quite heavily upon convenience sampling to recruit children and their non-imprisoned parents/carers. This is largely because of the practical difficulties we have encountered in recruiting sufficient numbers of individuals into the survey. These difficulties will be discussed more fully in subsequent publications. The method by which the sample was recruited will be taken into account in subsequent analysis of the data.

### 2.2 Instrument

The structure of the child and the non-imprisoned parent/carer questionnaires is shown in Figure 1, with individual topics listed in the order in which they appeared in the questionnaires (see Appendix 1). As is clear from Figure 1, the child, and even more so the parent/carer questionnaires, were, in terms of topics covered, quite substantial and wide-ranging.

### 2.3 Procedure

Most of the children and their non-imprisoned parents/carers were recruited via approaches made, first, to the non-imprisoned parent/carer when they were visiting the imprisoned parent/carer in prison. These approaches were made in prison visiting centres. If a parent/carer was willing for his/her child to take part in the survey, then an approach was made to the child. Children and parents/carers sometimes completed their questionnaires while they waited to visit the imprisoned parent/carer. Questionnaires were, though, completed and returned under a quite wide range of circumstances. These included:

- Children and parents/carers taking questionnaires home with them and then returning them, completed, on their next visits.

- Children and parents/carers taking questionnaires home with them and then returning them, completed, through the post.
- Children and parents/carers attending the offices of the key voluntary organisation in this research (POPS) and completing questionnaires in that setting.
- Fieldworkers, especially those from the University, visiting children and their parents/carers in their homes and administering questionnaires in that setting.
- Fieldworkers approaching prisoners directly (in face-to-face meetings in prison) to ask them whether they thought their children and the children's non-imprisoned parent/carer might take part in the research.
- Prison staff making the above request of prisoners.
- In the latter stages of the research, we approached additional voluntary organisations, working with prisoners' families, and asked them to identify families to take part in the survey and/or administer the questionnaire.

The fieldwork for WP1 began in October 2010 and finished at the end of August 2011.

#### 2.4 Analysis

All of this data was inputted and analysed via SPSS version 18.

## 3. UK

### Results

At the time this report was being prepared, around the middle of August 2011, 445 questionnaires had been completed, 251 from children and 194 from parents/carers. The overlap between these questionnaires, in terms of whether they came from the same or different families, is shown in Table 1 (see Appendix 1). Questionnaires were completed by both the child(ren) and the parent/carer in more than two-thirds (68.6%) of families. There were, though, a notable minority of families (26.5%) where just the child(ren) completed questionnaires

The subsequent analysis is based upon the questionnaires that have been inputted into the SPSS database thus far: 229 child questionnaires and 174 parent/carer questionnaires.

#### Child questionnaire

##### Socio-demographic characteristics

###### 3.1 Gender

The sample comprised almost equal proportions of males (51.1%) and females (48.9%) (Table 2).

###### 3.2 Age

There was a fairly even spread of children in terms of their ages (Table 3a). The mean age of all children in the sample was 11.58 years (standard deviation (SD) 2.94 years) (n=228), although the mean age of the females was marginally higher than the mean age of the males (11.84 years compared to 11.59 years) (n=234) (Table 3b).

###### 3.3 Ethnicity

With regards to ethnicity, 87.6% of children were White, 4.9% Asian and 3.1% Black, with 4.4% being of mixed ethnic origin (Table 4). Also provided in Table 4 are the relative proportions of the various ethnic groups in the UK population, as a whole, as measured in the 2001 census (Office of National Statistics, 2011). The UK COPING sample contains a slightly higher proportion of children from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups than are present in the UK general population (12.4% and 8.0% respectively).

###### 3.4 Specific well-being issues

Children were asked whether they had 'a long-term disability, illness, medical condition or special need'. These conditions are, for the purposes of this report, collected together under the generic term 'specific well-being issues'. A fairly notable minority of the children (14.2%), reported that they had at least one such specific well-being issue (Table 5). (The four major types of condition we asked about will be reported upon separately in our planned publications.)

##### Aspects of parental/carer imprisonment

###### 3.5 Contact with imprisoned parent/carer

A large majority of children had contact with their imprisoned parents/carers. Of the 228 children for whom we have this information, 216 of them (94.7%) of them had some sort of contact, whether this was in the form of, for example, visits, telephone calls or letters (Table 6).

### 3.6 Effects of parental/carer imprisonment

When asked whether their parent/carer being in prison had had any *bad* effect for them, 110 children (48.5%) reported that it had, 74 (32.6%) that it had not with 43 (18.9%) indicated that they were *not sure* (Table 7a).

Of the 205 children who answered the question, 142 (69.3%) reported that the imprisonment of their parent/carer had not any *good* effect for them, compared to 10.2% (n=21) of children who believed it had (Table 7b). The remainder of children (n=42, 20.5%) were unsure whether parental imprisonment had had any positive consequences.

### 3.7 Receipt of help regarding parental/carer imprisonment

69.8% of children in the sample indicated that they had received some form of help in relation to their parent/carer being in prison (Table 8). Future analysis will explore who provided this help (for example, family members, statutory agencies or non-governmental organisations) and in relation to what areas of the child's life (for instance, leisure activities, emotions and behaviour).

## Mental health and well-being

### 3.8 Strengths and difficulties

The self-report Goodman (1997) *Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire* (SDQ) is a behavioural screening instrument which elicits children and young peoples' perceptions of their conduct, concentration, emotions and social relationships. The SDQ comprises 25 items in total with five items loading onto each of the five subscales: *Emotional Symptoms*; *Conduct Problems*; *Hyperactivity*; *Peer Problems*; and a *Prosocial Scale*. Scores on all five subscales range from 0-10. A higher score on the first four subscales indicates greater difficulties in that area. The *Prosocial Scale* measures the extent to which children are providing socially desirable answers with higher scores indicating greater social desirability.

The self-report SDQ is designed for use with children 'aged around 11-16' years, of whom there were 125 in our sample. Mean subscale scores for the current sample, followed by SDs in brackets, were: *Emotional Symptoms* 2.32 (2.14); *Conduct Problems* 2.32 (1.80); *Hyperactivity* 3.98 (2.38); *Peer Problems* 1.86 (1.65); and the *Prosocial Scale* 7.50 (1.97) (Table 9a). Eventually, subscales scores will be compared with normative data in order to assess the level of difficulties experienced by children with a parent/carer against children in the general population.

The *Total Difficulties Score* is calculated by summing all of the subscales except the *Prosocial Scale*. Potential scores range from 0-40 with a higher score indicating greater difficulties overall. Children in the current sample produced a mean *Total Difficulties* score of 10.47 (5.92) (Table 9a).

The *Total Difficulties* score can be compared to normative population ranges to provide an indication of the likelihood that the child or young person will display mental health problems. Individuals with a score falling in the 'normal' range are unlikely to display mental health problems, those in the 'borderline' range have a slightly raised risk of experiencing mental health problems, whilst scores in the 'abnormal' range indicate substantial likelihood of mental health problems. 80.8% (n=101) of children's scores in our sample fell in the 'normal' range, 10.4% (n=13) in the 'borderline' range and 8.8% (n=11) in the 'abnormal' range (Table 9b). Approximately one-fifth (19.2%) of the sample could be said to be at some heightened risk of experiencing mental health problems.

### 3.9 Self-esteem

The self-report Rosenberg (1989) *Self-Esteem Scale* (SES) provides an indication of children and young peoples' perceived levels of self-esteem. The scale consists of ten items which are summed to produce an overall score ranging from 10-40 with higher scores indicating higher levels of self-esteem. Children in this sample had a mean score of 30.78 (SD 5.40) falling in the upper third of



potential scores, suggesting relatively high self-esteem, although these data will eventually need to be compared with normative population data.

The children's SES scores were broken down into three broadly equal groups based upon the raw SES score (Table 10). Just over one-half (56%) of all the children were in the highest group (scores 30-40), with only 6 children (2.7%) in the lowest group (scores 10-19). Over four in ten children (41.3%), though, did record intermediate SES scores (20-29).

### 3.10 Quality of life

The *KIDSCREEN* self-report instrument elicits children and young peoples' ratings of their health and well-being. The *KIDSCREEN-27* instrument comprises 27 items which load onto five dimensions. The number of items on each dimension varies and a higher score indicates more positive health and well-being. The mean score for each dimension was as follows: *Physical Well-being* 20.03 (SD 3.90), *Psychological Well-being* 28.66 (SD 4.65), *Autonomy and Parent Relation* 28.19 (SD 5.86), *Social Support and Peers* 17.03 (SD 3.33) and *School Environment* 15.05 (SD 4.02) (Table 11a). Raw scores will be compared with normative data to explore children of prisoners' subjective health and well-being in relation to that of the general population.

The children's five health-related quality of life scores were broken down into a number of broadly equal groups based upon raw *KIDSCREEN* scores (Table 11b). In general, large majorities of children were in each of the highest groups of *KIDSCREEN* scores. For example, 79.5% of children were in the top one-third of scores for the quality of life in terms of *Social Support & Peers*. There was one area where children appeared to score relatively less well, with 10.0% of children being in the lowest of the three groups for quality of life in respect of *School Environment*.

## Non-imprisoned parent/carer questionnaire

### Non-imprisoned parent/carer

#### 3.11 Relationship to child

The large majority (78.6%) of the non-imprisoned parents/carers taking part in the survey were the children's birth parents (Table 12a). The remaining parents/carers comprised much smaller proportions from other groups, including grandparents (10.4%) and step-parents (5.2%).

The largest single group of non-imprisoned parents/carers comprised the children's birth mothers, accounting for almost three-quarters approximately (72.9%) of all parents/carer respondents (Table 12b). The next largest group of respondents consisted of birth fathers but these made up only 5.3% of all non-imprisoned parents/carers.

#### 3.12 Quality of life

The *World Health Organisation Quality of Life Scale* (Brief version, WHOQOL-26) was administered to non-imprisoned parents/carers to obtain self-reported perceptions of their own quality of life. The WHOQOL consists of 26 items, with higher scores indicating more positive health and well-being. The first two items regarding *Overall Perception of Quality of Life* and *Overall Perception of Quality of Health* are examined separately. Potential scores range from 1-5 and the current sample produced a mean of 3.54 for overall quality of life and 3.62 for overall quality of health (SD 0.90 and 1.06 respectively) (Table 13a). The remaining 24 items load onto four domains which are multiplied by four to make them comparable to the full WHOQOL-100. Mean domain scores, with SDs in brackets, were as follows: *Physical Health* 15.22 (3.26); *Psychological Well-being* 14.01 (3.04); *Social Relationships* 13.63 (3.94); and *Environment* 14.40 (2.80). All items can be summed to produce a Total Scale Score, which for the current sample had a mean of 91.87 and SD of 18.61. Eventually sample scores will be related to normative data to enable a comparison to be made between the quality of life of non-imprisoned parent/carers and that of the general population.

The quality of life of the non-imprisoned parents/carers, as measured on all of the dimensions listed in Table 13b, was generally good. For example, over one-half (58.6%) of this group scored 4 or 5 (out of a maximum of 5) on *Overall perception of quality of life*. There was some variation with. For instance, non-imprisoned parent/carers appeared to score relatively poorly in terms of *Social Relationships*, with more than a quarter of this group (28.7%) being in the lowest two of the four bandings on this measure.

## Imprisoned parent/carer

### 3.13 Relationship to child

The large majority (72.8%) of the imprisoned parents/carers were the children's birth parents (Table 14a). The only other group of any appreciable size was step-parents making up just over one-tenth (12.7%) of all imprisoned parents/carers.

Just over one-half of all imprisoned parents/carers (56.8%) were the children's birth fathers (Table 14b). The next largest group were birth mothers (16.6%). The only other group of any notable size were step-fathers accounting for 13.0% of all imprisoned parents/carers.

### 3.14 Gender

The large majority of imprisoned parents/carers (83.5%) were male (Table 15). Although only a relatively small minority of the imprisoned parents/carers were female (16.5%), the proportion is considerably higher than that of females in the UK prison population overall (4.9%) (Ministry of Justice, 2011).

### 3.15 Time spent in prison

Non-imprisoned parents/carers were asked to report on the amount of time the imprisoned parent/carer had spent in prison, to date, combining any period on remand with any period since being sentenced. Imprisoned parents/carers (n=168) had spent an average of 25.14 months (SD 32.24 months) in custody so far on their current sentence or period of remand. The minimum and maximum periods of imprisonment among these parents/carers was 1 and 180 months (15 years) respectively.

