

CHAPTER 4 : DISCUSSION

In chapter three, the changing patterns in the wife's and child's perception of the husband/father's imprisonment were described by reference to case studies. These relate to three dimensions: cognitive, emotional and material, assessed twice with an interval of one year. Also included is an assessment of the child's self-esteem, moral development, demographic data and details of current family interactions. In this chapter, a framework of how the family copes with aspects of imprisonment will be presented, which integrates the above components into patterns of coping strategies. To this end, three theoretical approaches are adopted: the interactional perspective, the ecology of human development and Wallerstein's framework of sequencing psychological tasks.

Towards a theoretical framework of coping for children of offenders.

The theoretical perspective that has guided the interpretation of the data in this study is based on Magnusson's (1988) interactional approach. As we have outlined in chapter I, this framework develops from the premise that human behaviour is fundamentally meaningful and contextually situated, and that an adequate description or explanation of human behaviour must take

these features into account (Magnusson, 1988; Wells and Stryker, 1988). That is, human activity can be conscious, intentional and interpretive and cannot be isolated from the contexts in which it is embedded without destroying its meaning and therefore its comprehension. Behaviour is viewed as the product of an ongoing interplay between society and the self which involves the participants' active awareness of elements in interactive situations, and the responses to these elements in terms of their meanings rather than simply as physical cues. The various contexts included in this approach are the social, physical, biological and temporal contexts.

The interactionist framework integrates four basic propositions. First, the self is a central feature for understanding human experience which is based on its essential reflexivity and intentionality. Second, the individual is viewed in terms of a total integrated system. Third, the individual operates in an ongoing, dynamic, and reciprocal process of interaction with his/her environment. Fourth, the nature of the person-environment interaction depends on the nature of the continuing, dynamic and reciprocal process of interaction among individual's psychological and biological subsystems (Magnusson, 1981). In this study we emphasise the physical, social and temporal contexts as central to the analysis of the events under investigation.

The interactionist framework is adopted in this study for, in order to understand fully an individual's coping strategies when faced with a stressful event, and to determine the degree of success or failure of the outcome, it is essential to acknowledge the individual's perception and subsequent appraisal of the situation within the specific context in which the event takes place.

Interactive processes between the person and the situation

The theoretical perspective adopted in this study which emphasises the meaning and reasons that underlie action, has hitherto eluded the limited amount of research undertaken on children of offenders (see chapter I, pp. 43-45). To describe a child's reactions to loss of the father because imprisonment, or the characteristics of individuals or families in which this event takes place, is not useful in providing an explanatory model and has few implications for treatment. The limitations of these approaches are that, whilst general statements can be made about the effects of father's imprisonment on children, it cannot account for variations in the particular processes of children's coping, nor does it offer explanations for the developmental outcomes noted.

Various theories and conceptual frameworks have emphasised the crucial importance of considering the meaning the

individual gives to an event, in order to identify the generative mechanisms that give rise to the behaviour (Harre and Secord, 1972) and enable the understanding and explanation of behavioural variance. Harre (1977) also emphasises that behaviour is self-directed and self-monitored; thus, the explanation of social behaviour requires the identification of the rules governing it, rules which give it meaning for those enacting it. Shotter (1978) also argues that the reasons an actor gives are crucial to the understanding of individuals as agents, and as such are most appropriate for explaining social behaviour. He stresses the intentional nature of man, but contrary to Harre, argues against the determinism that adherence to rules implies. For Shotter, reasons given for action will not necessarily reveal rules or scripts for action, but rather demonstrate how these are assessed and taken into account. An example in our study would be the wives' hopes for a positive outcome on the release of their spouse and subsequent decision to wait for his return may appear unrealistic to outsiders, but it is not unrealistic to those involved, even if the reasons for their hope may be idiosyncratic (Families D, E, M).

The interactional perspective is also congruent with Mischel's (1973) emphasis on the idiosyncratic organization of behaviour, and like Bowers (1973), supports the interactionist position, in that the major determinant of behaviour is the individual's perception of the situation

(psychological environment) and not the environment per se. The individual is the active, intentional subject in the reciprocal person-by-situation interaction. S/he is not only affected by the situations but also affects what is going on and continuously contributes to changes in situational and environmental conditions both for him/herself and for others. What is of decisive importance within this process is the way an individual selects situations, stimuli and events, and perceives, construes and evaluates them (Magnusson, 1981). This makes situations and environments as they are perceived and appraised by individuals an essential subject matter of analysis. Moreover, the configuration of factors that operate in each individual's life requires that attention be given to the behaviour of each person as an integrated totality (Cairns, 1987), which includes the biological, psychological, and sociological aspects of the organism-environment system (Ekehammar, 1974).

By assimilating new knowledge and new experiences within existing categories and by accommodating old categories and forming new ones, each individual develops a total, integrated system of mental structures and contents in a continuous interaction with the physical, social, and cultural environments. Therefore, the development of coping strategies for dealing with various kinds of environments and situations is a continuously ongoing learning process,

which derives from the influence of the various systems an individual encounters in the course of development (Lewis and Feiring, 1978; Runyan, 1978).

The emphasis upon cognition as an organizing structure that determines our perceptions and knowledge of reality is acknowledged in the conceptual framework for managing life crises, proposed by Moos and Schaeffer (1986). Their five major sets of tasks are based on Crisis Theory, which deals with the impact of disruption on established patterns of person and social identity, and argues that a crisis is a situation that is so novel or major that habitual responses are insufficient to restore the individual's balance when characteristic patterns of thoughts and behaviour are upset. Crisis Theory's first and basic assumption is, that through a cognitive appraisal of its significance, a crisis sets forth basic adaptive tasks to which varied coping skills can be applied.

The significance of the theoretical contributions outlined above can be seen by Thomasson's (1984) observations that acceptance by wives of their husband's criminality may seem arbitrary, until they give their reasons for their belief. These are based on the assumption that the men are really no different from anyone else, apart from an extremely difficult past ("the sad tale" p.63), which led them into a life of crime, and hence their view that their men deserve understanding and even support.

In the case of the children in our study, the significance of establishing the meaning they give to the event can be observed in their different ways of perceiving the father's action, and the influence this has in the organization of their coping strategies. For example if the child considers that his/her friends will disapprove of the father's offence s/he is more likely to prepare a lie to explain the absence of the father than if s/he considers that friends will understand the situation.

Paternal imprisonment initiates a chain of cognitive activity that can be extended over a long period of time and involves complex thoughts, actions and reactions. New information from the environment and new thoughts feed back to the original interpretation of the father's action, denying it, confirming it, enhancing it, or reducing it, depending on further evaluations of what is happening and what the child can do about it.

Bronfenbrenner's ecological system framework

Given the recognition that paternal separation due to imprisonment does not occur in isolation from the socio-environmental context in which this event takes place, it is important to situate the various contextual sources of influences on the family, and the levels of abstraction at

which they operate.

A most useful framework that delineates different categories of variables which operate at various levels of contextual abstraction is the ecological systems framework proposed by Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1985; Bronfenbrenner and Crouter, 1983), which is presented in chapter I of this study. This perspective provides a particularly well suited framework to analyse and understand father-child separation, since it conceptualizes relationships and environments in terms of interacting systems, which are critical to the child's development. These systems include: microsystems, mesosystems, exosystems and macrosystems. For the purpose of this study, the microsystems refer to the settings of the family and the prison visit in which the child participates, the mesosystem to the interpersonal linkage between the family and the prison settings, the exosystem refers to the judicial system, that is, the effects court proceedings and the actions of the police have on the developmental environment of the child, even though s/he has never participated in these settings and the macrosystem to society's norm and values which influence the child's justifications for the father's offence.

Wallerstein's conceptualization of coping tasks

For the purpose of organising the data concerning the demands for adjustment to the major psychological, social and economic changes that paternal loss resulting from imprisonment poses to the child, five tasks with which s/he is confronted during this period are conceptualised. These five tasks have been derived from Wallerstein's (1983) work on father's loss due to divorce.

Wallerstein (1983) formulates a sequence of six interrelated hierarchical coping tasks that attend the child's experience in the divorcing family. The concept of task is used as a framework to link theoretical and experiential grounds, to clarify the child's patterns of coping and to illustrate the psychological significance of the child's responses, as well as their social context and social consequences over time. However, Wallerstein (1983) alerts us to the limitations of the concept of task, which implies a dichotomy between success and failure. In our study, success and failure are viewed as relative, and we follow Wallerstein's definition of success, as "that which permits the individual to maintain a reasonable developmental progression" (p. 282); and of failure, "that which significantly hampers or distorts subsequent development" (p. 282).

Models of coping strategies

Several authors have included the cognitive redefinition of the situation in their conceptual framework on methods of coping with stressful events, and have considered it to be essential to the understanding of the coping process (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984; Schlenker, 1987; Murphy and Moriarty, 1976; Moos and Schaefer, 1986). Even though many coping models have been developed, stress as a concept has been viewed as being dependent on the interaction of two complex systems, the environment and the person. That is, stress lies not in the environmental input but in the person's "agendas" such as beliefs, goals and capabilities to meet, mitigate or alter these demands.

In an example from the present study, we can see that, despite the enormous suffering and turmoil that the imprisonment of Frances' husband (family M) brought to her, she now believes that his imprisonment has given her cause for hope and that their relationship will be a "lot better" when he returns home. After years of trying unsuccessfully to stop his drinking, her husband himself has decided to stop, as a result of his offence being related to drinking. Similarly, Joanna (family B) thinks that her husband's arrest "was almost a good thing" in that it would stop him to be "sucked into a life of destruction", even though she felt "shocked and desperate".

Schlenker (1987) also regards stress as a transaction between people and the environmental forces that might change them, and he applies a self-identification approach to the analysis of this phenomenon. The central proposition of this approach is that a person strives to construct and maintain desired identity images and any impediments to the construction and maintenance of these images generate resistance which takes three generic forms: a) explanations that bear on the cause of the difficulty and have implications for the self, which define the nature of the problem, b) the production of intensified examination of information and c) the generation of strategic activities designed to overcome the difficulty.