### 3.16 Current reason for imprisonment

Drugs offences (34.4%) and physical assault (18.9%) were the most frequently reported reasons for imprisonment, by far, accounting for more than one-half (68.85) of all charges against imprisoned parents/carer (Table 16).

## Child

### 3.17 Contact with imprisoned parent/carer

98.3% of parents/carers indicated that their child had some form of contact with the imprisoned parent/carer. This could include visits, telephone calls or letters (Table 17). This figure is very close to the 94.7% figure for children who reported that they had contact with their imprisoned parent/carer.

### 3.18 Effects of parental/carer imprisonment

When parents/carers were asked whether the imprisonment of a parent/carer had had any *bad* effects for their child, 51.7% indicated that it had compared to 29.1% who indicated it had not (Table 18a). The remaining parents/carers (19.2%) were unsure whether parental imprisonment had had any negative consequences for their child. When compared to the children's responses, it can be seen that there was little overall difference between children's and parent/carer's reports of negative consequences.

71.3% of parents/carers reported that the imprisonment of a parent/carer had not produced any *good* effects for their child, compared to 14.4% that thought it had (Table 18b). The remaining parents/carers (14.4%) were unsure whether parental imprisonment had had any positive consequences. When compared to children's own responses, it can be seen that there was little overall difference between children's and parent/carer's reports of positive consequences.

### 3.19 Needs

Non-imprisoned parents/carers were asked to indicate whether in the last three months their child had required help in one of 34 areas broadly relating to social contact and free time, school or work, parental imprisonment, psychological health, physical health, housing, self care, money and communication (Table 19). Parents/carers reported relatively high levels of need in a number of specific areas. These included: *spending time with family* (47.9% needed help); *visiting imprisoned parents/carers* (47.2%); *following rules at school or work* (44.1%); and *general psychological problems* (22.1%).

### 3.20 Strengths and difficulties

The parent/carer *Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire* (SDQ) was used to elicit parent/carers' perceptions of their child's conduct, concentration, emotions and social relationships. The instrument and scoring is identical to that of the self-report scale. Given that the self-report SDQ is not suitable for children aged under 11, the informant SDQ can be used as a substitute. The informant SDQ can also be used to complement the self-report SDQ for children aged 11+. Mean scores for the current sample, with standard deviations in brackets, are as follows: *Emotional Symptoms* 2.52 (2.28); *Conduct Problems* 2.36 (1.92); *Hyperactivity* 3.94 (2.40); *Peer Problems* 2.24 (1.76); and the *Prosocial Scale* 7.69 (2.09) (Table 20a). Eventually subscales scores will be related to normative data to enable comparisons to be made between non-imprisoned parent/carers and parents/carers in the general population in terms of their respective ratings of their children's strengths and difficulties.

As with the self-report item, the *Total Difficulties Score* can be compared to normative population ranges to provide an indication of the likelihood that the child or young person will display mental health problems. 64.7% of parents scored their child in the normal 'range' indicating mental health problems are unlikely, 16.8% in the 'borderline' range suggesting moderate likelihood of problems, and 18.5% - almost one in five - in the 'abnormal' range indicating substantial likelihood of problems (Table 20b).

### 3.21 Quality of life

The informant *KIDSCREEN-27* instrument provides an indication of the parent/carers perception of their child's health and well-being. The instrument and scoring is identical to that of the self-report scale. The mean score for each dimension, with SD in brackets, was as follows: *Physical Well-being* 20.44 (SD 3.74); *Psychological Well-being* 27.47 (SD 4.88); *Autonomy & Parent Relation* 27.30 (SD 5.44); *Social Support & Peers* 15.35 (SD 3.74); and *School Environment* 14.98 (SD 3.93) (Table 21a). Raw scores will be compared with normative data to explore the perceptions of parent/carers' of children who have a parent/carer in prison in relation to the general population.

Non-imprisoned parents/carers generally rated the children's well-being quite highly. For example, almost two-thirds (64.7%) placed their children's *Physical well-being* in the top grouping (scores 20-25) (Table 21b). There was some variation in well-being scores. For instance, almost one-tenth (9.4%) of children were placed in the lowest of the three groups for *School environment* (scores 4-9).

## 4. Germany

### 4.1 Introduction

This report provides an overview about previous activities during work package 1 (WP1) and of key findings emerging from the research of WP1.

The partnership in Germany comprised the NGO Treffpunkt e.V. - TREFF - based in Nuremberg (Bavaria) and the Technical University of Dresden – TUD - (Saxony). The fieldwork administration is carried out by TREFF, with TUD being responsible for the data management, analyses and the evaluation.

TREFF cooperated with prisons throughout Bavaria to identify potential participants. TREFF provided the prisons with posters and information cards to publicise and explain the research. The posters were displayed in the visitor waiting rooms, in the rooms reserved for visits and in the prison itself.

TREFF was present on visiting days in the prisons to recruit the non-imprisoned parent and hopefully the child also. If the child was not present at visiting time, TREFF gave the questionnaire to the parent/carer to take them home. TREFF also tried to acquire participants with the help of family workshops and father-child groups in the prison.

TREFF provided counselling centres throughout Germany with posters, information cards and questionnaires, and also talked to staff in these centres about strategies for recruiting children and parents.

TREFF inserted a call-up with a request to support COPING in the newsletter of the Federal Association for delinquents. This newsletter reaches many counselling centres in Germany.

TREFF participated in a local radio show, which explicitly addresses prisoners and their families. This radio show airs in prison, so that family and friends can send letters and email and have their greetings and wishes read out. TREFF started a call-up with a request to contact TREFF and to participate in Coping.

TREFF has launched a call-up with a request on it's own website, which is appealing directly to members asking them to participate. In order to reduce inhibitions and to guarantee anonymity TREFF provided the questionnaire as download on it's website.

TREFF has launched call-ups with requests on different relevant websites addressing families of prisoners.

TREFF, being a counselling centre itself, also recruited participants from its own database.

TUD conducted the data analysis for this report.

### 4.2 Methodology

Surveys of 143 children in Germany with an imprisoned parent were investigated, using the German versions of the KIDSCREEN-27 (Child Version, The KIDSCREEN Group, 2004), the Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (SES, Ferring & Filipp 1996, v. Collani & Herzberg, 2003 rev.) to ascertain their coping strategies and mental health problems.

The non-imprisoned parents/carers were asked to rate their child using the Kindscreen-27 (Parent Version) and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ, Goodman 1997, parent version), and to rate themselves using The World Health Organization Quality of Life (WHOQOL)-BREF.

Further data were gained about socio-demographic information, situation of the children, their

relationship to the incarcerated parent/carer, school, family relationships, prison visits, imprisonment, effects of imprisonment on the child, special needs, help received and satisfaction with help, and children's views of their future.

The data were subject to preliminary analysis by means of frequency analyses, and calculations of means and standard deviations (SD).

## 4.3 Results

### Child questionnaire

#### Socio-demographic characteristics

##### 4.3.1 Gender

The sample of 143 children comprised an almost equal proportion of males and females (Table 1) (see Appendix 2).

##### 4.3.2 Age

There was a fairly even spread of children in terms of their ages (Table 2a). The mean age of all children in the sample was 11.13 years (SD 3.14, range 7-20 years), the mean age did not differ between male and female children (11.10 years vs. 11.13 years) (Table 2b).

##### 4.3.3 Ethnicity, nationality or country of birth

In Germany the children were not asked about their ethnicity, but regarding rather their nationality. The large majority of children were German (88.1%) but there were a range of other nationalities represented in the survey (Table 3).

##### 4.3.4 Specific well-being issues

Children were asked whether they had a specific long-term disability or medical condition. The majority of approximately 80% reported, that they have no such known well-being issue (Table 4).

#### Aspects of parental/carer imprisonment

##### 4.3.5 Contact with imprisoned parent/carer

The large majority of children (93.5%) have contact, such as visits or letters, with their imprisoned parent/carer (Table 5).

##### 4.3.6 Effects of parental imprisonment

When asked, whether the imprisonment had had any bad effects for them, more than half of children (54%) reported that it had (Table 6a). For 67.2% children the imprisonment had not had any good effects for them (Table 6b). But on the other hand, 17.5% of the children indicated, that the imprisonment in fact affected their lives in a positive way.

##### 4.3.7 Help regarding parental/carer imprisonment

The majority of children (87.1%) received help in one form or another (Table 7). Future analysis will provide a deeper insight into this topic.

## Mental health and well-being

### 4.3.8 SDQ Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire

The *Total Difficulties Score* is calculated by summing all of the subscales except the *Prosocial Scale*. Potential scores range from 0-40 with a higher score indicating greater difficulties overall. Children in the current sample produced a mean *Total Difficulties* score of 12.46 (SD 5.80, range 1-31) (Table 8a).

The *Total Difficulties* score can be compared to normative population ranges to provide an indication of the likelihood that the child or young person will display mental health problems. Individuals with a score falling in the 'normal' range are unlikely to display mental health problems, those in the 'borderline' range have a slightly raised score and are more likely to experience mental health problems, whilst scores in the 'abnormal' range indicate substantial likelihood of mental health problems. 74.5% of children's scores in our sample fell in the 'normal' range, 12.0% in the 'borderline' range and 13.5% in the 'abnormal' range (Table 8a). A quarter of the German sample (25.5%) could be said to be at some heightened risk of experiencing mental health problems.

### 4.3.9 Self-Esteem Scale (SES)

The mean SES score of all children in the sample was 31.86 (SD 5.34, range 17-40, N=138). In male children it was 32.50 (SD 5.26, range 18-40, n=70) and in female children it was 31.09 (SD 5.43, range 17-40, n=66). Table 9 shows the frequencies for the SES Score distribution.

### 4.3.10 KIDSCREEN questionnaires (quality of life)

KIDSCREEN measures a variety of dimensions of quality of life. As is shown in Table 10a, the children rated themselves quite highly on most measures. The children's five health-related quality of life scores were broken down into a number of broadly equal groups based upon raw KIDSCREEN scores (Table 10b). In general, large majorities of children were in each of the highest groups of KIDSCREEN scores. For example, considerably two-thirds of the children (66.4%) was in the top one-third of scores for the quality of life in terms of *Social Support & Peers*.

## Non-imprisoned parent/carer questionnaire

### 4.3.11 Non-imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child

Almost all of the non-imprisoned parent/carers (91.3%) were the birth parents of the children (Table 11a). The large majority of non-imprisoned parents/carers were the children's birth mothers (Table 11b).

### 4.3.12 WHO overall Quality of Life score

The non-imprisoned parents/carers were asked to report on their perceptions of their own life quality using the World Health Organisation *Quality of Life Scale (WHOQOL-26)*. The WHOQOL consists of 26 items, with higher scores indicating more positive health and well-being. Potential scores range from 1-5 and the current sample produced a mean of 3.18 for overall quality of life and a mean of 3.05 for overall quality of health (Table 12a).

The imprisoned parents/carers WHOQOL raw scores are grouped into a number of broadly equal groups (Table 12b). As is evident from Table 12b, many parents/carers were in the higher ranked groups. For example more than one quarter of all parents/carers (27.1%) were in the top band for *Environment* (scoring 15-20). However, there were some exceptions to this. For example, almost one-third of respondents (31.2%) were in the lower groups for *Psychological Well-being* (scoring 4-10.99).

## Imprisoned parent/carer

### *4.3.13 Imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child*

The large majority (76.8%) of the imprisoned parents/carers were the children's birth parents (Table 13a). The majority (69.6%) of the children had their birth fathers in prison (Table 13b). The next largest group were stepfathers (13.0%).

### *4.3.14 Gender of imprisoned parent/carer*

In Germany almost all imprisoned parents/carers (91%) from the sample of 143 children, were male (Table 14).

### *4.3.15 Total sentence/period on remand (current criminal charge)*

The average length of imprisonment served by parents/carers was 26.2 months, with an average of 21 months remaining (Table 15).

### *4.3.16 Current reason for imprisonment*

The parents/carers were imprisoned for a variety of charges but the most common of these was drugs offences (32%) followed by fraud (31%) (Table 16).

## **Child**

### *4.3.17 Child's contact with imprisoned parent/carer*

According to the non-imprisoned parents/carers, the large majority of children (92.8%) had some form of contact with their imprisoned parents/carers (Table 17).

### *4.3.18 Effects on child of parental/carer imprisonment*

The parents/carers were asked, whether the imprisonment had had any bad or good effects for the children. Table 18a indicates, that the majority of parents/carers reported a negative effect on the child's welfare (75%). Table 18b shows, that most of the parents/carers (64%) did not identify any good effects of the parental/carer imprisonment.