Lazarus' (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984) theory of coping highlights the interactive processes involved between the person and the environment, and the importance of feedback from the shifting person-environment relationship. This process may be the result of those directed at changing the environment or coping strategies directed inward that change the meaning of the event or increase understanding. They may also be the result of changes in the environment that are independent of the person and his/her coping activity.

These studies however, have been criticized for the broad categories they formulate, and as such are too simplistic

to account for the complex processes of coping used by different people in a variety of situations (Stone *et al.*, 1988). For example, Lazarus' "emotional-focused" coping strategy does not distinguish between the cognitive appraisal and the affective regulation of feelings elicited by a stressful event. And Moos and Schaefer's (1986) formulation of major types of coping skills that are employed to deal with the five adaptive tasks in order to overcome normative transitions and life crises do not account for the manner in which people actually cope in specific situations. However, his conceptual framework is more refined than Lazarus' (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984), as it distinguishes between "appraisal-focus" coping and "emotion-focused" coping.

A number of studies have investigated coping mechanisms related to specific situations of paternal loss, such as in the case of divorce (Tschann *et al.*, 1989; Peterson, 1986; Woody *et al.*, 1984; Weiss, 1979; Hetherington, 1982; Wallerstein, 1983). However, none of the above studies sought to establish the child's appraisal of the situation, although both Wallerstein and Hetherington investigate divorce from the child's perspective, that is, how they respond and adapt as a function of temperament, past experiences and the child's developmental status.

Coping strategies of children of offenders

The coping framework presented here can be seen as integration of the interactional theoretical orientation, Bronfenbrenner's ecological model of human development and the adaptation of Wallerstein's coping tasks to separation arising from imprisonment. Given the multistage process of the changes in family relationships and the influences of the various systems on them, we will first conceptualize the four successive phases that characterise the process of imprisonment, and within which will be located a set of five tasks with which children of offenders are confronted.

Phases of the process of imprisonment

The child's experience of paternal absence due to imprisonment is comparable in several ways to the child who experiences loss due to divorce, although in the latter case children may have greater contact with their father, and the separation, contrary to imprisonment, is, in general, permanent. However, both processes include a complex and interrelated series of external and internal events of radically changing family relationships, which, in the case of imprisonment begins with the father's arrest and its immediate aftermath and may continue for several years. In some cases the arrest of the husband may lead to divorce, which constitutes an additional burden for the child.

As we have pointed out in chapter 1, the separation from a father who is imprisoned is characterized by specific features, which are sudden, enforced and uncontrollable. It is sudden because the arrest is generally unexpected by the family; enforced because the decision to remove the father is made by an agency outside the family; and uncontrollable to the extent that it is not in the power of any member of the family to control the unfolding of the many occurrences and decisions taken by the judicial system. Also central to this type of separation is the possible stigmatisation of the family resulting from the father's criminal actions. Therefore, imprisonment can be classified as extrafamilial, involving dismemberment and demoralisation.

The impact of a father's imprisonment on children encompasses a sequence of experiences involving transitions in their lives. Although additional research with larger samples and different demographic groups are needed, our present information enables us to formulate four main successive phases to paternal imprisonment: acute, transient, normalising and reintegrative, which, despite overlap, are significantly distinguishable from each other.

Acute phase: The concept of "acute" has been taken from Wallerstein's (1983) study of divorce but is adapted to

meet the differences between divorce and imprisonment. For Wallerstein, it refers to the initial period of separation for divorcing couples, usually when legal proceedings are initiated and the husband leaves the family home. In this study, the acute phase is precipitated by the arrest of the father, the impact of which engenders profound distress on the family members. It is potentially disorganising as it demands complex, rapid recognition of a major life change, and the rapid adaptation to changed circumstances.

The chaotic ambience of the acute phase stems from the usually unexpected and sudden removal of the father, which initiates profound material, social and psychological changes. These changes include abrupt alterations in economic stability, which generally results in a decline in the family's standard of living, role redistribution and change in the relationship between parent and child. Also important are the problems created by the mother's moods and attitudes after the husband's imprisonment. Generally, the imprisonment of the husband is accompanied by a decrease in the emotional availability of the mother at a time when this capacity is most needed to give support to the child.

Both mother and children feel shocked and disorientated at the father's arrest. Even in situations where the father has been in prison on previous occasions, the child is not spared the impact of this event, as s/he is often

confronted with new disruptive experiences. The arrest of the father can be particularly stressful in cases where children are a witness to it, and/or the police search the home. Also problematic for children are the occasions when the mother is requested to go to the police station for questioning.

Transient phase: This phase refers to the period prior to the trial, during which the mother and child are overwhelmed by feelings of uncertainty, powerlessness, and anxiety. The wife rarely understands the complex court procedures which are set in motion suddenly. As the husband must remain incarcerated before the trial, the wife is plunged into a situation where she must learn quickly the legal terminology, become acquainted with complex bureaucratic procedures, and establish what resources are available. She is often confronted with demands made by the husband, such as contacting solicitors, trying to arrange security for bail, providing money for cigarettes, providing change of clothes and the ordeal of visiting the prison regularly (remand prisoners are allowed daily visits of approximately 15 minutes' duration).

Because the pre-trial period can extend from several months to a year or more, families are unable to plan concretely for their future and therefore maintain themselves in a state of "limbo". That is, the changes with which families

are confronted are dealt as they occur on the basis of "taking one day at a time". It is a time of conflicting feelings and uncertainty, as both mother and child have to accept that the husband/father will not return immediately, although hopes for his release at the trial are retained. During the transient phase, doubts and speculation on the course of future events dominate the family's discourse. As a consequence of the disruption to the family system and the new link formed with the prison system, the parent-child relationship is likely to undergo qualitative changes.

Like other types of separations, paternal imprisonment also brings multiple losses for the child, such as the loss of the family daily routine, the loss of the symbols, traditions and the continuity of the intact family, the loss of the protective physical presence of two parents and sometimes the loss of the child's physical setting such as the family home, school, and neighbours. But an additional loss which is specific and central to the case of the incarcerated father is the father's loss of moral status. Therefore, apart from having to cope with the turmoil that accompanies imprisonment, children of offenders, unlike children who experience loss of the father through divorce, death or mental illness, have to adjust to the new social definition of the father as deviant, and to cope with the resulting social stigma. This new information about the father that is incongruent with the child's perception of

him, brings into question his role as a model with whom to identify, since he is now seen to be in need of punishment.

The normalizing phase begins at the time the father is sentenced, when the reality of the on-going incarceration is confirmed for the first time. It requires that the child accept the long-term absence of the father and assimilate the new information arising from the trial.

Prior to sentencing, most mothers and children hope that the husband/father will be acquitted and often disregard the fact that long-term imprisonment is likely. During this phase, although the child has to accept the separation from the father, it is essential that s/he still maintains regular contact with him to facilitate the process of adaptation on his return.

According to the systems approach, a system needs to be sure of its components, that is, who is inside and outside the system boundaries, both physical and psychological, for in an ambiguous microsystem the quality of relationships within and between microsystems may produce impaired development. Boss (1980) found that a strong psychological father's presence is a wife-centered variable which is significant in blocking the regenerative power of the entire family system during his absence. However, in families of offenders, where the father is expected to

return, it is necessary to maintain a family structure in which the father continues to take part in family decision-making, and to provide the family members with emotional support. Important in this process is the degree to which wives of offenders are able to maintain the psychological-presence of the father whilst taking on his roles.

Finally the Integrative phase includes the weekend leave granted to some fathers prior to release and the actual re-entry of the father into the family system on completion of his sentence. Although our data for this phase is limited, four factors appear to be important for a successful reintegration of the father in the family system: the length of sentence, the quality and frequency of father/child interaction during the prison term, the degree to which wives maintain or exclude the father's psychological presence, and the extent to which the father fulfils the child's expectations s/he developed during his imprisonment.

Although the imprisonment of the father entails a continuous ongoing process of change and reorganisation for the family, specific crisis points have been identified as especially stressful for the mother and child. These crisis points include: the arrest, the trial and subsequent confirmation of incarceration and release.

Having outlined the main phases that constitute the process

that the family must follow as the father proceeds through the criminal justice system, we now present a conceptualization of the five tasks to be addressed by the child in order to adjust to this type of parental loss.

Psychological Tasks

Within the above four phases, a series of five tasks have been formulated in order to describe the continuing and particular demands for major psychological, social and often economic reorganisation that imprisonment of the father poses to the child. The five tasks conceptualise the required readjustment to be addressed by the child immediately, as well as over the years of the imprisonment. And it is the child's "success" or "failure" in mastering these tasks that will influence ultimately the child's adaptation to the father's absence and his subsequent return. These five tasks represent a major addition to the expectable normative tasks of childhood and adolescence and although based on Wallerstein's tasks for children in divorcing families, they have been modified to meet the specific conditions that apply to children of offenders.

For Wallerstein, the first two tasks that have to be addressed immediately after separation are acknowledging the reality of the marital rupture, and disengaging from the parental conflict and distress and resume customary

pursuits. Ideally these tasks should be resolved within the first year of the divorce. The following three tasks: resolution of loss; resolving anger and self-blame and accepting the permanence of the divorce may extend over a longer period of time before their resolution is achieved. The sixth task, achieving realistic hopes regarding relationships, is related to issues that are confronted during adolescence. In the case of children of offenders, however, separation from the father takes a different form. Whilst in divorce the reason for the separation is usually known by the children at the outset, for children of offenders this is not always the case, particularly for young children. In general, the child's awareness of the father's imprisonment is a result of a process in which the mother tries initially to conceal the truth and the child gains access to relevant information in a fragmented way from various sources as the events related to imprisonment unfold. Therefore, the first three tasks proposed in this study are contingent upon the specific features of this process, and are interrelated. These are: establishing the meaning of the father's action; acknowledging the father's departure and adapting daily activities to the new situation and managing feelings of loss. The remaining two tasks, accepting the temporary separation from the father and readjusting to the father's return follow a sequential pattern in that the former must be addressed after the father's conviction and the latter on his release.