### *4.3.19 Child's needs*

Parents/carers were asked to indicate whether in the last three months their child had required help in one of 34 areas broadly relating to social contact and free time, school or work, parental imprisonment, psychological health, physical health, housing, self care, money and communication. The areas in which children have needed help are shown in Table 19.

### *4.3.20 Strengths and difficulties*

The parent/carer *Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire* (SDQ) was used to elicit parent/carers perceptions of their child's conduct, concentration, emotions and social relationships. The instrument and scoring is identical to that of the self-report scale. Mean scores for the current sample, with standard deviations in brackets, are given in Table 20.

As with the self-report item, the *Total Difficulties Score* can be compared to normative population ranges to provide an indication of the likelihood that the child or young person will display mental health problems. Parents scored 54% of the children in the normal 'range' indicating mental health problems are unlikely, 16% in the 'borderline' range suggesting moderate likelihood of problems, and 30% in the 'abnormal' range indicating substantial likelihood of problems (Table 20b).

#### 4.3.21 Quality of life - Kidscreen scores

The informant *KIDSCREEN-27* instrument provides an indication of the parent/carers perception of their child's health and well-being. The instrument and scoring is identical to that of the self-report scale. The mean score for each dimension are given in Table 21a. Non-imprisoned parents/carers generally rated the children's well-being quite highly as the banding of the children's raw scores on different health and well-being dimension (Table 21b).

#### 4.4 Summary

Since the start of the project (2010) the preparation of the survey, especially the preparation of the questionnaire, has taken nearly one year. The final questionnaires were released in M10. Before TREFF could start with the survey, the questionnaires had been translated into German and retranslated into English. In Germany the final questionnaires could be printed by the end of M11. By the end of M11 TREFF started with the distribution of questionnaires.

As TREFF could start in M11 with its acquisition strategies, it quickly became clear that the survey had to be spread throughout Germany, as in Bavaria TREFF couldn't obtain 250 children questionnaires. Additional counselling centres were contacted. TREFF originally had only seven months for the dissemination of questionnaires including evaluation, although the original timetable provided 9 months for this part. TREFF supported an extension to M20.

Finally 295 parent/carer questionnaires and 416 child questionnaires were in circulation. 143 child and 98 parent questionnaires are returned to this day. A total of 99 families participated in the survey. We have a return of 34.4% for children questionnaires and 33.2% for parent questionnaires.

There are various assumptions on why the return isn't higher. Our initial strategy was to get contact information through the prisons. This was more difficult than expected because the prison staff had rather less contact with relatives of prisoners. Later, we started recruiting participants through counselling centres. Not every suitable relative was willing to participate in the survey. There were several reasons for this. Families of prisoners have a high need to be anonymous and want to feel safe. They are highly suspicious answering questions regarding the imprisonment and are afraid to be recorded in yet another list. Most of them need to know and trust the ones who carry out the survey. Not all of the willing participants sent back the questionnaires. The main reason for this was the length of the questionnaire. A lot of the participants don't have the time and patience for the survey. They have stressful lives and are tense, so they don't really feel like answering a lot of questions. Some other families don't like to think deeper about the imprisonment because it would be too emotionally charging. There may be a lot more individual reasons for the relative low return on questionnaires we don't know about yet.



## 5. Romania

### 5.1 Methodology

#### 5.1.2 Sample

The COPING Romanian research targeted children with imprisoned parents aged 7 to 17 years old and their carers in 6 counties: Iasi, Botosani, Vaslui, Bacau, Neamt, and Suceava. The surveys were mirrored and designed to be applied to both the carer (non imprisoned) and the child of an imprisoned parent. The back translation did not lead to any removal of items included in the surveys nor to its conceptual alteration.

The initial sample was of 170 child/carers out of which 7 child/carers refused to take part in the research and other 3 children and 3 carers were excluded from the survey analysis due to non consistent responses and/or no information provided in the SDQ. At the time of

#### 5.1.3 Procedure

The recruitment of estimated sample was made in two stages:

- Through prisons: penitentiaries in the target area disseminated information regarding COPING within the prison population and invited prisoners to take part in the research. With their written consent, imprisoned parents offered information regarding their children: age, sex of the child, address, contact person outside the prison (other parent/carers), and – if applicable – telephone number. This information was included in a database that was provided to ASA. A total number of 243 prisoners offered information on 361 children aged 7 to 17 years old.
- Through State Care Services: requests were made to State Social Services in the targeted area (counties of Iasi, Botosani, Vaslui, Bacau, Neamt, and Suceava). As result of this approach, at the time of reporting, 209 children/carers questionnaires have been collected.

The fieldwork was envisaged in Romania with the participation of MA students from the University of Alexandru Ioan Cuza. For this purpose, 22 students were selected and participated in a training on October 29<sup>th</sup> 2010. The training included introductions on the following topics: COPING presentation, child development stages, COPING research approaches, and organizational matters.

During November 3<sup>rd</sup> – December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2010 the surveys were applied to 170 children. 6 carers changed their mind in participating in the research. The surveys were applied in 6 counties in Romania: Iasi, Botosani, Vaslui, Bacau, Neamt, and Suceava.

### 5.2 Results

This report analyzes questionnaires from 166 families, who are all of those that were in the SPSS database at the time this report was compiled. Of these families, 160 completed both the child and the parent/carers questionnaire (96.4%) (Table 1) (see Appendix 3). The data upon which the analysis below is based includes questionnaires from three families where just the parent/carers provided an eligible response and three families where just the children provided an eligible response. This is due to the fact the questionnaires completed by the corresponding children and parent/carers had to be removed from the research as result of errors during their completion, for example, inconsistent responses and no information provided in the SDQ. Items on both child and carers questionnaires will be analyzed separately. However, due to delays in producing the syntaxes for WHO Quality of Life Scale and for KIDSCREEN self report, items on both instruments will be analyzed at a later date.

## Child questionnaire

### Socio-demographic characteristics

#### 5.2.1 Gender

The gender distribution of respondents - 58% male and 42% female - is slightly balanced in favour of boys in relation to national statistics (52% male and 48% female) (Table 2).

#### 5.2.2 Age

The average age of children in the sample is 10.64 years (Table 3). The score is lower than the national average (12 years). Moreover, the sample mode is 7 years, while the nationwide mode is 17 years. One possible explanation for this is the relatively low age of the prisoners, which will have had an effect upon their children's age.

#### 5.2.3 Ethnicity

83% of children in the sample said they are white (Table 4). They would typically refer to themselves as Romanians. 17% of children indicated that they had another ethnicity. Most of these said they were Rroma [sic].

#### 5.2.4 Specific well being issues

8.6% of children who answered the questionnaire said they suffered from various disabilities, illness, medical condition, or special needs (Table 5).

### Aspects of parental/carer imprisonment

#### 5.2.5 Contact with imprisoned parent

A significant proportion (84%) of children in the sample said they had contact with their parent/carer in prison whether this was in the form of, for example, telephone, letters or visits (Table 6).

#### 5.2.6 Effects of parental/carer imprisonment

Just over on-half of all the children surveyed said that their parent/carer's incarceration had not had a negative effect on them, approximately 10% were not sure about the effects and almost 40% of children said the incarceration had a negative effect on them (Table 7a).

Despite the fact that 52.2% of children said the incarceration of a parent had no negative effects on them, only 15.6% of them believe that incarceration has had positive effects, whilst 6.7% were not sure and 77.6% reporting the absence of positive effects (Table 7b).

#### 5.2.7 Received help with regards to parental/carer imprisonment

A significant proportion of children, approximately 60%, said they had received various types of assistance (Table 8). On the other hand, the 40% of children who have not received any help constitutes an alarming figure, indicating the neglect of this group in Romania.

### Mental health and well being

#### 5.2.8 Strengths and difficulties

The *Total Difficulties Score* is calculated by summing all of the subscales except *Prosocial Scale*. Children in the analyzed sample produced a mean *Total Difficulties* score of 11.68 (5.72) (Table 9a). Based on child-reported SDQ scores, we have built three categories: normal (74%) with range between 0 – 15 pt., borderline (17%) with range between 16 – 19 pt. and abnormal (9%) with range between 20 – 40 pt. The scores must be treated with caution given that the Romanian normalization of SDQ has highlighted a weaker reliability in group of children under 11 years old and the sample average age is just 10.64 (Table 9b)

#### 5.2.9 Self esteem

We have calculated the Rosenberg SES, which ranges between 0 and 30 points, and have grouped these scores into three major categories: Low Self-Esteem (range between 0 – 9 pt.), Medium Self-Esteem (range between 10 – 19 pt.) and High Self-Esteem (range between 20 – 30 pt.). Children's SES appeared, generally, to be quite low. Only one child (0.7%) scored in the High Self Esteem group, 62% of children scored in Medium Self-Esteem category and 37% in the Low Self-Esteem (Table 10).

### **Non-imprisoned parent/carer questionnaire**

#### Non-imprisoned parent/carer

##### 5.2.10 Relationship to child

In most cases in this study the non-imprisoned parent/carers were the child's birth parent (68.7%) or their biological grandparent (17.2%) (Table 11).

#### Imprisoned parent/carer

##### 5.2.11 Relationship to child

Virtually all of the imprisoned parents/carers (94.5%) were the children's birth parents (Table 12). A further 3.1% were the children's stepmother or stepfather.

##### 5.2.12 Gender of the imprisoned parent/carer

The large majority of the imprisoned parent/carers (92%) were male, with a small minority being females (8%) (Table 13). Correlating this variable with the above variables we can conclude that in most of the cases the biological father is incarcerated and the child is taken care of by the biological mother or, in fewer cases, by grandparents.

##### 5.2.13 Time spent in prison

The average period for which parent/carers had been in prison was 4.26 years and the average period for which they would remain in prison is 5.26 years (Table 14).

##### 5.2.14 Current reason for imprisonment

The most common types of crimes for which a parent was incarcerated refer to handling stolen goods or theft (11.6%), physical assault (not domestic violence) (10.7%) and taking and driving away (car theft) (10.7%) (Table 15).

#### Child

##### 5.2.15 Contact with imprisoned parent/carer

83% of parents/carers in the sample said the children had some form of contact with their imprisoned parent/carer in prison. The percentage is almost the same as that reported on the child questionnaire (Table 16).

#### *5.2.16 Effects of parental/carer imprisonment*

The effects of incarceration of the child's parents on the child are judged quite differently by the parent/carer compared to the child. 47.9% of the parents/carers in the sample consider that imprisonment had bad effects whilst only 37% of children in the sample consider that the imprisonment have bad effects (Table 17a).

The large majority of non-imprisoned parents/carers believed that incarceration of the child's parent/carer had not had any good effect for the child (79.6%) (Table 17b). Almost 15% of parents/carers felt that incarceration of the parent/carer had had a good effect for the child.

#### *5.2.17 The child's needs*

The needs that the children were reported as having, by their non-imprisoned parent/carer, are shown in Table 18. The Table shows the broad categories of need that were covered in the questionnaire, the total number of times parent/carers identified any one of the range of needs in any of these categories and the average 'needs score' that children had (Each time a child was identified as having a specific need, this was given a value of '1'. All of these scores within a given category were added up and divided by the number of children to produce an average need score for that category.) The most common needs that children had were in the areas of housing (average need score 0.6), social contacts and free time (0.51) and self-care (0.51). The overall total needs score is in the first half of the interval (0.39), but we appreciate the level as being quite high.

#### *5.2.18 Strengths and difficulties*

Table 19a shows the mean SDQ scores for the children, as judged by their non-imprisoned parents/carers. The results indicate a range of outcomes. For example, the children score relatively badly in terms of *Emotional Symptoms* (4.22) but much better in terms of *Conduct Problems* (2.33). The children did though score relatively highly on the *Prosocial Scale* (8.23).

Based on parent SDQ scores we have built three categories: normal (49.4%) with range between 0 – 13 points; borderline (15.4%) 14 – 16; and abnormal (35.2%) 17 – 40 (Table 19b). These results indicate a relatively large proportion of children in the abnormal category.