The child's resolution of the above tasks is greatly influenced by the nature of the child's relationship with both mother and father, and the extent to which the mother has made progress in addressing the many issues resulting from the incarceration of the father. The mother's adjustment has a major influence on the child's ability to cope with the many problems engendered by this type of separation. In fact, the adaptation of the whole family seems to focus on the coping ability of the mother (Boss, 1980). If she can maintain the family as a unit, the separation can be endured better. Also important is the quality of support given by the immediate and extended family to the child's struggles, the family's balance of unresolved conflicts as well as the assistance provided by friends and neighbours. All these factors affect the relationships within the family microsystem and hence play a role in helping the child to resolve the psychological tasks as they unfold during the phases of imprisonment. However, how children progress through the various tasks is also influenced by their particular role in the family constellation, their individual developmental status, and their psychological strength and resourcefulness. That is, the effects of separation are assimilated within the attitudes, beliefs and values, the self-concept and the expectations of the child, which are modified over the course of time by the unfolding developmental stages, and by subsequent life experiences and life decisions.

I - Estasblishing the meaning of the father's action

As we have emphasised above, how the child appraises a stressful event influences how s/he will cope with it over time. This is particularly relevant for children of offenders, where the moral status of the father is brought into question, for it may affect the child's capacity to maintain an integrated sense of self. The social definition of the father as bad, coupled with the restricted experience the child has of the good father during the prison visits, may not only hamper the child's development of an integrated view of the good, but also of the bad or frustrating parent. Therefore, being deprived of the good father, the child may not succeed in maintaining a cohesive sense of self by developing further enduring representations of the good, but also the bad parental figure (Mahler, 1968). In order to address the father being defined socially as deviant, the child has to integrate the father's bad actions into a new perceived father figure which includes the conflicting definition.

The main proposition of this study is that the child's identity as a good person is threatened by the father's loss of moral status, and the resulting disapproval stemming from internalized norms and conforming others in the social environment. We argue that the child attempts to resolve this conflict by integrating the new social

definition of the father in a manner in which his moral integrity is maintained. That is, the child tries to accommodate the father's deviance to his/her acquired norms and values by construing mechanisms which dissociate the notion of the father's culpability from his actions, without denying the wrongfulness of the act in itself.

This process is manifest in statements made by most primary-school children and adolescents, who insist that the imprisonment of their father has made no difference to the way they see his image "because he is still my dad and the same person". That is, for both younger children and also adolescents, the father's alleged criminal activities are seen as being inconsistent with his behaviour and attitudes as experienced during their interaction with him, before and since imprisonment. Therefore, by dissociating the father's culpability from the offence, it enables children to reject the notion of the father as deviant.

Social origins of the mechanisms of dissociation

It has been argued above that the reasons and meaning the child gives to the father's actions are central to the understanding of how s/he copes with this most stressful event. However, mental phenomena develop as a function of the interaction between the organism and its material and social environment, that is, through the interaction of the

micro and macrosystems. Conflict and conflict resolution are often characterised by the interaction and juxtaposition of interpersonal, institutional, subcultural and societal orientation. The processes of making sense of the experience of imprisonment are imbedded in a set of systems working within larger systems, which facilitates the investigation of the environmental influences at four levels beyond the individual organism, from the micro- to the macro-level. In line with this assumption, the content of the mechanisms developed by the child, which aim to neutralize the father's loss of moral status, is drawn from social discourse, which provides the child with the required validity for his/her redefinition of the father's action.

The normative system of society is marked by flexibility, which does not have a body of laws held to be binding under all conditions. For example, an integral part of the criminal law is the concept of intent (Smith and Hogan, 1983). If the individual can prove that criminal intent was lacking, moral culpability for the criminal action can be avoided and, consequently, some sanctions of society. In addition, society's norms and values are limited in their applicability in terms of time, place, person and social circumstances (Bilton, 1981). For example, the condemnation of murder does not apply to the enemy during combat in time of war. Furthermore, society attaches specific values and expectations to the various social roles played by

individuals. In the present study, when a child justifies the father's offence by saying that he had to steal to keep his family because he was unemployed, the child bases this justification on society's expectation of the role of the father, whose primary concern is to provide for the family. Therefore, an act defined as wrong by society can be legitimised by a value defined as right by the same society. However, the construed justification may not be sufficiently powerful to shield fully the child from his/her own internalised norms and values and the reactions of conforming others, as primary-school children and adolescents alike express feelings of shame when confronted with their peer groups. They either attempt to hide the event from their friends or, if this is not possible, they avoid talking about the subject with them. They explain that their friends do not really understand all the subtleties of the situation and would make a wrong interpretation of the event.

The child's justifications for the father's action are selected actively from the available information generally provided by the family and the mother in particular. But it may be provided also by friends, neighbours or the media. While the child's justification usually reflects the mother's concern for preserving the positive image of the husband, the particular elements chosen for minimising the father's offence are the ones which the child deems to be

most salient. The intentional selective process of information can be illustrated by the different ideas that the siblings Tania and Larry (family I) found significant to consider in neutralising their father's responsibility for the offence. Whilst Tania displaces the father's responsibility of the offence to "my mum's boyfriend as he shouldn't be here", Larry blames "my mum, because she goes off to the pub, pick up this man and brought him home".

The justification may be modified during the process of the father's imprisonment, as new information concerning his offence become available, and is perceived by the child as conflicting and cannot be integrated in the already construed justification. Evidence from this study shows that this can occur when the father is convicted contrary to the child's expectations and a re-evaluation becomes necessary.

Categorisation of the mechanisms of dissociation

The child's various ways of dissociating the father's culpability can be organised into seven categories, each of which contains a set of related underlying ideas. It must be emphasised that in some cases there is a degree of overlap between categories, and the final decision into which category to place the child was based on what idea the child reported to be most salient.

- 1 - Displacement of responsibility
- 2 - Focus displacement
- 3 - Diminished responsibility
- 4 - Family loyalty
- 5 - Selective avoidance
- 6 - Innocent of the offence
- 7 - Comparative deviance

Displacement of responsibility: This mechanism of dissociation neutralises the father's responsibility for the offence by placing the real onus onto another person who is also involved or can fit consistently within the circumstances of the crime. For example, Lola (family B) firmly believes that her father's partner was responsible for her father's arrest as he told the police that her father was the owner of the "stuff" (cocaine), when this friend was the one that was "playing the game" (dealing with the drug) and not her father. By displacing the father's responsibility, without denying his involvement in the offence, the child avoids entering into conflict with society's norms and values, and thereby remaining committed to the dominant normative value system. In our study, displacement of responsibility is only used by the younger children, and it is the one most commonly adopted within this age group.

Although from the age of seven, there is a shift in

dimensional salience from objective outcome to subjective intent as the main dimension of moral evaluation (Weiner and Peter, 1973), the ability of the primary-school child to apply this criterion seems to be dependent on the child's naive definition of what he or she considers to be a meaningful response to any specific conflict. Therefore, the motives and reasons used by children to displace the father's responsibility onto other agents are based on plausible justifications drawn from their social environment where they find commonly held beliefs, such as the belief that a person can be led into committing actions without having the intention to do so.

Focus displacement: This mechanism of dissociation is a particular case of displacement, where the child shifts the focus of attention from the father's criminal act to the motives and behaviour of those who enforce the law. By directing attention to the negative qualities of the police and/or solicitors the wrongfulness of the father's action is more easily suppressed. In our study, this mechanism is used only by primary-school children. George (Family H) illustrates this mechanism by focusing on the persecutory attitude of the police, while dismissing the fact that his father was arrested for stealing, of which he knew, as the police carried out a search of the family home after the father's arrest and found stolen property.

Diminished responsibility : This mechanism refers to cases in which the child neutralizes the father's moral culpability for his criminal action by claiming lack of intent due to the influence of alcohol, drugs or self-defence. The principle underlying the above rationale is an extension of the criteria adopted in law. In the domain of retributive justice, the same punishment is not administered universally, for consideration is given to mitigating circumstances. In this study children use this mechanism when they believe that the father had to defend himself from an attack, they perceive him to lack will power to resist following friends or drug habits thus in need of help, or that he committed the offence in an altered state of mind and therefore is exempt from moral culpability. Diminished responsibility was found to be used only by adolescents such as Ronald (Family M) who claimed that his father should not receive a prison sentence as he committed the offence under the influence of alcohol. He explains that his father received a large amount of money from his employer just prior to Christmas which prompted him to organise a party in his best friend's house. Being an alcoholic, he drank too much as did his friend, and during an argument that followed, Ronald's father picked up a saucepan and hit his friend on the head, killing him.

Family loyalty: This mechanism of dissociation operates by neutralising internal and external demands for conformity by emphasising the particular obligation to family members, rather than the more general obligations to society. Therefore, between the demands of law and the demands of the family, priority is given to the family as a higher loyalty. By applying this form of reasoning, the child can accept that the father's deviation from societal norms has occurred, not because the father is a bad person, but because the personal obligations elicited by family relationships are accorded precedence over the norms related to the criminal law. For example, the role assigned to the father as responsible for the family precedes his obligations towards other members of society. This is clearly expressed by Peter who claims that his father's involvement in the crime arose from his loyalty to his brother ("it's his own blood") who was in need of money as his wife had died of cancer, therefore, his father "had no choice".

Selective avoidance: This mechanism of dissociation refers to the child's intentional avoidance to think about the father's imprisonment, thereby extricating himself/herself from making judgments that could lead to internal conflict. It is normally adopted in cases where the father has been to prison on previous occasions, or when the child is confused about the father's involvement in the offence, either because s/he has not received any clear explanation,

or when the child becomes aware of new, conflicting information which would make a further re-evaluation too painful. Only primary-school children use this type of mechanism. Walter (Family A), for example, received new conflicting information when his father was convicted. He received a nine-years sentence, when to Walter it was certain that his father was innocent and that he would be released. As a consequence, Walter says that he cannot remember why his father is in prison and does not think further about the matter.