## 6. Sweden

### 6.1 Procedure

WP1 comprised a questionnaire-based survey among the children of prisoners and their non-imprisoned parents/carers. Most of these children were recruited via the NGO Bryggan, which is an organisation, providing support to children of prisoners, based in several cities in Sweden. Bryggan's offices in four cities - Stockholm, Karlstad, Norrköping and Malmö - have been involved in recruitment. Children and non-imprisoned parents/carers were asked to participate when visiting the Bryggan Centres. If the child was 15 years or older approaches were made directly to the child, otherwise the non-imprisoned parent/carer was asked first before approaches were made to the child. The participants most often completed the questionnaire during the visit at Bryggan but some also chose to take them home and return them, completed, on their next visit or by post. Participants were also recruited via prisons and most commonly via imprisoned parents/carers who provided contact information to their families (after consent from the families) in order for us to be able to contact them and ask them to participate. Children and parents/carers recruited through the imprisoned parent/carer most commonly completed the questionnaires at home before sending them back to KI or Bryggan. Posters and information letters were sent to prisons, before recruiting, in order to inform parents/carers in prisons about the study. Due to lack of time and room during visiting hours, and since Swedish prisons do not have visiting centres, it has been difficult to come in contact with children and non-imprisoned parents directly at prisons. Only one questionnaire was completed in prison.

### 6.2. Results

At the time the interim report was produced a total of 69 questionnaires had been inputted into SPSS: 38 child questionnaires and 31 parent questionnaires. In 31 cases both the parent and child had completed a questionnaire and in 7 cases just the child.

#### Child questionnaire

##### Socio-demographic characteristics

###### 6.2.1 Gender

The sample of 38 children comprised a slightly higher proportion of females (Table 1) (see Appendix 4).

###### 6.2.2 Age

There was a fairly even spread of children in terms of their ages (Table 2a). The mean age of all children in the sample was 11.50 years (SD 3.33 years). The mean age did not differ so much between males and females (11.76 years for males and 11.29 years for females years) (Table 2b).

###### 6.2.3 Ethnicity and county of birth

Questions on ethnicity were not asked in the Swedish questionnaire. Regarding country of birth, the majority of children (92.1%) were born in Sweden.

###### 6.2.4 Specific well-being issues

Children were asked whether they had 'a long-term disability, illness, medical condition or special need'. These conditions are, for the purposes of this report, collected together under the generic term 'specific well-being issues'. Only 8% reported that they had at least one such specific well-being issue (Table 3). (The four major types of condition we asked about, will be reported upon separately in future reports.)

## Aspects of parental/carer imprisonment

### 6.2.5 Contact with imprisoned parent/carer

Almost all of the children had contact with their imprisoned parents/carers. Of the 38 children, 37 of them (97%) of them had some sort of contact, whether this was in the form of, for example, visits, telephone calls or letters (Table 4).

### 6.2.6 Effects of parental/carer imprisonment

When asked whether their parent/carer being in prison had had any *bad* effect for them, 21 (55%) children reported that it had, 11 (29%) that it had not and 6 (16%) indicated that they were 'not sure' (Table 5a).

58% of children reported that the imprisonment of their parent/carer had not produced any *good* effects for them, compared to 24% of children who believed it had (Table 5b). The remainder of children were unsure whether parental imprisonment had had any positive consequences.

### 6.2.7 Receipt of help regarding parental/carer imprisonment

92% of children in the sample indicated that they had received some form of help in relation to their parent/carer being in prison (Table 6). Future analysis will explore who provided this help (for example, family members, statutory agencies and third sector organisations) and in relation to what areas of the child's life (for instance, leisure activities, emotions and behaviour).

## Mental health and well-being

### 6.2.8 Strengths and difficulties

The self-report Goodman (1997) *Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire* (SDQ) is a behavioural screening instrument which elicits children and young peoples' perceptions of their conduct, concentration, emotions and social relationships. The SDQ comprises 25 items in total with five items loading onto each of the five subscales: *Emotional Symptoms*; *Conduct Problems*; *Hyperactivity*; *Peer Problems*; and the *Prosocial Scale*. Scores on all five subscales range from 0-10. A higher score on the first four subscales indicates greater difficulties in that area. The *Prosocial Scale* measures the extent to which children are providing socially desirable answers with higher scores indicating greater social desirability.

The self-report SDQ is designed for use with children 'aged around 11-16' years, of whom there were 16 in our sample. Mean subscale scores, for the current sample, followed by SDs in brackets, were: *Emotional Symptoms* 3.63 (1.95); *Conduct Problems* 2.42 (2.48); *Hyperactivity* 4.89 (3.26); *Peer Problems* 1.89 (1.29); and the *Prosocial Scale* 8.63 (1.21) (Table 7a). Eventually, subscales scores will be compared with normative data to explore the level of difficulties experienced by children with a parent/carer in prison compared to those experienced by the general population.

The *Total Difficulties Score* is calculated by summing all of the subscales except the *Prosocial Scale*. Potential scores range from 0-40 with a higher score indicating greater difficulties overall. Children in the current sample produced a mean *Total Difficulties* score of 12.44 (7.72) (Table 7a).

The *Total Difficulties* score can be compared to normative population<sup>1</sup> ranges to provide an indication of the likelihood that the child or young person will display mental health problems. Individuals with a score falling in the 'normal' range are unlikely to display mental health problems, those in the 'borderline' range have a slightly raised risk of experiencing mental health problems, whilst scores in the 'abnormal' range indicate substantial likelihood of mental health problems. 57.9 % of children's scores in our sample fell in the 'normal' range, 26.3 % in the 'borderline' range and 15.8% in the 'abnormal' range (Table 7b). More than one-third (42.1%) of the sample could be said to be at some heightened risk of experiencing mental health problems.

### 6.2.9 Self-esteem

The self-report Rosenberg (1989) *Self-Esteem Scale* (SES) provides an indication of children and young peoples' perceived levels of self-esteem. The scale consists of ten items which are summed to produce an overall scale score ranging from 10-40 with higher scores indicating higher levels of self-esteem. Children in this sample had a mean score of 31.39 (SD 4.79) (Table 8). falling in the upper third of potential scores, suggesting relatively high self-esteem, although this will eventually be compared with normative population data.

The children's SES scores were broken down into three broadly equal groups based upon based upon the raw SES score. Almost two-thirds of the children were in the highest group (scores 30-40), with no child the lowest group (scores 10-19). 30% of the children, though, did record intermediate SES scores.

### 6.2.10 Quality of life

The *KIDSCREEN* self-report instrument elicits children and young peoples' rating of their health and well-being. The *KIDSCREEN-27* instrument comprises of 27 items which load onto five dimensions. The number of items on each dimension varies and a higher score indicates more positive health and well-being. The mean score for each dimension is presented in Table 9a. Raw scores will be compared with normative data to explore children of prisoners' subjective health and wellbeing in relation to that of the general population.

The children's five health-related quality of life scores were broken down into a number of broadly equal groups based upon based upon raw *KIDSCREEN* scores (Table 9b). In general, large majorities of children were in each of the highest groups of *KIDSCREEN* scores. For example, 89.5 % of the children were in the top one-third of scores for the quality of life in terms of *Social Support & Peers*. There was one area where children appeared to score rather less well, with 39.5% of children being in the two lower of three groups for quality of life in respect of *School Environment*.

## Non-imprisoned parent/carer questionnaire

The following results are based on 31 parent/carer questionnaires (7 of the 31 children participating did not have a parent/carer filling in a questionnaire, hence the lower number of parent/carer questionnaires).

### Non-imprisoned parent/carers

#### 6.2.11 Relationship to child

Almost all the non-imprisoned parents/carers taking part in the survey were the children's birth parents (Table 10a). Only two of the parent/carers had any other type of relationship to the child (one grandparent and one 'other').

---

<sup>1</sup> Categorisation is here based on UK norms. For future analysis Swedish normative data will be used to compare the results to a standard population.

The majority of non-imprisoned parents/carers comprised the children's birth mothers, accounting for more than 95% of respondents (Table 10b). The next largest group of respondents consisted of birth fathers but these made up only 8.3% of all non-imprisoned parents/carers.

#### 6.2.12 Quality of life

The brief World Health Organisation *Quality of Life Scale* (brief version, WHOQOL-26) was administered to non-imprisoned parents/carers to obtain self-reported perceptions of their own quality of life. The WHOQOL consists of 26 items, with higher scores indicating more positive health and well-being. The first two items regarding *Overall Perception of Quality of Life* and *Overall Perception of Quality of Health* are examined separately. Potential scores range from 1-5 and the current sample produced a mean of 3.67 for overall quality of life and 3.35 for overall quality of health (SD 0.91 and 1.11 respectively) (Table 11a). The remaining 24 items load onto four domains which are multiplied by four to make them comparable to the full WHOQOL-100. Mean domain scores, with SD in brackets, were as follows: *Physical Health* 14.27 (3.60); *Psychological Well-being* 13.72 (2.23); *Social Relationships* 14.53 (3.50); and *Environment* 13.45 (3.23). All items can be summed to produce a Total Scale Score, which for the current sample had a mean of 89.19 and SD of 16.63. Eventually, sample scores will be related to normative data to enable comparisons to be made between non-imprisoned parents/carers and the general population in terms of their respective subjective quality of life measures.

The quality of life of the non-imprisoned parents/carers, as measured on all of the dimensions listed in Table 11b, was generally good to very good. For example, about one-half (51.6%) of this group scored 4 or 5 (out of a maximum of 5) on *Overall perception of quality of life*. Non-imprisoned parent/carers appeared to score fairly poorly in terms of *Physical Health* with one-fourth (25.8%) being in the second lowest of the four bandings on this measure. Regarding *Psychological well-being*, a majority (61.3%) of respondents were in the middle of the three bandings on this measure.

#### Imprisoned parent/carers

##### 6.2.13 Relationship to child

The large majority (83.9%) of the imprisoned parents/carers relationship were the children's birth parents (Table 12a). The remaining parents/carers were stepparents.

A majority (74 %) of the imprisoned parent/carers were the children's birth fathers (Table 12b). The other two groups were birth mothers (9.7%) and stepfathers (16.1%) parents/carers.

##### 6.2.14 Gender

The large majority of imprisoned parents/carers (90.3%) from the sample of 31 children, were male (Table 13). Although, only a relatively small minority were females (9.7%), this was considerably higher than the proportion of females in the Swedish prison population overall (5.4%<sup>2</sup>) (Kriminalvården, 2011).

##### 6.2.15 Time spent in prison

Non-imprisoned parents/carers were asked to report on the amount of time the imprisoned parent/carer had spent in prison, to date, combining any period on remand with any period since being sentenced. Imprisoned parents/carers had spent an average of 24.03 months (standard deviation 28.9 months) in custody so far on their current sentence or period of remand.

---

<sup>2</sup> Based on the number of prisoners on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010. Remand prisoners are not included.



## Child

### 6.2.16 Contact with imprisoned parent/carer

All of the parents/carers indicated that their child had some form of contact with the imprisoned parent/carer (Table 14), which might include visits, telephone calls and letters. This correspond closely to the figure 97% for the children who reported that they had contact with their parent in prison (only one child reported no contact)

### 6.2.17 Effects of parental/carer imprisonment

When parents/carers were asked whether the imprisonment of a parent/carer had had any *bad* effects for their child, a majority (82.8%) indicated that it had (Table 15a). Compared to the children's responses, there was a considerable difference between children's and parent/carer's reports of negative consequences (55% of the children reported bad effects).

35.7% of parents/carers reported that the imprisonment of a parent/carer had produced *good* effects for their child, compared to 53.6% that thought it had not (Table 15b). The remaining parents/carers (10.7%) were unsure whether parental imprisonment had had any positive consequences. When compared to children's own responses, there was some difference between children's and parent/carer's reports of positive consequences (24 % of the children reported good effects).

### 6.2.18 Needs

Parents/carers were asked to indicate whether in the last three months their child had required help in one of 34 areas broadly relating to social contact and free time, school or work, parental imprisonment, psychological health, physical health, housing, self care, money and communication. Table 16 shows the answers in each area.

### 6.2.19 Strengths and difficulties

The parent/carer *Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire* (SDQ) was used to elicit parent/carers perceptions of their child's conduct, concentration, emotions and social relationships. The instrument and scoring is identical to that of the self-report scale. Given that the self-report SDQ is not suitable for children aged under 11 years, the informant SDQ can be used as a substitute. The informant SDQ can also be used to complement the self-report SDQ for children aged 11+. Mean scores for the current sample, with standard deviations in brackets, are as follows: *Emotional Symptoms* 2.77 (1.86); *Conduct Problems* 2.23 (1.94); *Hyperactivity* 4.48 (2.80); *Peer Problems* 2.16 (1.71); and the *Prosocial Scale* 7.87 (1.89) (Table 17a). Eventually, subscales scores will be related to normative data to allow comparisons between non-imprisoned parent/carers and parents/carers in the general population in terms of their respective ratings of their children's strengths and difficulties.