Innocent of the offence: This mechanism is adopted when a child is convinced that the father did not play any role in the alleged offence. In this study, the child's unquestioned certainty of the father's innocence is influenced by a combination of three conditions: 1) the child's perception of the father figure, 2) the mother's belief in her husband's innocence, and 3) circumstantial aspects of the event. The father is perceived by the child in idealistic terms as being morally beyond reproach probably because of their close relationship. However, other elements are essential to strengthen the belief of the father's innocence, such as the confirming feedback from the mother and some concrete evidence on which to base this assumption. In the case of Mara (9 years old, Family N), for example, the mother is convinced of her husband's innocence as drugs were not found on him, but rather in the

possession of her step-son, when they returned from a trip abroad together. If these conditions are not met, the belief in the father's total innocence is brought into question and different mechanisms take its place.

Comparative deviance: Children in this category minimise the seriousness of the father's offence by comparing it with a crime of a more serious nature. This mechanism is used only in cases where children are aware of the father's previous criminality and find it difficult to construe justifications based on external agents, social norms or lack of intent.

Society makes distinctions between the seriousness of criminal acts, and by extension, the child can make the same distinctions in evaluating the father's offence. For example, tax evasion is considered less serious than acts of robbery, child abuse or sex offences. Laura (Family G) uses this mechanism when she recognises that her father "is doing wrong", but adds that burglary is not really a "bad thing" compared to rape or murder.

We have argued above that, to establish the meaning of the father's action, the child uses mechanisms to dissociate him from the notion of immorality which underlies his action. This enables the child to retain an image of the good father and thereby deflect the threat posed to his/her own self-concept.

Moral development and self-esteem

The results from the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory lend some support to the proposition that a relationship exists between moral development and self-esteem. It must be emphasised, however, that in this study the self-esteem scores are used idiographically rather than normatively. The decrease in the level of self-esteem of nine of fifteen primary-school children revealed at the time of the second interview, appears to be related to a change in their perception of the father, as they now express confusion and ambivalence about the father's role in the offence. New facts such as the father's conviction, changes in the mother's attitude towards the father, new information about the father's offence, and a gradual awareness of the stigma attached to it, seem to have brought into question the children's previous perception of the father.

It may be argued that the decrease in the level of self-esteem could be an artifact of the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory. However, in support of the above interpretation, three facts are suggested. First, the decrease in the levels of self-esteem are sufficiently high to conclude that they are unlikely to be accounted for by the effect of testing on the outcome of subsequent uses of the test, subject attrition and the subjects' attitudes such as

inattentiveness, carelessness or low motivation. Second, while it cannot be assumed that all high scores reflect truly positive self-esteem, it is more likely that low scores reflect valid assessment of low self-esteem. High scores can be artificially inflated reports of self-esteem and/or defensive denial of low self-esteem resulting from the social desirability factor (Hales, 1981b). Third, when the primary-school boys are analysed separated from primary-school girls, a clearer pattern emerges, one which is consistent with the results of research on the differential effect of various variables on the level of self-esteem of boys and girls (Fry and Scher, 1983; Miller, 1984; Eisen, 1972). That is, research on the self-esteem of girls, contrary to boys, has consistently shown unclear patterns when relationships have been sought between self-esteem and other variables.

The overall level of self-esteem of all boys in this group declined significantly from the first to the second interview, compared with the girls where three decreased, three increased and three maintained their level of self-esteem. A further analysis of the self-esteem scores of the primary-school boys reveals that the decrease in self-esteem is most apparent in the sub-scales school-academic and home-parent. The decline in the levels of self-esteem manifested in the school context may be explained by the fact that primary-school children are engaged in the normative task of acquiring skills to develop a sense of

competence as a worker (Erikson, 1968); therefore their feelings of worthlessness are expressed mainly in this area. Concerning the decline of self-esteem in the home-parent sub-scale, which is manifested by primary-school boys with the greatest decline in overall self-esteem, it may be an expression of the doubts they have of the familiar father figure or, alternatively, the decline may be related to factors within the home environment, such as the mother's lack of emotional support, children's feelings of insecurity and so on.

With regard of the primary-school girls, the factors that have influenced the changes in self-esteem between the first and second interview are unclear, and we can only suggest tentatively some reasons why these changes have occurred.

Of the three girls whose self-esteem decreased, only the cases of Lola and Sousie are discussed as Tanya's decrease is very small. Sousie's decline in self-esteem is the greatest of the three girls. Given the extreme change in her attitude toward her father at the second interview resulting from her deep disappointment with his conviction, it may be suggested that this factor has had an influence in the decline of her self-esteem.

In the case of Lola, one can speculate that the decline in

self-esteem over the one year period could be related to two factors. First, during the year Lola became increasingly aware of the stigma attached to having a father in prison. At the first interview she considered herself to be the centre of attraction at school as friends showed interest in her father's situation. At the second interview, however, she was upset deeply by the bullying she experienced from friends. Second, also during the period between the first and second interview, it became apparent that Lola was experiencing difficulties at school concerning writing, which was diagnosed as dyslexic.

Of the three primary-school girls whose self-esteem scores increased, only in the case of Lauren was it sufficiently marked to justify a tentative explanation. Two major factors which occurred between the first and second interview may explain this increase: the family moved to a new house, and the father was released from prison. In her previous home, Lauren felt insecure because her mother was attacked by a neighbour, and she disliked the general environment of the estate.

Changes in self-esteem in the adolescent group between the first and second interviews show no consistent pattern. However, in the two cases where the level of self-esteem declined significantly, they suffered severe rejection from their environments compared to those where the level of self-esteem increased or remained the same and no such

rejection took place. The increase in the adolescents' levels of self-esteem may be attributed to their accuracy in perception which enables them to understand socially relevant factors within a specific context, and therefore to respond to the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory in a socially desirable manner. However, another possible explanation to the increase and lack of decline in adolescents' levels of self-esteem may be related to their greater emotional and intellectual capacity to understand imprisonment compared with primary-school children. That is, the former are less susceptible to inconsistencies arising from their moral reasoning as they are better able to construct justifications for the father's offence that are more consistent with socially approved principles that mitigate criminal acts.

A relationship between self-esteem and moral judgment has been posited by Meacham (1975). He argues that the course of moral development is one of increasing integration of principles of moral judgment with the concept of self, which occurs through the construction of evaluative relationships between the individual and other persons. It is through this process that mature moral development is achieved.

In the case of children of offenders, the influence of personal involvement on moral judgment is clearly

manifested when they judge the father's action, and this conflict elicits a reasoning process in which criteria other than categorical principles of right and wrong come into play. That is, comparisons and conditions of the context in which the act takes place are included in the reasoning process. This would suggest that Kohlberg underestimated the influence of contextual affective motivations on reasoning about painful moral experiences, and at the same time indicates that contextual elements which affect moral judgements are already consciously realised and are entering into children's theoretical thought.

The reasons given by the child as to why the father should not be punished, or at most receive a very lenient punishment, not only reflect the influence of contextual affective motivations on reasoning about personal moral experiences, but also give some indication of the nature of the conflict which occurs when judging dilemmas with varying degrees of personal involvement. For moral conflicts which involve persons with whom one has a sense of identification are different in nature to those where the moral dilemma concerns an evaluation of an unknown person. As has been shown, in the former, the evaluation of a moral dilemma may lead to an increase in awareness of contextual elements and the active selection of them in the construction of justifications. These results are consistent with Haan's (1978) findings that prediction of

action from test levels are significantly improved on interpersonal moral scores when ego processing is taken into account, that is, when their freedom to cope or their necessity to defend was governing the action level of morality they actually produced. This would suggest that judgments about moral issues in which the self is involved are guided not by the individual's role playing, but rather by his/her attempts to maintain a consistent self-concept. This is not to say that the constructive, organising activities of the individual do not play a role, but that formal structures are not a sufficient and comprehensive configuration of those moral levels that children actually use. As Meacham (1975) argues, the individual's judgment of him/herself and his/her own behaviour can play a role in guiding moral conduct.

In agreement with this view, Gerson and Damon (1978) maintain that moral emotions, either pleasant or unpleasant, serve as important reasons for the child to adhere to moral objectives. Judgments of morality can be made with different degrees of personal involvement, and therefore there are in the person motivational sources that may come into conflict with cognitive motives. This suggests that moral reasoning involves sensitivity to complex human emotions and situations, and also the personal experiences of moral conflict, choice and responsibility, which can be distinguished from formal

structure.

The child's coping with the conflict related to the change to the father's moral status influences moral development. This is manifested by the way in which many children have generalised the rationale they use to justify the father's action to the more abstract level of punishment for people who break the law in general. As we have seen in the results (see pp.308-309), seven of the 10 children who, in varying degrees, incorporated the underlying ideas of the father's justification in their responses to Kohlberg's hypothetical dilemma show an increase in development in moral stage. Although the sample is small and these results should be taken with caution, they provide some indication that, when children judge a person with whom they identify, this personal moral dilemma may have implications for moral development.

This study shows that moral judgement is not a unitary construct. Distinct dimensions of moral reasoning may develop in parallel according to contextual variations, which may become integrated to influence moral development. More complex moral thought can develop in attempting to cope with conflicting moral situations that may threaten the self-concept and lay the foundations for a mature morality that, contrary to theoretical constructs of justice reasoning, is prompted by the experience of personal moral dilemmas and the need to cope with them.

Variations have been revealed in the particular mechanisms used by the child to dissociate the father's culpability from the alleged offence. These variations are related to the mother's perception of the husband and the adequacy of the explanation given to the child about imprisonment, developmental factors, the circumstances of the event and the child's knowledge of the father's previous criminal history.

Reciprocal processes between mother's and child's perception of the situation

As pointed out above, the ecological system perspective focuses on environmental interconnections and their impact on the forces directly affecting human development, thus emphasising the examination of the family, its ecological niche, and the relations which operate simultaneously between the systems. This interactive process takes place at various levels of the person-environment system. At the level of the family microsystem, the child's construed mechanisms of dissociation are continuously shaped by his/her interaction with the parents, particularly the mother. Therefore, the mother's attitude towards the husband, whether positive or negative, will affect significantly the legitimacy of the mechanisms of dissociation construed by the child. That is, mothers who

have a positive perception of the husband are more likely to provide support and consistency to the child's construed mechanisms. Conversely, mothers with a negative perception of the husband will make it more difficult for the child to retain the good father image.