As with the self-report instrument, the *Total Difficulties Score* can be compared to normative population ranges to provide an indication of the likelihood that the child or young person will display mental health problems. 58.1% of parents scored their child in the normal 'range' indicating mental health problems are unlikely, 19.4 % in the 'borderline' range suggesting moderate likelihood of problems, and 22.6% in the 'abnormal' range indicating substantial likelihood of problems (Table 17b).<sup>3</sup> Comparison with the self-report version, suggests that the parents perceive more difficulties for their children than the children themselves. However, the results from the self-report version, Table 7b, are based upon only children 11 years and older, so this comparison should be treated with caution.)

---

<sup>3</sup> Categorisation is here based on UK norms. For future analysis Swedish normative data will be used to compare the results to a standard population.

### 6.2.20 Quality of life

The informant *KIDSCREEN-27* instrument provides an indication of the parent/carers perception of their child's health and well-being. The instrument and scoring is identical to that of the self-report scale. The mean score for each dimension, with SD in brackets, was as follows: *Psychological Well-being* 18.14 (SD 3.19); *Psychological Well-being* 25.81 (SD 43.91); *Autonomy & Parent Relation* 25.16 (SD 3.49); *Social Support & Peers* 15.30 (SD 3.08); and *School Environment* 14.71 (SD 2.73) (Table 18a). Raw scores will be compared with normative data to explore the perceptions of parent/carers' of children who have a parent/carer in prison in relation to the general population.

Non-imprisoned parents/carers generally rated the children's well-being quite highly. For example, in the categories *Social Support & Peers* and *School Environment* more than one-half of respondents (66.7% and 54.8% respectively) placed their children in the top grouping. (Table18b). In the other categories a majority of the parents (over 80%) scored their children in the two top groupings

## 7. Conclusion

There is, in general, a fair degree of comparability between the sample of children (and their parents/carers) in the four countries. For example, each country has a balance of girls and boys taking part in the survey; their mean ages are within one year of each other; and most have an ethnicity, citizenship/nationality or country of birth that is the same as the majority of people in the country in which they live. (Each country has, though, been able to recruit a proportion of children who are exception to this rule and this may enable some important analyses to be undertaken in relation to this variable.

The samples from the four countries are also broadly similar to one another in terms of a number of major variables relating to the non-imprisoned parents/carers. For example, the large majority of parents/carers in each country are the children's birth parents and most of these are birth mothers. The WHO QOL scores of these parents/carers tend to be within a narrow range.

The large majority of imprisoned parents/carers are male. They also tend to have served very similar lengths of sentence. The sole – and a possibly important exception - to this is in Romania where the average sentence served so far was considerably higher than in any of the three other countries.

As explained in the Introduction, the survey was designed to provide a more detailed and extensive picture of these children's lives than was originally anticipated. This has highlighted some important but also contrasting findings between countries. A prime example of this is the number of children who reported that they had 'a long-term disability, illness, medical condition or special need', what we have referred to in this report by the generic term 'specific well-being issue.'

A sizeable minority of children in each country were found to be in the abnormal range of the SDQ based upon their parent/carer rating. This indicates that a child has a 'substantial likelihood of mental health problems'. There were, though, major differences between countries.

There were also some considerable and important differences in relations to the imprisoned parents/carers, for example, the charges they faced.

In conclusion, then, it can be seen that there is broad comparability between the samples in the four countries but that, at the same time, the research has highlighted important differences between these countries. The reasons for these differences and their implications in terms of other findings will be assessed in the more detailed publications that are planned for this project.

Work on these publications is already well under way and we hope to have a number of papers submitted to high ranking, peer-reviewed journals by the end of the year. These publications will be written by teams within countries but also by teams comprising members from across the four participating countries.

## References

Goodman R (1997) The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A Research Note. **Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry**, 38, 581-586.

Ministry of Justice (2011) **National Offender Management Service. HM Prisons Population Bulletin Weekly 20<sup>th</sup> May**. London: Ministry of Justice

Rosenberg, M. (1989) **Society and the Adolescent Self-Image**. Revised edition. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

The KIDSCREEN Group Europe. (2006). **The KIDSCREEN Questionnaires - Quality of life Questionnaires for Children and Adolescents**. Handbook. Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers.

WHO (2004) **The World Health Organization Quality of Life (WHOQOL) – BREF**. Geneva: WHO

Office of National Statistics (2011) Population Size <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=455>  
Accessed on 13<sup>th</sup> June

## Appendix 1 – Figure and tables for UK data

**Figure 1. Structure of child and non-imprisoned parent/carer questionnaires**

Child	Non-imprisoned parent/carer
1. Socio-demographic characteristics	1. Socio-demographic characteristics of child
2. <i>KIDSCREEN</i> questionnaire (quality of life) (The <i>KIDSCREEN</i> Group Europe, 2006)	2. <i>KIDSCREEN</i> questionnaire (child) (The <i>KIDSCREEN</i> Group Europe, 2006)
3. Contact with imprisoned parent/carer	3. Child's relationship with non-imprisoned parent/carer
4. Goodman <i>Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire</i>	4. Child's relationship with imprisoned parent/carer
5. The effects of parental/carer imprisonment	5. Goodman <i>Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire</i> (regarding child)
6. Rosenberg <i>Self-Esteem Scale</i>	6. Child's contact with imprisoned parent/carer
7. Help regarding parental/carer imprisonment	7. Child's needs
8. Aspirations	8. Effects on child of parental/carer imprisonment
9. Other comments	9. Socio-demographic characteristics of imprisoned parent/carer
	10. Imprisoned parent/carer's prison record
	11. Socio-demographic characteristics of non-imprisoned parent/carer
	12. Relationship between non-imprisoned and imprisoned parent/carer
	13. WHO <i>Quality of Life</i> questionnaire (non-imprisoned parent/carer) (WHO, 2004)
	14. Aspirations
	15. Other comments

**Table 1 The origin of child and parent/carer questionnaires in terms of families**

Child-parent/carer questionnaire overlap by family	N	%
Questionnaires from both the child(ren) and the parent/carer in a family	181*	68.6
Questionnaires from just the child(ren) in a family	70	26.5
Questionnaires from just the parent/carer in a family	13	4.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>100.0</b>

(\*These questionnaires have to be counted twice to reach the overall total of 445 questionnaires.)

**Table 2 Children's gender**

Gender	N	%
Male	116	51.1
Female	111	48.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>227*</b>	<b>100.0</b>

(\*If totals, in any table, do not equal the number of inputted child (N=229) or parent/carer (N=174) questionnaires, then this is due to the exclusion of cases where data is missing.)

**Table 3a Children's ages**

Age (yrs)	N	%
7	10	4.4
8	24	10.5
9	26	11.4
10	27	11.8
11	27	11.8
12	23	10.1
13	25	11.0
14	24	10.5
15	20	8.8
16	8	3.5
17	12	5.3
18	2	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 3b Children's mean age by gender**

Gender	Mean (yrs)	SD
Male (n=120)	11.42	2.86
Female (n=114)	11.84	3.03
<b>All (n=234)</b>	<b>11.59</b>	<b>2.94</b>

**Table 4 Children's ethnicity**

Ethnicity	COPING		UK
	N	%	%
White	198	87.6	92.1
Asian	11	4.9	4.0
Black	7	3.1	2.0
Mixed	10	4.4	1.2
Other	0	0.0	0.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>226*</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.1**</b>

(\*Wherever total percentages do not equal 100 this is because of rounding.)

**Table 5 Children with specific well-being issues**

Well-being issue	N	%
Yes	32	14.2
No	194	85.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 6 Children's contact with imprisoned parents/carers**

Child has contact	N	%
Yes	216	94.7
No	12	5.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 7a Whether parental/carer imprisonment had any *bad* effect on child**

<b>Bad effect</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	110	48.5
No	74	32.6
Not sure	43	18.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 7b Whether parental/carer imprisonment had any *good* effect on child**

<b>Good effect</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	21	10.2
No	142	69.3
Not sure	42	20.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 8 Receipt of help by children regarding their parent/carer being in prison**

<b>Help received</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	157	69.8
No	68	30.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 9a Strengths and difficulties - mean scores and standard deviations**

<b>Description (n=125)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Emotional Symptoms	2.32	2.14
Conduct Problems	2.32	1.80
Hyperactivity	3.98	2.38
Peer Problems	1.86	1.65
Prosocial Scale	7.50	1.97
Total Difficulties Score	10.47	5.92

**Table 9b Categorisation of children by Total Difficulties score**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Normative ranges</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Normal	0-15	101	80.8
Borderline	16-19	13	10.4
Abnormal	20-40	11	8.8
<b>Total</b>		<b>125</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 10 Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale scores**

<b>Score</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
10-19	6	2.7
20-29	93	41.3
30-40	126	56.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 11a KIDSCREEN scores – 5 health-related quality of life scores**

Quality of life dimension	Number of items on scale	Minimum possible score	Maximum possible score	Mean	SD
Physical Well-being (n=212)	5	5	25	20.03	3.90
Psychological Well-being (n=225)	7	7	35	28.66	4.65
Autonomy & Parent Relation (n=212)	7	7	35	28.19	5.86
Social Support & Peers (n=224)	4	4	20	17.03	3.33
School Environment (n=220)	4	4	20	15.05	4.02

Table 11b Categorisation of children by individual *KIDSCREEN* scores

Score	N	%
Physical Well-being		
05-09	2	0.9
10-14	17	8.0
15-19	65	30.7
<u>20-25</u>	<u>128</u>	<u>60.4</u>
Total	212	100.0
Psychological Well-being		
07-13	1	0.4
14-20	11	4.9
21-27	69	30.7
<u>28-35</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>64.0</u>
Total	225	100.0
Autonomy & Parent Relation		
07-13	5	2.4
14-20	20	9.4
21-27	53	25.0
<u>28-35</u>	<u>134</u>	<u>63.2</u>
Total	212	100.0
Social Support & Peers		
04-09	7	3.1
10-14	39	17.4
<u>15-20</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>79.5</u>
Total	224	100.0
School Environment		
04-09	22	10.0
10-14	57	25.9
<u>15-20</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>64.1</u>
Total	220	100.0

Table 12a Non-imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child

Relationship	N	%
Birth mother/father	136	78.6
Grandmother/father	18	10.4
Stepmother/father	9	5.2
Boy/girlfriend of child's parent/carer	3	1.7
Aunt/uncle	3	1.7
Brother/sister	2	1.2
Stepgrandmother/father	1	0.6
Friend	1	0.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100.0</b>



**Table 12b Non-imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child by their gender**

Relationship	Female		Male		All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Birth parent	124	72.9	9	5.3	133	78.2
Grandparent	13	7.6	5	2.9	18	10.6
Step-parent	7	4.1	2	1.2	9	5.3
Boy/girlfriend of parent/carer	3	1.8	0	0.0	3	1.8
Aunt/uncle	3	1.8	0	0.0	3	1.8
Sibling	2	1.2	0	0.0	2	1.2
Step-grandparent	0	0.0	1	0.6	1	0.6
Friend	0	0.0	1	0.6	1	0.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>89.4</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 13a Non-imprisoned parent/carers' quality of life**

Description	No. of items	Min score possible	Max score possible	Mean	SD
Overall perception of quality of life (n=116)	1	1	5	3.54	0.90
Overall perception of health (n=115)	1	1	5	3.62	1.06
Physical Health (n=112)	7	4	20	15.22	3.26
Psychological Well-being (n=114)	6	4	20	14.01	3.04
Social Relationships (n=115)	3	4	20	13.63	3.94
Environment (n=114)	8	4	20	14.40	2.80
Total Scale Score (n=116)	26	26	130	91.87	18.61

**Table 13b Non-imprisoned parent/carers' quality of life**

Description	N	%
Overall perception of quality of life		
1	3	2.6
2	11	9.5
3	34	29.3
4	56	48.3
<u>5</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>10.3</u>
Total	116	100.0
Overall perception of health		
1	5	4.3
2	15	13.0
3	20	17.4
4	54	47.0
<u>5</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>18.3</u>
Total	115	100.0
Physical Health		
04.00-06.99	2	1.8
07.00-10.99	11	9.8
11.00-14.99	34	30.4
<u>15.00-20.00</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>58.0</u>
Total	112	100.0
Psychological Well-being		
04.00-06.99	2	1.8
07.00-10.99	17	14.9
11.00-14.99	49	43.0
<u>15.00-20.00</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>40.4</u>
Total	114	100.0
Social Relationships		
04.00-06.99	7	6.1
07.00-10.99	26	22.6
11.00-14.99	37	32.2
<u>15.00-20.00</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>39.1</u>
Total	115	100.0
Environment		
04.00-06.99	2	1.8
07.00-10.99	9	7.9
11.00-14.99	52	45.6
<u>15.00-20.00</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>44.7</u>
Total	114	100.0
Total Scale Score		
26.00 - 50.99	2	1.7
51.00 - 76.99	24	20.7
77.00 -102.99	55	47.4
<u>103.00-130.00</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>30.2</u>
Total	116	100.0

**Table 14a Imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child**

Relationship	N	%
Birth mother/father	126	72.8
Stepmother/father	22	12.7
Aunt/uncle	7	4.0
Grandmother/father	5	2.9
Brother/sister	4	2.3
Boy/girlfriend of child's parent/carer	3	1.7
Friend	2	1.2
Step-grandmother/father	1	0.6
Other	3	1.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 14b Imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child by their gender**

Imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child	Gender of imprisoned parent/carer				All	
	Male		Female			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Birth parent	96	56.8	28	16.6	124	73.4
Step-parent	22	13.0	0	0.0	22	13.0
Aunt/uncle	6	3.6	0	0.0	6	3.6
Grandmother/father	5	3.0	0	0.0	5	3.0
Boy/girlfriend to child's parent/carer	3	1.8	0	0.0	3	1.8
Sibling	3	1.8	0	0.0	3	1.8
Friend	2	1.2	0	0.0	2	1.2
Step-grandmother/father	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.6
Other	3	1.8	0	0.0	3	1.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>83.4</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 15 Gender of imprisoned parents/carers: COPING sample compared to UK prison population**

Gender	COPING		UK	
	N	%	N	%
<b>Male</b>	142	83.5	80,779	95.1
<b>Female</b>	28	16.5	4,149	4.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>84,982</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 16 Reason for imprisonment – most recent charge\***

Charge (n=180 parents/carers)	N	%
Drugs offences	62	34.4
Physical assault (not domestic violence)	34	18.9
Robbery	14	7.8
Burglary	11	6.1
Domestic violence	10	5.6
Murder or manslaughter	9	5.0
Road traffic offences (for example, dangerous driving)	8	4.4
Sexual offences	7	3.9
Offensive weapons	6	1.7
Criminal damage	5	2.8
Fraud	4	2.2
Handling stolen goods	4	2.2
Conspiracy	4	2.2
Arson	3	1.7
Money laundering	3	1.7
Deception or dishonesty	3	1.7
Assault occasioning actual bodily harm	2	1.1
Other**	6	3.3

\*Some respondents may have listed more than one charge

\*\* 'Other' comprised one each of the following: Blackmail, Firearm's offence, Harassment, Kidnap, Recall on licence, Threat to kill

**Table 17 Child-imprisoned parent/carer contact**

<b>Whether child has contact</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	170	98.3
No	3	1.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 18a Bad effects of parent/carer's imprisonment upon child**

<b>Bad effect</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	89	51.7
No	50	29.1
Not sure	33	19.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 18b Good effects of parent/carer's imprisonment upon child**

<b>Good effect</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	24	14.4
No	119	71.3
Not sure	24	14.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 19 The areas in which children have needed help in the past three months**

Type of help needed	Yes		No		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Social contacts and free time						
Spending time with family	69	47.9	75	52.1	144	100.0
Spending time with children – school time	61	45.5	73	54.5	134	100.0
Spending time with children – outside school	59	42.8	79	57.2	138	100.0
Exposure to bullying or harassment	15	10.9	123	89.1	138	100.0
Playing sports	54	39.4	83	60.6	137	100.0
Going on holiday	30	21.7	108	78.3	138	100.0
School or work						
Help with homework	75	52.8	67	47.2	142	100.0
Following rules at school/work	63	44.1	80	55.9	143	100.0
Getting to school/work	54	37.8	89	62.2	143	100.0
Getting a place in school or a job	27	19.9	109	80.1	136	100.0
Dealing with school authorities	37	37.0	100	73.0	137	100.0
Parent/carer being in prison						
Visiting imprisoned parent/carer	67	47.2	75	52.8	142	100.0
Information about having parent/carer in prisons	44	32.6	91	67.4	135	100.0
Information about support for children of prisoners	42	30.9	94	69.1	136	100.0
Psychological health						
Psychological problems (general)	31	22.1	109	77.9	140	100.0
Psychological problems because parent/carer is in prison	21	15.3	116	84.7	137	100.0
Reducing self-harm	8	5.7	133	94.3	141	100.0
Reducing harm caused to others	7	5.2	128	94.8	135	100.0
Reducing alcohol/dug use	5	3.7	130	96.3	135	100.0
Information about mental health care system	7	5.3	125	94.7	132	100.0
Dealing with mental health authorities	8	6.1	124	93.9	132	100.0
Physical health problems						
Physical health problems	12	9.0	121	91.0	133	100.0
Visiting child or family doctor	21	15.7	113	84.3	134	100.0
Visiting dentist	32	24.1	101	75.9	133	100.0
Information about general health care system	13	9.8	120	90.2	133	100.0
Dealing with general health authorities	12	9.1	120	90.9	132	100.0
Housing						
Having a place to live	29	21.5	106	78.5	135	100.0
Self-care						
Eating well enough	45	33.6	89	66.4	134	100.0
Basic body care	39	28.7	97	71.3	136	100.0
Contraception	16	13.3	104	86.7	120	100.0
Money						
Managing own money	35	25.7	101	74.3	136	100.0
Communication						
Using the internet	40	29.4	96	70.6	136	100.0
Using telephones	36	26.5	100	73.5	136	100.0
Dealing with social welfare authorities	16	12.1	116	87.9	132	100.0
Other	3	4.9	58	95.1	61	100.0

**Table 20a SDQ Total difficulties' and total strength's sub-scores**

Description (n=173)	Mean	SD
Emotional Symptoms	2.52	2.28
Conduct Problems	2.36	1.92
Hyperactivity	3.94	2.40
Peer Problems	2.24	1.76
Prosocial scale	7.69	2.09
Total Difficulties Score	11.06	5.94

**Table 20b Categorisation of children by Total Difficulties score**

Categorisation	Norm range	n	%
Normal	0-13	112	64.7
Borderline	14-16	29	16.8
Abnormal	17-40	32	18.5
Total		<b>173</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 21a Kidscreen scores – Five health-related quality of life scores**

Quality of life dimension	Number of items	Minimum possible score	Maximum possible score	Mean	SD
Physical Well-being (n=167)	5	5	25	20.44	3.74
Psychological Well-being (n=170)	7	7	35	27.47	4.88
Autonomy & Parent Relation (n=165)	7	7	35	27.30	5.44
Social Support & Peers (n=167)	4	4	20	15.35	3.74
School Environment (n=160)	4	4	20	14.98	3.93

**Table 21b Categorisation of children by individual *KIDSCREEN* scores**

Score	N	%
Physical Well-being (n=167)		
05-09	1	0.6
10-14	14	8.4
15-19	44	26.3
20-25	108	64.7
Psychological Well-being (n=170)		
07-13	0	0.0
14-20	13	7.6
21-27	71	41.8
28-35	86	50.6
Autonomy & Parent Relation (n=165)		
07-13	0	0.0
14-20	19	11.5
21-27	61	37.0
28-35	85	51.5
Social Support & Peers (n=167)		
04-09	12	7.2
10-14	53	31.7
15-20	102	61.1
School Environment (n=160)		
04-09	15	9.4
10-14	51	31.9
15-20	94	58.8

## Appendix 2 – Tables for Germany data

**Table 1 Children's gender**

Gender	N	%
Male	74	52
Female	67	48
<b>Total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100</b>

\* N=2 missings

**Table 2a Children's ages**

Age (yrs)	N	%
7	25	18
8	12	8
9	13	9
10	14	10
11	17	12
12	11	8
13	13	9
14	13	9
15	5	4
16	12	8
17	5	4
20	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 2b Children's mean age and range by gender**

Gender	Mean (yrs)	SD	Range
Male (n=73)	11.10	3.13	7-17
Female (n=67)	11.13	3.20	7-20
<b>All (n=140)</b>	<b>11.13</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>7-20</b>

\* n=3 missings

**Table 3 Children's nationality**

Citizenship	N	%
German	126	88.1
Turkish	6	4.2
Serbian	1	0.7
Montenegro	1	0.7
Italian	2	1.4
Aramaic	1	0.7
German and Turkish	1	0.7
German and Ghana	1	0.7
German and American	1	0.7
German and Italian	2	1.4
German and Croatian	1	0.7
<b>All (n=143)</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 4 Children with specific well-being issue**

Disability	N	%
------------	---	---

Yes	28	20.1
No	111	79.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 5 Children's contact with imprisoned parents/carers**

<b>Child has contact</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	130	93.5
No	9	6.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 6a Whether parental/carer imprisonment had *bad effect* on child**

<b>Any bad effects of imprisonment</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	76	54.7
No	37	26.6
Not sure	26	18.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 6b Whether parental/carer imprisonment had *good effect* on child**

<b>Any good effects of imprisonment</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	24	17.5
No	92	67.2
Not sure	21	15.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 7 Receipt of help by children regarding their parent/carer being in prison**

<b>Help received (N=54)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	122	87.1
No	18	12.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 8a Strengths and difficulties - mean scores and standard deviations**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Emotional Symptoms (n=142)	3.35	2.47
Conduct Problems (n=142)	2.25	1.59
Hyperactivity (n=141)	4.24	2.32
Peer Problems (n=142)	2.58	1.83
Prosocial Scale (n=141)	7.45	2.05
<b>Total Difficulties Score (n=141)</b>	<b>12.46</b>	<b>5.80</b>

**Table 8a Categorisation of children by Total Difficulties score (overall sample, self-rating)**

<b>Category</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Normal	105	74.5
Borderline	17	12.0
Abnormal	19	13.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100</b>



**Table 8b** Categorisation of children > 10 years old by Total Difficulties score (by German norms, self-rating)

Category	Normative Ranges Germany (self-rating, children aged >10)	N	%
Normal	0-15	58	76.3
Borderline	16-17	4	5.3
Abnormal	18-40	14	18.4
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>76</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 9** Self-esteem scores of the German sample (N=138)

SES Score	N	%
10-19	4	2.9
20-29	40	29.0
30-40	94	68.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 10a** *KIDSCREEN* scores – 5 health-related quality of life scores and total score

Score	Number of items on scale	Minimum possible score	Maximum possible score	Mean	SD
Physical Well-being (n=127)	5	5	25	18.81	3.93
Psychological Well-being (n=141)	7	7	35	26.23	5.29
Autonomy & Parent Relation (n=137)	7	7	35	25.95	4.86
Social Support & Peers (n=140)	4	4	20	15.26	3.67
School Environment (n=132)	4	4	20	14.11	3.14
<b>Total score (n=142)</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>98.82</b>	<b>16.13</b>

**Table 10b** Categorisation of children by individual *KIDSCREEN* scores

<b>Score</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Physical Well-being (n=127)</b>		
05-09	0	0.0
10-14	22	17.3
15-19	50	39.4
20-25	55	43.3
<b>Psychological Well-being (n=141)</b>		
07-13	2	1.4
14-20	18	12.8
21-27	61	43.3
28-35	60	42.6
<b>Autonomy &amp; Parent Relation (n=137)</b>		
07-13	1	0.7
14-20	14	10.2
21-27	66	48.2
28-35	56	40.9
<b>Social Support &amp; Peers (n=140)</b>		
04-09	12	8.6
10-14	35	25.0
15-20	93	66.4
<b>School Environment (n=132)</b>		
04-09	9	6.8
10-14	60	45.5
15-20	63	47.7

**Table 11a Non-imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child**

<b>Relationship</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Mother/father	126	91.3
Stepmother/-father	2	1.4
Grandmother/ -father	6	4.2
Boy/Girlfriend of the child's parent/carer	1	0.7
Other	3	2.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 11b Non-imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child by their gender**

<b>Relationship</b>	<b>Female</b>		<b>Male</b>		<b>All</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Birth parent	122	96.8	4	3.2	126	91.3
Step-parent	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	1.4
Grandmother/ -father	4	66.7	2	33.3	6	4.3
Boy/Girlfriend of the child's parent/carer	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
Other	3	100.0	0	0.0	3	2.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>95.7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 12a Non-imprisoned parent/carers' quality of life**