The mother's positive perception of the husband and the optimistic expectations about their relationship when he returns home depend on the degree of conflict in their relationship prior to the arrest. This, in turn, influences the mother's decision as to whether she should wait for her husband's return, or separate from him. In cases where the mother has decided to separate, a dramatic change in her attitude towards her husband takes place, relating to him both as a person and as a criminal. Whilst before her decision to separate, she minimises the husband's responsibility in the offence, she now uses his imprisonment, generally after sentencing, as a basis for the separation. The impact on the children of the mother's changed attitude can be illustrated by the case of Sousie. Before the father's sentence Sousie was convinced of his innocence. She would write "I love daddy" on the walls of the corridors of the estate on which she lived and stated that her father was kind, used to tell the truth, often cuddled her and emphasised she was sure of his innocence. However at the time of the second interview, and after her mother adopted a rejecting attitude towards her father, contrary to her previous supportive attitude, Sousie admits

that the father had a fight and the man died as a consequence, even though she believes the latter probably started it. She adds that as a consequence of her mother's divorce, she has not seen her father for the last two or three months, and she understands her mother's decision to separate as "she never really got on with my dad and it's her life she's wasting".

The quality of the mother's explanation also affects the legitimacy and consistency of the child's mechanisms of dissociation. All children interviewed in this study were aware that their fathers had been arrested and were in prison, although not all gained this information from their mothers.

In general, the child's knowledge of the father's absence and the reason for his departure is gained through a process of discovery. Initially, mothers tend to conceal the father's whereabouts for as long as possible in the hope that he will be released and return home soon. Findings in our study are similar to those found by Hounslow *et al* (1982), where mothers are confused and have great difficulty knowing just what to tell the children. Therefore, the relevant information is gained in a fragmented way as the real circumstances surrounding the offence filter through from various sources such as the media, or friends and relatives. Even in cases where the

child witnesses the arrest, the mother may still deny that there is any need to explain the situation, as she believes that the child is too young to understand what is happening. In the absence of a suitable explanation of the father's imprisonment from mothers, some children rely on their own imagination and construct dramatic stories, which serve to fulfill their needs for making sense of the event.

When, how and what the mother tells the child depends on various factors such as the age of the child, type of offence, the circumstances surrounding the arrest, and the father's previous criminal history. The younger the child, the more likely that the mother provides a deceptive explanation about the father's absence; the more stigmatising the offence the more likely she modifies the reasons for the father's incarceration; and in cases where the father has previous convictions, the mother may think it is only necessary to tell the children that "he's gone again" as they have "gone through it all before".

According to the results of this study, the explanations provided by the mothers can be categorised as deceptive, partially deceptive and truthful, or she may not give any explanation at all. Deception varied from total to a more modified form in which the mother changes elements that are considered too painful for the child. When the mother decides to adopt total deception, the most common

explanations are that the father is working away from home or that he is in hospital. However, deceptive explanations may develop into complicated fabrications which may have to be maintained for years until such a time as they can no longer be sustained.

The reasons mothers give for not telling the truth about the father's whereabouts usually include: the belief on the part of the mother that the children are too young; to preserve the image of the father as a good person, and the desire to protect the child from teasing by peers. However, by maintaining the secret, the mother denies the child outlets for expressing grief and frustration. In reality, the child often senses the truth and sees the mother's false explanation as a sign of personal rejection.

The child's desire to know the true facts can be manifested in various ways. For example Lola's mother (Family B) feels "shocked" at her daughter's knowledge of the visiting days and regulations of most prison in England. In the case of Jennifer (Family O), her mother has never spoken about the subject with her, but when asked how she knew about her father's imprisonment, she says, very sadly that she "tried to think" where her father was because no one told her anything. As a consequence she is very confused and worried about the whole matter, which she expresses during the interview in her repetitive reference to the way her

father killed the victim: "If he steal they'll be taken his head off because they steal things, kill people, hit them on the head...bang dead".

However, children often collude in the mother's duplicity by not pressing her for further information, and in turn develop their own forms of deception to be used with their peers. In some cases, the mother may tell an older child to deceive the younger siblings about the father's whereabouts, creating an additional burden for the child to bear. Some mothers, conversely, believe it to be beneficial to give a truthful explanation, as they are able to comfort the child when distressed and clarify doubts and distorted perceptions should they arise.

The mother's explanation is mediated by the child's own systems of thoughts, their self-perception and their conception of the external world. Trying to explain why her father committed various offences, Natalya (family P) says: "all his friends do and he don't want to be the odd one out". She goes on to say that she does not understand why her father does not find other friends, and compares him to herself, for when she was at the old school, her friends "got her into stealing and swearing" otherwise she could be the "odd one out". Now that she has changed school and has different friends, she does not steal or swear anymore.

Mothers are often unaware of the extent to which children know the facts about the father's crime. For example, in Julia's (Family I) account of her children's experience of the father's crime, she states that they were largely unaware of the event at the time it took place in the family home. However, the children's description of their experience contradicts their mother's account, for they report that they heard everything, felt very frightened and as soon as their mother left to phone an ambulance they came downstairs to find the man lying on the floor.

The tendency of mothers to withhold the truth about the father's offence, and their often misconceived perceptions of what the children really know, show that to rely solely on the mother's accounts of how children experience the father's imprisonment can result in misleading conclusions.

Developmental factors influencing the child's mechanisms of dissociation

From a developmental perspective, the data from this study reveal distinguishable differences in the children's capacity to understand and organise legitimate causal attributions of the father's responsibility for the offence. That is, how the event is experienced reflects developmental differences in perceptual, cognitive and defensive configurations. Children's evaluations of other

people and their actions depend both on their understanding of others and on the evaluative criteria that they consider relevant (Berndt 1975). Thus, responses to a social interaction may indicate the child's social understanding and moral judgement. This appears to be the case for the child's cognitive appraisal of the causal attributions related to the responsibility of the father's action.

As we have argued above, most children in the study appraise the father's action in terms of an imperative which is external to the intrinsic character of the father. In doing so, they are able to dissociate the father as a criminal from the image they have of him as a good person, thereby defining themselves as good also, and by extension, they are able to retain their own moral identity.

The primary-school child, although able to manipulate categories, classification systems and move from experience to general principles (Newman and Newman, 1975), is still tied to physical reality, and hence less skilled at drawing upon the underlying principles of social norms and values in formulating their justifications. That is, whilst both the primary-school-aged child's and adolescent's justifications of the father's action are grounded in social norms and values, the latter group usually base their explanations on general obligations and general principles of loyalty and justice underlying these norms rather than onto external physical agents. This can be seen

in the preference given to the ideas underlying the category of Displaced responsibility by primary school children, whereas most adolescents adopt justifications which focus on ideas underlying the categories of Diminished responsibility or Family loyalty. Adolescents in this study also do not use the category Selective avoidance, which expresses a more simplistic mode of coping.

The less sophisticated nature of the primary-school child's appraisal of the father's action outlined above suggests that, to deal with ambivalent feelings towards the father may be more problematic for them than for adolescents. That is, younger children are more likely to experience difficulties when confronting and accommodating the various challenges posed by the social environment, and hence, are less able to act upon the environment and to adjust emotionally to these challenges.

The age-related construction of justifications for the father's action makes the primary-school child particularly vulnerable to new, discrepant information about the father, which emanates from various sources such as overheard conversations, newspaper reports, new information given to the child at the time of the trial, or the mother's change in perception towards the husband. Thus, the primary-school child's mechanisms are highly unstable and easily upset by

any external event that casts doubt on the father's moral status. It is the primary-school child's limited ability to manipulate definitions of the father's activities at the various stages during the course of the legal process of being labelled as deviant which appears to be problematic. This is most difficult when the father is convicted, and the sentence is concrete evidence of the father's responsibility for the offence.

Findings in this study show that only primary-school children change categories between the first and second interviews compared to the adolescents, who, generally do not modify their rationale for the father's action, as their more sophisticated mechanisms are better able to accommodate the new, threatening information. Therefore, it is suggested that the mechanisms primary-school children use to deflect the father's responsibility from his action are most vulnerable when changes occur in their perception of the father's action, particularly after conviction. For example, the doubts resulting from an unexpected long sentence expressed by Sally (9 years old, Family S) during the second interview are a clear indication of this vulnerability: "His friends put him into it, but I don't know why they give this sentence. I feel

bad because if he didn't do it like, if he never had anything to do with this, and he was put into it and then why is he getting punished for no reason?". However, it must be emphasised that the child's formulation of the new category is largely dependent upon changes in the discourse within the family resulting primarily from the mother's new interpretation of the event.

The above findings can be seen as providing support for the proposition that children's coping mechanisms are dependent upon both their own levels of cognitive maturity and the interaction with their specific environment. The child's attempt to make sense of the imprisonment of the father is influenced, at the microsystem level, by his/her interaction with the family, particularly the mother, and at the macrosystem level by society's norms and values. Particularly relevant is the fact that, although children are influenced by their parents' definition of the situation, they select elements from the environment that are significant to them.

II - Acknowledging the separation from the father and adapting daily activities to the new situation

A second task children of offenders are required to address following the father's arrest is to acknowledge the separation from him, adapt to the changes that follow, and

resume customary age-appropriate activities in the school, at home, and at play. According to Wallerstein's (1983) study on divorce, for children to acknowledge the separation and resume customary pursuits they have to maintain some degree of psychological distance from the family crisis and regain the capacity for learning and pleasure. To this end, the child needs to reduce the anxieties that arise from the separation. Comparisons in this study were found to the extent that, in order for the child to regain some equilibrium to resume academic pace and his/her overall developmental agenda, it is necessary for him/her to master anxieties engendered by the imprisonment, and in particular to maintain a degree of psychological distance from issues related to the trial, which dominate the family atmosphere during the pre-trial period.