Description	No. of items	Min score possible	Max score possible	Mean	SD
Overall perception of quality of life (n=139)	1	1	5	3.18	0.74
Overall perception of health (n=140)	1	1	5	3.05	1.03
Physical Health (n =137)	7	4	20	13.70	3.00
Psychological Wellbeing (n=138)	6	4	20	12.34	3.18
Social Relationships (n=135)	3	4	20	12.52	3.57
Environment (n=133)	8	4	20	12.74	2.70
Total Scale Score (n=140)	26	26	130	81.81	17.19

Table 12b Non-imprisoned parent/carers' quality of life

Description	N	%
Overall perception of quality of life (n=139)		
1	1	0.7
2	21	15.1
3	73	52.5
4	40	28.8
5	4	2.9
Overall perception of health (n=140)		
1	12	8.6
2	30	21.4
3	41	29.3
4	53	37.9
5	4	2.9
Physical Health (n=137)		
04.00- 06.99	4	2.9
07.00- 10.99	26	19.0
11.00- 14.99	59	43.1
15.00- 20.00	48	35.0
Psychological Well-being (n=138)		
04.00- 06.99	10	7.2
07.00- 10.99	33	23.9
11.00- 14.99	60	43.5
15.00- 20.00	35	25.4
Social Relationships (n=135)		
04.00- 06.99	10	7.4
07.00- 10.99	45	33.3
11.00- 14.99	51	37.8
15.00- 20.00	29	21.5
Environment (n=133)		
04.00- 06.99	1	0.7
07.00- 10.99	31	23.3
11.00- 14.99	65	48.9
15.00- 20.00	36	27.1
Total Scale Score (n=140)		
26.00- 50.99	5	3.6
51.00- 76.99	45	32.1
77.00-102.99	70	50.0
103.00-130.00	20	14.3

Table 13a Imprisoned parent/carers' relationship to child

<b>Relationship</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Mother/father	109	79.0
Stepmother/father	18	13.0
Boy/girlfriend of child's parent/carer	9	6.5
Friend	2	1.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 13b Imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child by their gender**

<b>Relationship</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>All</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Birth parent	96	69.6	13	9.4	109	79.0
Step-parent	18	13.0	0	0.0	18	13.0
Boy/girlfriend of child's parent/carer	9	6.5	0	0.0	9	6.5
Friend	2	1.4	0	0.0	2	1.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>90.6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9.4</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 14 Gender of imprisoned parents/carers: COPING sample compared to Germany population**

<b>Gender</b>		
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Male	129	90.8
Female	13	9.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 15 Time spent in prison**

<b>Total sentence/period on remand (current criminal charge)</b>	<b>Mean (mths)</b>	<b>SD (mths)</b>	<b>Range (mths)</b>
How long in prison (N=129)	26.2	21.3	1-108
Sentence remain (N=102)	23.1	21.9	1-20
Total sentence/period (N=99)	49.3	31.7	4-168

**Table 16 Reason for imprisonment**

<b>Current reason for imprisonment (N=131)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
burglary	16	12.2
deception or dishonesty	6	4.6
drugs offences	42	32.1
fraud	41	31.3
offensive weapons	8	6.1
road traffic offences	11	8.4
sexual offences	2	1.5
criminal damage/ vandalism	4	3.1
domestic violence	4	3.1
firearms offences	8	6.1
handling stolen goods or theft	14	10.7
murder or manslaughter	1	0.8
physical assault (not domestic violence)	21	16.0
robbery	8	6.1
taking and driving away (car theft)	3	2.3
other	10	7.6

\* Some respondents may have listed more than one charge

**Table 17 Child – imprisoned parent/carer contact**

Whether child has contact	N	%
Yes	128	92.8
No	10	7.2

**Table 18a Bad effects of parent/carer's imprisonment upon child**

Any bad effects of imprisonment (N=138)	N	%
Yes	103	74.6
No	22	15.9
Not sure	13	9.4

**Table 18b Good effects of parent/carer's imprisonment upon child**

Any good effects of imprisonment (N=135)	N	%
Yes	31	23.0
No	86	63.7
Not sure	18	13.3

**Table 19 The areas in which children have needed help in the past three months**

Type of help needed	Yes		No		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Social contacts and free time						
Spending time with family	55	44.4%	69	55.6%	124	100.0%
Spending time with children – school time	39	32.0%	83	68.0%	122	100.0%
Spending time with children – outside school	44	37.0%	75	63.0%	119	100.0%
Exposure to bullying or harassment	30	24.8%	91	75.2%	121	100.0%
Playing sports	47	38.5%	75	61.5%	122	100.0%
Going on holiday	37	30.8%	83	69.2%	120	100.0%
School or work						
Help with homework	55	44.7%	68	55.3%	123	100.0%
Following rules at school/work	44	38.9%	69	61.1%	113	100.0%
Getting to school/work	32	27.6%	84	72.4%	116	100.0%
Getting a place in school or a job	29	25.4%	85	74.6%	114	100.0%
Dealing with school authorities	25	21.7%	90	78.3%	115	100.0%
Parent/carer being in prison						
Visiting imprisoned parent/carer	76	61.8%	47	38.2%	123	100.0%
Information about having parent/carer in prisons	74	61.2%	47	38.8%	121	100.0%
Information about support for children of prisoners	65	53.7%	56	46.3%	121	100.0%
Psychological health						
Psychological problems (general)	53	43.1%	70	56.9%	123	100.0%
Psychological problems because parent/carer is in prison	55	45.8%	65	54.2%	120	100.0%
Reducing self-harm	15	12.9%	101	87.1%	116	100.0%
Reducing harm caused to others	17	15.2%	95	84.8%	112	100.0%
Reducing alcohol/dug use	6	5.4%	105	94.6%	111	100.0%
Information about mental health care system	20	17.7%	93	82.3%	113	100.0%
Dealing with mental health authorities	11	9.8%	101	90.2%	112	100.0%
Physical health problems						
Physical health problems	25	21.2%	93	78.8%	118	100.0%
Visiting child or family doctor	46	38.3%	74	61.7%	120	100.0%
Visiting dentist	48	40.3%	71	59.7%	119	100.0%
Information about general health care system	28	23.9%	89	76.1%	117	100.0%
Dealing with general health authorities	19	16.2%	98	83.8%	117	100.0%
Housing						
Having a place to live	38	32.2%	80	67.8%	118	100.0%
Self-care						
Eating well enough	48	40.0%	72	60.0%	120	100.0%
Basic body care	44	37.0%	75	63.0%	119	100.0%
Contraception	18	16.7%	90	83.3%	108	100.0%
Money						
Managing own money	31	27.0%	84	73.0%	115	100.0%
Communication						
Using the internet	31	26.1%	88	73.9%	119	100.0%
Using telephones	44	36.7%	76	63.3%	120	100.0%

Type of help needed	Yes		No		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Dealing with social welfare authorities	20	16.9%	98	83.1%	118	100.0%
Other	10	50.0%	10	50.0%	20	100.0%

Table 20a SDQ Total difficulties' and total strength's sub-scores

Description (N=138)	Mean	SD
Emotional Symptoms	3.51	2.71
Conduct Problems	2.50	1.81
Hyperactivity	4.26	2.51
Peer Problems	2.27	1.93
Prosocial scale	7.59	1.83
Total Difficulties Score	12.54	6.76

Table 20b Categorisation of children by Total Difficulties score (German norms)

Categorisation	Norm Range	N	%
Normal	0-12	74	53.6
Borderline	13-15	22	15.9
Abnormal	16-40	42	30.4
<b>Total</b>		<b>138</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 21a Kidscreen scores – 5 health-related quality of life scores and total score

Description	Number of items	Minimum possible score	Maximum possible score	Mean	SD
Physical Wellbeing (n=56)	5	5	25	18.43	3.72
Psychological Wellbeing (n=54)	7	7	35	24.56	5.16
Autonomy & Parent Relation (n=53)	7	7	35	25.53	3.81
Social Support & Peers (n=56)	4	4	20	14.38	3.52
School Environment (n=51)	4	4	20	14.02	2.95
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>95.06</b>	<b>14.79</b>

**Table 21b Categorisation of children by individual *KIDSCREEN* scores**

<b>Score</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Physical Well-being (n=133)</b>		
05-09	2	1.5
10-14	17	12.8
15-19	61	45.9
20-25	53	39.8
<b>Psychological Well-being (n=131)</b>		
07-13	4	3.1
14-20	23	17.6
21-27	64	48.9
28-35	40	30.5
<b>Autonomy &amp; Parent Relation (n=130)</b>		
07-13	1	0.8
14-20	10	7.7
21-27	76	58.5
28-35	43	33.1
<b>Social Support &amp; Peers (n=136)</b>		
04-09	12	8.8
10-14	38	27.9
15-20	86	63.2
<b>School Environment (n=125)</b>		
04-09	9	7.2
10-14	55	44.0
15-20	61	48.8



### Appendix 3 – Tables for Romanian data

**Table 1 Questionnaire completion**

Questionnaire completed by	N
Just parent/carer	3
Just child	3
Both parent/carer and child	160
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>

**Table 2 Gender of children**

Gender	%
Male	57.7
Female	42.3

**Table 3 Children's ages**

Gender	Mean (yrs)	SD
Male	10.40	3.02
Female	10.97	3.05
All	10.64	3.04

**Table 4 Children's ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Children in COPING (%)	General population of NE Region of Romania (%)
White	83.0	97.89
Rroma	15.0	1.22
Other	2.0	0.89

**Table 5 Children experiencing specific well-being issues**

Specific well-being issues	%
Yes	8.6
No	91.4

**Table 6 Whether children had contact with their imprisoned parent/carer**

Contact	%
Yes	83.9
No	16.1

**Table 7a Whether parental/carer imprisonment had a bad effect for the child**

Bad effect	%
Yes	37.0

No	52.5
Not sure	10.5

**Table 7b Whether parental/carer imprisonment had a bad effect for the child**

Good effect	%
Yes	15.6
No	77.6
Not sure	6.7

**Table 8 Whether child received help due to parental/carer imprisonment**

Help received	%
Yes	58.3
No	41.7

**Table 9a Mean strengths and difficulties scores**

Description	Mean	SD
Emotional Symptoms	3.93	2.48
Conduct Problems	1.99	1.90
Hyperactivity	3.14	2.132
Peer Problems	2.60	1.65
Prosocial Scale	9.20	1.23
Total Difficulties Score	11.68	5.72

**Table 9b Categorization of children by SDQ by score**

Category	Range	%
Normal	0 – 15	74.1
Borderline	16 – 19	16.7
Abnormal	20 - 40	9.3

T

**Table 10 Children's Self Esteem Scores**

Category	Valid Percent
Low Self-Esteem	37.1
Medium Self-Esteem	62.3
High Self-Esteem	0.7

**Table 11 Non-imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child**

Non-imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child	Valid Percent
---	---------------

Mother/Father	68.7
Stepmother/Stepfather	1.2
Grandmother/Grandfather	17.2
Brother/sister	1.8
Aunt/Uncle	6.7
Other	4.3

**Table 12 Imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child by their gender**

Relationship	%
Mother/Father	94.5
Stepmother/Stepfather	3.1
Grandmother/Grandfather	1.2
The Boy/Girlfriend to this child's other parent/carer	1.2

**Table 13 Gender of the imprisoned parent/carer**

Gender	%
Male	92.0
Female	8.0

**Table 14 Duration of parent/carer's imprisonment**

Period	Months		Years
How long has this child's parent/carer been in prison so far?	10.17	<i>or</i>	4.26
How much longer will he or she be in prison?	7.21	<i>or</i>	5.26

**Table 15 Reason for parent/carer's current term of imprisonment**

Offence	%
Burglary	5.8
Deception or dishonesty	2.5
Drugs offences	0.0
Fraud	1.7
Indecent images of children or indecency with children	0.0
Offensive weapons	0.0
Road traffic offences (e.g. dangerous driving)	0.0
Sexual offences	3.3
Criminal damage/vandalism	0.8
Domestic violence	2.5
Firearms offences	0.0
Handling stolen goods or theft	11.6
Murder or manslaughter	0.0
Physical assault (not domestic violence)	10.7
Robbery	5.0
Taking and driving away (car theft)	10.7