However, important distinctions between the divorce and imprisonment need to be outlined. First, the father's imprisonment is usually sudden and unexpected, whereas in the case of divorce, the child may have some indication that parental separation is likely to occur prior to the actual departure of the father, and thus s/he may have had more time to ease into the new situation. Second, for children of offenders it is often the case that mothers decide not to reveal the true nature of the father's absence and fabricate various explanations to account for his departure, unlike divorce where the reason for

separation is not in doubt. Third, although stigmatisation is present in both divorce and imprisonment, specific to the latter is the change to the father's moral status and, by association, to the family members. Therefore, the suddenness of the separation, together with the possibility of misleading information and the moral element present in separations resulting from imprisonment, constitute a qualitatively different context, when compared to divorce, for children of offenders to master.

Child's fantasies of abandonment and father's well being

Following the incarceration of the father, many primary-school children express anxiety-provoking fantasies about the father's well being and/or being abandoned by the mother. Children's fantasies of abandonment by the mother were found to be based on the belief that, as with the father, the mother may also be taken away from them. In some cases a sense of reality is added to the child's fantasy by such occurrences as the mother's hospitalisation or her requirement to attend the police station for questioning.

Children's fantasies about the father's well being generally focus either on the material conditions of the prison or his physical safety, usually based on the fear

that he may be physically harmed by the police. However, the degree to which children are concerned with the father's well being varies according to the circumstances of the arrest. This study shows that the majority of primary-school children who witness the father's arrest procedures (arrest, police search and/or interrogation) develop fantasies about his well being.

It has been found that when the arrest of the father takes place in the presence of children, it may also lead to further deterioration of the parental image (Verrijdt, 1975), although in this study no such effects were found. As this finding was based on data gathered from various institutional sources throughout the world, comparisons cannot be made. The adolescents in the study also showed concern about their father's well being, although these were not expressed in terms of a fantasy but rather were related to factual criteria such as a long term illness, drug addiction, or actually being harmed by the police during the arrest.

Generally, primary-school children's preoccupation with the father's well being declines after they become reassured during prison visits. As time passes and their fears prove to be groundless, all children are able to resolve these fears by distinguishing reality from their own fantasies. This is in contrast to their fear of being abandoned by the mother, which was still apparent in some children at the

time of the second interview.

Intra-system changes

There is widespread support in the literature on divorce and imprisonment that the quality of the relationship between parents and children is crucial for predicting the child's emotional and behavioural adaptation to separation (Hetherington, 1976; Wallerstein and Kelly, 1980; Hughes, 1982; Hounslow *et al*, 1982; Shaw, 1989; Fishman, 1983). According to Hetherington's (1989) findings on divorce, a good relationship with one or both parents is more important to the child's adjustment than the degree of marital conflict. Marital conflict affects children indirectly through its effects on parenting.

The child's adaptation to the uncertainties and upheavals of the pre-trial period, which we define as the transient phase of the imprisonment, is largely dependent on the mother's ability to provide a degree of continuity within the family system, which in turn is influenced by her personal and psychological resources and the support on which she is able to draw from external sources. The quality of the father-child relationship can also influence the child's adaptation to the separation, and its importance to the child remained the same after the father's imprisonment, even though it diminishes in its

power and influence compared with that of the intact family, because it is maintained within the constraints of the prison visit.

Mother-child relationship

The majority of the families examined in this study are located in the lowest socio-economic strata of society. All but three families suffered additional material deprivation after the father's incarceration. These findings are consistent with those found by authors such as Fishman (1981), who concludes that imprisonment usually carries major economic implications for the family microsystem. For the women in this study, the severity of their financial situation resulted in difficulties in paying bills and clothing the children, and many found it necessary to reduce the quality and quantity of food for the family. Women also expressed a sense of humiliation for having to deny children what they were accustomed to, such as sweets and pocket money. A further important implication of the women's financial situation is the effect it has on their ability to maintain regular contact with the husband by prison visits. Women cope during this period by "taking one day at a time", which is an indication of what Bould (1977) terms a low sense of parental fate control. That is their deteriorating economic situation affects their ability to plan for the future.

The children themselves feel annoyed at being deprived of the material things they received prior to the father's imprisonment. Primary-school children's complaints focus on pocket money, sweets, Christmas and birthday presents, and holidays. Adolescents, on the other hand, miss clothes, records and the extra money they used to receive from their fathers to engage in their preferred activities. The main implication of the family's decline in their economic situation for children is manifested in their resentment at being curtailed in their out-of-home activities.

As a result of the abruptness of the separation and the economic and social upheaval that follows, wives of offenders are forced to make major life decisions at a time when they are emotionally least able to do so. During the remand period, mothers are often too preoccupied with their own emotional needs to respond sensitively to those of the children. Apart from taking responsibility for the family's financial affairs, mothers are quite often enmeshed in legal procedures, such as dealing with solicitors, barristers and probation officer's reports, and many feel compelled to make use of the daily prison visits that are allowed during the remand period to give and gather information relating to financial and legal issues. These events take priority on the mother's emotional and material resources at the time when the child is most in need of her support. This may have implications for the

child, as the mother's response to separation immediately after arrest can influence the child's coping and adjustment. The mother's reduced emotional availability resulting from separation was also found in Hetherington's study (1982) on divorce, where mothers tended to communicate less well and were less affectionate with their children.

Children's perceptions of the above changes are reflected in their accounts of the lack of attention they receive from their mothers, her mood changes, as well as changes in household rules and the mother's usual routine. They often complain that their mothers are too busy and distressed to give them the attention they need. However, they also worry intensely about their mother's distress and moodiness which they feel powerless to influence. Feelings of precariousness resulting from being dependent on one parent and their concerns for that parent's well being was also found in children of divorced parents (Wallerstein and Kelly, 1980).

In the absence of the mother's attention, the major source of support for children is the extended family. Within the extended family, the grandmother is the person in whom most children seek to confide, particularly their anxieties concerning the imprisonment of the father. However, when the mother is able to give the child the attention and support s/he seeks, it is clear that her strength and

emotional accessibility is most beneficial, providing the child with a sense of security from the shared experience. For example, Tom (Family L) makes it clear that he could not have coped with his father's imprisonment if it were not for his mother's strength and support.

Many mothers found it difficult to discipline the children without the support of the husband, particularly in the chaotic context that prevails after his arrest. They identify managing the children to be the second major problem after their financial difficulties. However, women in general do not perceive children's behavioural changes as being associated with factors related to the imprisonment of the father, but rather a result of the absence of a controlling agent. This finding is consistent with Morris' (1966) observations that many wives report children with behavioural problems yet deny that they are linked to the imprisonment of the father.

In their accounts, rarely do mothers acknowledge the possible effects the stigmatisation of the event and/or the ordeal of witnessing the arrest procedures can have on the child's behaviour. Neither are they aware of the child's need for attention and emotional support in order that s/he may elaborate the losses resulting from the imprisonment of the father. As the results clearly indicate, mothers have difficulty providing an adequate

explanation and try to avoid as far as possible discussing emotional issues related to the father's absence. Mothers appear not to realise the extent to which talking about the experience can help to reduce the child's anxiety.

The failure of mothers to recognise subtle signs of suffering in the child often leads them to perceive that s/he is being provocative, which in turn exacerbates these problems. Studies in violence have pointed out the relationship between the mother's lack of empathy and her interpretation of the child's failure to perform some activities (Herzberger (1983)). A parent who lacks empathic sensitivity to discern what his/her child is thinking or feeling may interpret the child's behavioural problems as deliberate and perhaps done to spite the parent. In such cases a retaliatory attitude from the parent may be elicited leading to subsequent aggression. This can be seen in the case of Walter (Family A), whose behaviour, according to his mother, has deteriorated since his father's imprisonment. Whilst the mother acknowledges that for Walter, his father's imprisonment was a great shock, she does not realise that his behavioural problems may be related to the separation. She perceives Walter's behaviours as being provocative to which she reacts aggressively.

Mothers in general tend to be less restrictive concerning household rules, and more inconsistently punitive, after

the father's imprisonment. They also expect children to take on new responsibilities and cooperate more in household chores. A decline in effective control and monitoring of children's behaviour has also been observed in divorced families (Hetherington, 1989). As in our sample, divorced mothers knew less about where their children were, who they were with and what they were doing and were likely to have less supervision in maternal absence.

From the children's perspective, they report that mothers expect them to make a greater contribution to the functioning of the household and fulfil some of the father's functions, such as keeping her company, locking doors at night, helping to control younger siblings and relying on them for emotional support. Compared to when the father was at home, children also report that they enjoy greater freedom in regard to the time that they are required to return home or go to bed. Although children who are delegated new roles within the family feel proud of their new-found independence and self-sufficiency, they also express feelings of resentment towards the mother for her lack of fairness. They perceive these additional tasks as an unfair burden which interferes with their interaction with peers. This seems to be consistent with Weiss' (1979) conclusion that most children of single-parent families feel pleased to be able to take on new responsibilities but

at the same time regret having to do so.

Changes to the mother's domestic routine are also a major concern to children, as they resent the disruption it brings to the family system. They complain of the quick meals and the mother's erratic approach to both the housework and their personal requirements, mainly resulting from her frequent visits to the prison. It may be suggested that feelings of resentment children express may be an indication of the insecurity they feel as a consequence of the disruption in the family's daily routine.

The mother's ability to cope with the father's imprisonment is largely dependent upon her personal and psychological resources, which in turn affects the child's emotional and behavioural adjustment, a finding that is consistent in the literature on separation (Lowenstein, 1986; Tschann *et al.*, 1989; Patterson and Reid, 1984). Two main factors are identified as significant to the mother's ability to reorganise successfully the household: the mother's level of education (Lowenstein, 1986) and the degree of self-sufficiency (Pearlin and Schooler, 1978) in dealing with the additional roles. However, in this study, all but one woman left school at 16 years old with no academic qualifications, therefore formal education cannot account for the variations in their ability to cope with the separation. The coping responses reported by women concerning financial affairs and managing the children vary

depending on whether they adopt an active approach to deal with the problems they encounter. Some women manifest social and emotional paralysis; that is, they become socially isolated, depressed and resort to drink and drug abuse. These women are more likely to incur debts and experience difficulties managing the children. As a consequence, the child is more likely to become separated from the mother, either to live with relatives, or in extreme cases taken into care. Conversely, other women are more successful in reorganising the family after incarceration, even though before the separation they were totally or partially dependent on the husband as breadwinner and disciplinarian. They take a more pro-active approach to the new situation by seeking employment, being more attentive to the child's needs, monitoring school work, his/her interaction with friends and ensuring regular contact with the fathers.

Support System

The role of the social network has emerged as an important external source of potential support to alleviate the effects of stress resulting from separation (McCubbin et al, 1980). The family ties to support networks were identified as explanatory variables of children's differential adjustment to the father's incarceration by Lowenstein (1986). Apart from the mother's personal

resources, children who are better able to adjust are those in families where the mother also has familial coping resources. Similar to research on separation resulting from divorce (Hetherington et al, 1982 Hetherington, 1989), the results of this study show that the support system of families of offenders include the immediate family, close friends and neighbours. In addition, some families reported the social welfare system as a potential source of support. However, while these networks generally do provide support which is positive in reducing stress, both the quality and ability to provide help vary greatly among the families.

The main forms of support wives of offenders require during the incarceration period are financial, emotional and practical services. In the vast majority of cases, wives report that they receive most help from their own families and very little or none at all from the husband's family. This pattern is similar to the one found in Schwartz & Weintraub's study (1974), where hostile feelings develop on both sides; on the part of the husband's parents, the daughter-in-law is at least partly blamed for their son's criminal actions, and the wife in turn blames her in-laws for causing the psychological difficulties that have resulted in her husband's imprisonment. However, our study shows that this is not the only reason for the deterioration of the in-law relationships. It was found that, in many cases, the relationship with the husband's family was already problematic before his imprisonment,

mainly because the husband's parents condemn his criminal life style and ostracise him.

Generally, it is the mother or sisters of wives of offenders who play an important role providing practical support, such as looking after the children when necessary, helping with transport to the prison, or helping with food and clothes for the children. However, the wife's family often show resentment towards the incarcerated son-in-law, which may explain why women in this study mainly rely on close friends for emotional support. They often report the need for interaction with people who are understanding and with whom they can express their problems without being judged. Generally, wives of offenders find these qualities in a close friend. However, a study by Daniel & Barret (1981) found that, contrary to the above findings, wives of offenders experience lack of understanding in their relationships with both friends and families. In addition they report that, although the members of the husband's families are not consistently helpful, they are as helpful as the women's immediate families. One reason for these different findings may be related to the objectives and methods of the two studies. That is, while Daniel & Barret (1981) assessed lack of understanding by how many friends the wives lost after their husbands' imprisonment, this study aimed to examine the nature of support close friends and family were providing.

Although a number of studies have mentioned the neighbours' support as an important source of assistance for short-term problems such as baby sitting, or latch-key children (Patterson, 1971; Lee, 1979), the majority of wives in the present study report that they do not receive any help from the neighbours and they only have passing contact with them. However, they also say that they do not feel the need to seek actively their help and in many cases they avoid contact with them. One reason for women isolating themselves from neighbours appears to be their fear of exposing themselves to judgments from people who they fear are not able to understand the situation, and therefore are likely to draw wrong conclusions about the event.

With regard to the social services, wives perceive the support they offer is enmeshed in bureaucratic procedures and not directed at their special needs. In general, they believe that social service personnel judge them in their capacity as mothers and fear that any problems they report will be interpreted as reflecting their inability to cope, and as a consequence the children may be taken from them. This fear often prevents wives of offenders from seeking the help to which they are entitled. Moreover, the bureaucratic procedures appear to wives to be insensitive, petty, time-consuming and incomprehensible, which result in feelings that the effort involved in seeking support is not

worthwhile.

However, the extent to which help is forthcoming depends on the personality of the officer who is responsible for a particular family, and the nature of the interaction s/he has with them. According to the wives' accounts, the most sensitive approach a social worker could take would be to inquire what they needed without "preaching" to them what they should do.

Results from this study indicate that much of the hostility generated towards the social services derives from the wives' perception that they do not understand their special needs, the demeaning nature of seeking support, the attitudes of some staff, and the threat posed to the women's identity as competent wives and mothers at a time when the family's social and moral status are already threatened.

Father-child relationship

The incarceration of the father can affect significantly the nature of the relationship he has with the child in a number of ways. A previous close relationship may become strained and detached, or alternatively, a former detached relationship may become closer. In the latter case, the children's reports suggest that the bond between the father

and child can become closer when the father adopts a more caring attitude towards the child, shows him/her more affection, becomes interested in the child's problems, and seeks his/her opinions on issues which he previously would not have done. However, this more attentive approach toward the child by the father implies the maintenance of contact after incarceration. For relationships are more likely to become strained and detached when interaction between father and child is restricted by the geographical location of the prison and the costs involved in visiting, a long prison sentence or in cases of divorce, where visiting ceases altogether.

An immediate implication of the father's separation for children is the loss of their interaction with him and the activities they normally share, such as going to football matches, parks, fun fairs and so on. The loss of these types of interaction create problems of adjustment for children, as they not only miss the pleasurable aspects of these activities, but also the father's individual attention. Generally, mothers are unable and/or unwillingly to substitute for the father in these activities, because of the constraints on time and money, and because the experiences provided by the father are of a different nature to those normally provided by the mother.

As previous research on intact families has shown (Lewis, 1986; Clarke-Stewart, 1980; Lamb, 1977), fathers and

mothers differ in their interaction with the children. Consistent with the literature, children in this study report that they engage in more playful and adventurous interaction with the father, whilst their relationship with the mother is seen as providing emotional stability. Children complain bitterly about the boredom they feel at home and express their resentment at not being able to engage in the activities they used to share with their fathers. However, differences exist between boys and girls in what types of interaction with the father they miss the most. Whilst both boys and girls miss active forms of interaction, such as games with an element of surprise, boys emphasise these forms of interaction, whereas girls emphasise affective forms of interaction, such as cuddles and attention.

The above findings are consistent with theories that assign an instrumental role to the father (Parson and Bales, 1955; Sarnoff, 1982), in which he helps the child to attain new skills with which to explore and experiment in the development of competence. They also suggest however, that the father plays an important role in the emotional requirements of children, particularly girls. It is also important to consider the child's developmental level in addressing his/her ability to cope with the loss of experiences provided by the father, as the degree to which the child is dependent on parents influences his/her

possibility for other forms of interactions. With increasing age the child develops a greater repertoire of situationally relevant coping behaviours, permitting a lessening of exclusive reliance on the availability of the parents. Therefore, adolescents do not struggle as much with this problem as do primary-school children.

The primary-school child's dependence on adults is clearly evident from the children's reports of feeling restricted in their freedom of engaging in outdoor activities, which decline drastically after the father's incarceration. Although adolescents are also affected in their experiences, compared to primary-school children, they are less reliant on the mother for extra-familial activities, such as going to football matches and parties or indeed for the money they receive.

The role of the father as a provider of advice and help is most important on occasions when they need to draw upon his experiences or invoke his status. This can be important at times when an ecological transition takes place, such as the normative task of moving from a junior to a senior school, as was the case with Peter (12 years old, Family C) who was apprehensive on entering a comprehensive school and wanted to know his father's experience on the matter.

However, children's perception of the father's role as a provider of advice and help when needed is complex, and

distinctions have to be made in the nature of the problems that need resolving, and whether children view him as a confidant and/or a competent problem-solver. When children are concerned with problems of a personal nature, they choose a person who can "keep the secret", allow them the time to express themselves, take their problems seriously and show sympathy and understanding. For problems of a more practical nature, such as those encountered at school and with friends which they cannot resolve themselves, they choose a person who they believe has the qualities and experience to help with the specific problem in question. With regard to personal problems, children in this study have chosen predominantly the mother to play this role, which may be an indication of the emotional support she provides. However, also included in the choice by some children is the father, the grandmother, aunt, brother, cousin or teacher. But in general, children believe that their fathers do not take them seriously and lack the understanding necessary to deal with their personal problems. With regard to problems of a more practical nature, children choose the father only if they believe he is able to take the appropriate action and would not punish them severely.

The changes observed in the child's perception of the father as a confidant and/or problem-solver appear to be related to the nature of parenting that takes place within

the prison context, which is vulnerable to breakdown and disintegration into fantasy. Within this setting, parenting is artificial and characterised by powerlessness (Hounslow *et al*, 1982). The lack of interaction within the context of day-to-day reality increases the likelihood of the fantasy level of the relationship as they experience different realities. In this context the father is largely unaware of and unable to influence the child's reality; therefore, once incarcerated it is difficult for the father to have an accurate perception of the child's needs. Similarly, children cannot make a judgment about the father as they do not know how he would behave in particular situations. Within the artificiality of their interaction in the prison visiting context, children develop expectations about their future relationship with the father concerning the interesting and exciting activities they will share when he is released. The father, in turn, reinforces these expectations by promising to fulfil them on his return. This can lead to problems for the relationship when the father is eventually released and he has to deal directly with the child. This is more likely to occur when the father has served a long prison sentence, and the child has had little experience with him in day-to-day interactions.

Promises made by the father that are specific to children of recidivists are those which refer to changing his behaviour and not re-offending which, if unfulfilled, serve to undermine the child's trust in him. The father's

promises may be explained by his desire to compensate for his absence and to maintain a positive image and the child's affection.

Based on the above discussion, it can be suggested that fathers who are sensitive to the child's needs are more likely to counteract the effects that the stigmatisation of their imprisonment may have on the child's trust in them. Furthermore, it may be argued that the close bond between father and child contributes to the child's integration of the good and the bad father. Conversely, children who do not perceive the father as understanding or fulfilling any of their needs are more likely to experience greater difficulty in integrating the good and bad father, as defined by his deviance.

Interaction with friends

The bonds formed with peers are of a different nature to those established between child and parents (Youniss, 1980; Piaget, 1968) as they serve different purposes and reflect different mutual expectations. The parents' role is based on the child's need for affection, protection and instruction. Within the adult/child relation, the transmission of social norms and values is from the adult to the child, even though the child seeks instructions. Therefore, children's relations with parents provides them

with a sense of ordered social reality and launch them into a world of social relations.