**Table 16 Whether child had contact with their imprisoned parent/carer**

Contact	%
Yes	83.3
No	16.7

**Table 17a Bad effects of imprisonment**

Bad effect	%
Yes	47.9
No	42.9
Not sure	9.2

**Table 17b Good effects of imprisonment**

Good effect	%
Yes	14.6
No	79.6
Not sure	5.7

**Table 18 The children's needs**

Types of needs	Number of "yes"	Needs score
Social contacts and free time	501	0.51
Parent/carer being in prison	231	0.47
Psychological health	182	0.16
Physical health problems	179	0.22
Housing	98	0.60
Self-care	249	0.51
Money	80	0.49
Communication	202	0.41
Other help needed	9	0.04
<b>Total needs</b>	<b>2111</b>	<b>0.39</b>

**Table 19a Total difficulties and total strengths sub-scores**

Description	Mean	SD
Emotional Symptoms	4.22	2.75
Conduct Problems	2.33	2.20
Hyperactivity	3.83	2.42
Peer Problems	2.87	2.00
Prosocial scale	8.23	1.93
Total Difficulties Score	13.31	7.07

**Table 19b Categorisation of children's strengths and difficulties scores**

Category	Range	Valid Percent
Normal	0 – 13	49.4
Borderline	14 – 16	15.4
Abnormal	17 – 40	35.2

## Appendix 4 – Tables for Swedish data

**Table 1 Children's gender**

Gender	N	%
Male	17	45
Female	21	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 2a Children's ages**

Age (yrs)	N	%
7	4	10,5
8	3	8
9	9	24
10	3	8
11	1	3
12	4	10,5
13	1	3
14	2	5
15	3	13
16	3	8
17	3	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 2b Children's mean age by gender**

Gender	Mean (yrs)	SD
Male (n=17)	11.76	3.21
Female (n=21)	11.29	3.48
<b>All (n=38)</b>	<b>11.59</b>	<b>3.33</b>

**Table 3 Children with specific well-being issues**

Well-being issue	N	%
Yes	3	8
No	35	92
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 4 Children's contact with imprisoned parents/carers**

Child has contact	N	%
Yes	37	97
No	1	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 5a Whether parental/carer imprisonment had *bad* effect on child**

Bad effect	N	%
Yes	21	55
No	11	29
Not sure	6	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 5b Whether parental/carer imprisonment had *good* effect on child**

<b>Good effect</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	9	24
No	22	58
Not sure	7	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 6 Receipt of help by children regarding their parent/carer being in prison**

<b>Help received</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	34	92
No	3	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 7a Strengths and difficulties - mean scores and standard deviations**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Emotional Symptoms (n=19)	3.63	1.95
Conduct Problems (n=19)	2.42	2.48
Hyperactivity (n=19)	4.89	3.26
Peer Problems (n=19)	1.89	1.29
Prosocial Scale (n=19)	8.63	1.21
Total Difficulties Score (n=19)	12.84	7.17

**Table 7b Categorisation of children by Total Difficulties score**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Normative Ranges</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Normal	0-15	11	57.9
Borderline	16-19	5	26.3
Abnormal	20-40	3	15.8
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>19</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 8 Self-esteem scores**

<b>SES Score</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
10-19	0	0
20-29	11	29
30-40	27	71
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 9a KIDSCREEN scores – 5 health-related quality of life scores**

Quality of life dimension	Number of items on scale	Minimum possible score	Maximum possible score	Mean	SD
Physical Well-being (n=37)	5	5	25	18.11	4.20
Psychological Well-being (n=37)	7	7	35	28.51	4.96
Autonomy & Parent Relation (n=37)	7	7	35	26.76	4.85
Social Support & Peers (n=38)	4	4	20	17.29	2.27
School Environment (n=38)	4	4	20	15.55	3.52

**Table 9b Categorisation of children by individual *KIDSCREEN* scores**

Score	N	%
<b>Physical Well-being (n=30)</b>		
05-09	1	2.7
10-14	5	13.5
15-19	16	43.2
20-25	15	40.5
<b>Psychological Well-being (n=30)</b>		
07-13	0	0.0
14-20	3	8.1
21-27	8	21.6
28-35	26	70.3
<b>Autonomy &amp; Parent Relation (n=30)</b>		
07-13	0	0.0
14-20	5	13.5
21-27	16	43.2
28-35	16	43.2
<b>Social Support &amp; Peers (n=31)</b>		
04-09	0	0.0
10-14	4	10.5
15-20	34	89.5
<b>School Environment (n=31)</b>		
04-09	2	5.3
10-14	13	34.2
15-20	23	60.5

**Table 10a Non-imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child**

Relationship	N	%
Mother/father	29	93.5
Stepmother/father	0	0.0
Grandmother/father	1	3.2
Stepgrandmother/father	0	0.0
Boy/girlfriend of child's parent/carer	0	0.0
Brother/sister	0	0.0
Aunt/uncle	0	0.0
Friend	0	0.0
Other	1	3.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 10b Non-imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child by their gender<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>4</sup> One of the parents completing the questionnaire was the imprisoned parent (father). This respondent is not included in Table 10b, which is why the total number of All responses is 26 and not 27 as in Table 10a.

Relationship	Female		Male		All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Birth parent	27	96.4	1	3.6	28	93.3
Grandparent	1	100	0	0.0	1	3.3
Other	1	100	0	0.0	1	3.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>96.7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 11a Non-imprisoned parent/carers' quality of life

Quality of life dimension	No. of items	Min score possible	Max score possible	Mean	SD
Overall perception of quality of life (n=31)	1	1	5	3.67	0.91
Overall perception of health (n=31)	1	1	5	3.35	1.11
Physical Health (n=31)	7	4	20	14.27	3.60
Psychological Wellbeing (n=31)	6	4	20	13.72	2.23
Social Relationships (n=31)	3	4	20	14.53	3.50
Environment (n=31)	8	4	20	13.45	3.23
Total Scale Score (n=31)	26	26	130	89.97	17.41

Table 11b Non-imprisoned parent/carers' quality of life



<b>Description</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Overall perception of quality of life (n=31)		
1	0	0
2	3	32.3
3	10	16.1
4	12	35.5
5	6	16.1
Overall perception of health (n=31)		
1	0	0
2	10	9.7
3	5	32.3
4	11	38.3
5	5	19.4
Physical Health (n=31)		
04.00-06.99	0	0.0
07.00-10.99	8	25.8
11.00-14.99	8	25.8
15.00-20.00	15	48.4
Psychological Well-being (n=31)		
07.00-10.99	3	9.7
11.00-14.99	19	61.3
15.00-20.00	9	29.0
Social Relationships (n=31)		
04.00-06.99	1	3.2
07.00-10.99	6	19.4
11.00-14.99	7	22.6
15.00-20.00	17	54.8
Environment (n=31)		
04.00-06.99	0	0.0
07.00-10.99	7	22.6
11.00-14.99	10	32.3
15.00-20.00	14	45.2
Total Scale Score (n=31)		
26.00 - 50.99	0	0.0
51.00 - 76.99	7	22.6
77.00 -102.99	15	48.4
103.00 -130.00	9	29.0

**Table 12a Imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child**

<b>Relationship</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Mother/father	26	83.9
Stepmother/father	5	16.1
Grandmother/father	0	0
Stepgrandmother/father	0	0
Boy/girlfriend of child's parent/carer	0	0
Brother/sister	0	0
Aunt/uncle	0	0
Friend	0	0
Other	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table12b Imprisoned parent/carer's relationship to child by their gender**

Relationship	Male		Female		All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Birth parent	23	74.2	3	9.7	26	83.9
Step-parent	5	16.1	0	0.0	5	16.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>90.3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 13 Gender of imprisoned parents/carers: COPING sample compared to SWEDISH prison population**

Gender	COPING		SWE	
	N	%	N	%
Male	28	90.3	5086	94.6
Female	3	9.7	288	5.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>5374</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 14 Child-imprisoned parent/carer contact**

Whether child has contact	N	%
Yes	31	100
No	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 15a Bad effects of parent/carer's imprisonment upon child**

Bad effect	N	%
Yes	24	82.8
No	4	13.8
Not sure	1	3.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 15b Good effects of parent/carer's imprisonment upon child**

Good effect	N	%
Yes	10	35.7
No	15	53.6
Not sure	3	10.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 16 The areas in which children have needed help in the past three months**

Type of help needed	Yes		No		All	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Social contacts and free time						
Spending time with family	2	8.3	22	91.7	24	100.0
Spending time with children – school time	3	12.5	21	87.5	24	100.0
Spending time with children – outside school	3	12.5	21	87.5	24	100.0
Exposure to bullying or harassment	3	12.5	21	87.5	24	100.0
Playing sports	6	25	18	75	24	100.0
Going on holiday	3	12.5	21	87.5	24	100.0
School or work						
Help with homework	8	33.3	16	66.7	24	100.0
Following rules at school/work	6	25	18	75	23	100.0
Getting to school/work	1	4.3	22	95.7	23	100.0
Getting a place in school or a job	0	0	23	100	23	100.0
Dealing with school authorities	3	13	20	87	23	100.0
Parent/carer being in prison						
Visiting imprisoned parent/carer	8	34.8	15	65.2	23	100.0
Information about having parent/carer in prisons	8	34.8	15	65.2	23	100.0
Information about support for children of prisoners	9	39.1	14	60.9	23	100.0
Psychological health						
Psychological problems (general)	4	17.4	19	82.6	23	100.0
Psychological problems because parent/carer is in prison	5	21.7	18	78.3	23	100.0
Reducing self-harm	2	8.7	21	91.3	23	100.0
Reducing harm caused to others	1	4.3	22	95.7	23	100.0
Reducing alcohol/dug use	1	4.3	22	95.7	23	100.0
Information about mental health care system	2	8.7	21	91.3	23	100.0
Dealing with mental health authorities	1	4.3	22	95.7	23	100.0
Physical health problems						
Physical health problems	3	13	20	87	23	100.0
Visiting child or family doctor	2	8.7	21	91.3	23	100.0
Visiting dentist	2	8.7	21	91.3	23	100.0
Information about general health care system	3	13	20	87	23	100.0
Dealing with general health authorities	2	8.7	21	91.3	23	100.0
Housing						
Having a place to live	2	8.7	21	91.3	23	100.0
Self-care						
Eating well enough	3	13	20	87	23	100.0
Basic body care	2	8.7	21	91.3	23	100.0
Contraception	1	4.3	22	95.7	23	100.0
Money						
Managing own money	1	4.3	22	95.7	23	100.0
Communication						
Using the internet	1	4.3	22	95.7	23	100.0
Using telephones	1	4.3	22	95.7	23	100.0
Dealing with social welfare authorities	1	4.3	22	95.7	23	100.0
Other	2	8.7	21	91.3	23	100.0

Table 17a SDQ Total difficulties' and total strength's sub-scores

Description	Mean	SD
Emotional Symptoms (n=31)	2.77	1.86
Conduct Problems (n=31)	2.23	1.94
Hyperactivity (n=31)	4.48	2.80
Peer Problems (n=31)	2.16	1.71
Prosocial scale (n=31)	7.87	1.89
Total Difficulties Score (n=31)	11.65	6.26

Table 17b Categorisation of children by Total Difficulties score

Categorisation	Norm Range	N	%
Normal	0-13	18	58.1
Borderline	14-16	6	19.4
Abnormal	17-40	7	22.6
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>31</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Table 18a Kidscreen scores – 5 health-related quality of life scores

Quality of life dimension	Number Of items	Minimum possible score	Maximum possible score	Mean	SD
Physical Wellbeing (n=28)	5	5	25	18.14	3.19
Psychological Wellbeing (n=31)	7	7	35	25.81	3.91
Autonomy & Parent Relation (n=30)	7	7	35	25.16	3.49
Social Support & Peers (n=30)	4	4	20	15.30	3.08
School Environment (n=31)	4	4	20	14.71	2.73

Table 18b Categorisation of children by individual *KIDSCREEN* scores

<b>Score</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Physical Well-being (n=25)</b>		
05-09	0	0.0
10-14	4	14.3
15-19	12	42.9
20-25	12	42.9
<b>Psychological Well-being (n=27)</b>		
07-13	0	0.0
14-20	3	9.7
21-27	18	58.1
28-35	10	32.3
<b>Autonomy &amp; Parent Relation (n=27)</b>		
07-13	0	0.0
14-20	2	6.7
21-27	21	70.0
28-35	7	23.3
<b>Social Support &amp; Peers (n=26)</b>		
04-09	1	3.3
10-14	9	30.0
15-20	20	66.7
<b>School Environment (n=27)</b>		
04-09	1	3.2
10-14	13	41.9
15-20	17	54.8