The child's relationship with peers is characterised by mutuality, which allows children to discover individuals as persons sharing common motives, feelings, and hopes. Peers affect one another by the practice of reciprocal exchange among equals. Reciprocity implies that the peers influence each other's thinking, whereas the established ideas of adults are not changed so readily by children.

Research has shown that peer interaction is an essential component of the child's development (Damon, 1984) and becomes increasingly important during middle childhood (Hartup, 1979) as the child's attachment to parental figures decreases. Experiences with peers are a necessity in childhood socialisation, and the failure of the child to engage in the activities of the peer culture may be an indicator of difficulties in development (Damon, 1983). Therefore it may be argued that, in the case of children of offenders, the anxieties resulting from the imprisonment of the father which inhibit the child's communication with the peer-group may affect social development.

All children in this study experienced anxiety at the thought of facing their peers concerning their father's imprisonment, as they feared being confronted with questions, about his absence. Many were unsure how to

respond to such questions as they thought that their friends would not understand the full circumstances of the event and hence draw wrong conclusions about the father's character. This fear of confronting the peer-group may be explained in terms the risks of rejection and derogation the child may encounter in peer-group interaction.

Children respond to this situation in a number of ways. While some children prepare an excuse for the father's absence in anticipation of a possible enquiry from peers, such as "he works until late" or "he's on holiday", others try to avoid talking about the matter, and if pressed, try to terminate the conversation as soon as possible. In cases where the father's imprisonment is not known by the peer group, children avoid all conversation that includes fathers in general. However, some children do tell their best friends about their fathers if they can trust them to "keep the secret" and feel that they understand the situation.

The imprisonment of the father can also affect children's peer relations to the extent that visiting the father interferes with the ongoing interaction with friends. Children report conflicting feelings that arise from having to choose between visiting the father or playing with friend, particularly during school terms, when visiting is restricted to weekends.

A further effect that the imprisonment of the father has on the child's interaction with friends is bullying. In this study bullying has been identified with two forms of behaviour: verbal abuse and ostracism. The extent to which a child suffers from bullying is dependent on the nature of the community in which s/he lives. For children who live in communities where the absence of the father and/or his imprisonment is not uncommon, the father's absence may go un-noticed or attract little interest from peers. In these cases, children find it easier to avoid referring to their fathers, and consequently to his imprisonment. For children who live in communities where an imprisoned or absent father is less common, and the father's imprisonment is known by the peer-group, children are more likely to experience severe bullying.

Children react to bullying by seeking help from a trusted teacher, developing counteracting verbal insults or, as a last resort, physical violence. An unusually severe case of bullying found in this study contributed to the family's decision to move the child to another part of the country to live with relatives.

Inter-system dynamics

By inter-system dynamics we refer to the relationship between the family setting of the home and the setting of the prison visit. In Bronfenbrenner's (Bronfenbrenner and Crouter, 1983) terms this link is conceptualised as a mesosystem, where it is the quality of its connections that influences the child's development. In this study the links in question are those made between the home and the prison. The importance of the father/child relationship to the child's adjustment to the separation due to divorce is well documented (Hetherington, 1979; 1989; Hetherington *et al*, 1982; Wallerstein, 1980; 1983; Peterson and Zill, 1986). In the case of father absence resulting from imprisonment, there is wide agreement from authors (Hughes, 1982; Monger & Pendelton, 1977; Sack *et al*, 1976) and practitioners who work with families of offenders, that visiting is especially helpful for children in that it allays their fears about the father's health and welfare, as well as concerns for the feelings he has for them (Weintraub, 1976; Sack, 1977). Therefore, the new link to the prison is of fundamental importance, as it is the only means by which the child can maintain personal interaction with the father.

According to Garbarino (1985) risks in the mesosystem are defined by the absence of connections and by conflicts of values between two microsystems in which the child

participates. What determines the quality of a mesosystem for a child in general is the initiative of both the child and the caring adult to make connections. The adult plays an important role when the child enters a new microsystem to the extent that the adult perceives the new setting as positive, prepares the child to enter it and follows the child's development within it.

In the case of families of offenders, the initiative for making the link between the home and prison is dependent upon the mother, although the child must also be willing to participate in the new setting. The mother plays an important role in the development of a strong and positive mesosystem that is beneficial for the child's development, as she decides the frequency and to some extent the quality of visiting. The mother's positive perception of the prison visit is important, in order that frequent contact with the husband is maintained. Also important is her preparation of the child for the new setting and her monitoring of the interaction the child has with the father, with the aim of ensuring that it is as fulfilling for him/her as possible, within the constraints of the prison context.

With regard to the mother's positive attitude towards prison visits, this is closely associated with her perception of the relationship she has with the husband.

Wives who are committed to their husbands and have hopes for their future together are more likely to maintain frequent patterns of visiting and transmit positive feelings concerning visits to the child. For example, Jaber (14 years old, Family K) is reticent to visit his father, as his mother spends most of the visiting time arguing with him. The mother's positive attitude towards her future relationship and, hence, visiting enables mothers to overcome the many obstacles and frustrations that prison visiting entails. For apart from the financial costs involved, frequent visiting during the pre-trial period leads to a disruption of the family organisation.

Women feel particularly frustrated with visiting during the remand period, as after making many sacrifices, the 15 minutes allowed is insufficient to accommodate either their own or their husband's emotional and practical needs, let alone their children's. Other sources of frustration which they are powerless to influence are prison rules, the geographical location of the prison and the lack of facilities for children. Women complain bitterly about the bureaucratic procedures of the prison visit, and most do not understand the underlying reasons for the rules. Most women also feel that prisons do not consider the needs of children when allocating offenders to prisons, nor do they feel that prisons provide adequate facilities for children which are conducive to a minimal level of warm and fulfilling family interactions or regular visiting

patterns. The major implications of these difficulties are that they serve to undermine a positive approach to prison visits, and women often perceive their children to be a hindrance during visit, although they are aware of the children's need to see their father.

The mother's preparation of the child for prison visits by explaining fully the nature and context of the visit is a further factor that contributes to a beneficial mesosystem. Generally, mothers in this study were not aware of the need to explain the procedure and circumstances of the visiting setting. In only one case did the mother prepare the child with information about visiting, and this was the result of the child seeking it actively in the first place.

A further important factor that is conducive to a positive mesosystem is the mother's awareness of the child's needs for interacting with the father and ensuring that s/he has the opportunity to do so. However, half of the children in the present study complain about the quality of the interaction they had with their fathers during visits. They feel that they do not receive sufficient attention from their fathers, either because the mother dominates the visit, or because the father himself does not listen to their accounts. Consequently, they frequently feel excluded from the interaction with the father and, hence, bored, as there is nothing for them to do. Sally (9 years, Family S)

succinctly expresses what most children experience during visits: "I just say: hello and then I say: bye, bye". In a rare example of the mother's awareness of the child's needs, Vera (Family C) left her son alone with the father under the pretext that she had to go to the lavatory.

To an extent, adolescents are less dependent on the mother for visiting. If the mother is unable or unwilling to visit the father, the adolescent has more opportunity than the primary-school child to seek an alternative adult to accompany him/her. In the present study, for example, Dennis (14 years old, Family F) travels to his uncle's house to attend the prison with him, his aunt or his cousin, because his mother refuses to visit his father as she is now divorced. However, for children in general, when parents divorce, the link between the prison and home is usually severed and the child is deprived of regular contacts with the father.

III - Managing feelings elicited by the situation

The results from this study indicate that the incarceration of the father results in multiple losses for the child. These are: the loss of the family status, the continuity of the familiar daily routine, the loss of the father's protective physical presence, the loss of his moral status, and the loss of the pleasurable and exciting activities they shared. It can also lead to the loss of the family

home, and by implication, the school, neighbours and friends.

Associated with the many losses resulting from the father's imprisonment are the powerful emotions which they arouse: anxiety and fear resulting from the uncertainty of the situation; deep feelings of sadness at the separation; shame with the stigma attached to the father's loss of moral status; and anger directed at the legal authorities and, in some instances, to the father also. Consequently, managing feelings is one of the most difficult and important task with which children of offenders are faced, for it entails the acceptance of multiple losses in order to adapt to the changes that follow incarceration.

Many of the emotions arising from the imprisonment of the father can be found in other forms of separation such as divorce, although some are associated with the particular features of imprisonment. One of the fundamental characteristics of imprisonment is that the decision to separate is made by external agents, and therefore, the separation is an involuntary act, whereas in divorce, the decision to separate is made by the parents. The implication of this difference is that, in separation due to divorce, the child's anger is directed to the parents (Wallerstein, 1980), whilst for children of offenders their anger is directed to the agents of law enforcement, and/or the

father in the case of recidivists.

Both imprisonment and divorce may elicit feelings of shock and disbelief at the parents' separation. However, in the former case, children also express disbelief that the father could commit a criminal offence and feelings of shame associated with his crime. A further distinction between the two forms of separation is that imprisonment is temporary, as the father generally returns to the family system, and hence the child does not have to mourn a permanent loss, as in the case of divorce.

The most pervasive feeling expressed by children in this study is a deep sadness at the loss of the father. Grief is frequently manifest by both primary-school children and adolescents in their accounts of their experience of the separation. They mentioned how many times they "cried and cried", particularly when they realised that the father's arrest was not a mistake and his return would not be imminent. The longing for the father was particularly painful for children who had been close to him and shared many activities with him prior to his imprisonment.

Also evident in these accounts is the children's sense of belonging to an incomplete family. This is expressed in their feelings of emptiness arising from the father's separation and what his presence symbolises in terms of the traditions and continuity of the intact family. This is

clearly shown by the way children convey that "we are not a family anymore", and by the primary-school children's sense of insecurity at not having a "man around the house in case something happens". Feelings of deep sadness take on special significance at periods such as Christmas, birthdays, open days at school, and when friends talk about the interaction they have with their fathers.

The assimilation of the above losses can be greatly facilitated by regular visits to the father, to the extent that children can be reassured that he is still part of the family. For example, Joanna (Family B) had to arrange special visits for her daughter to see the father as the usual visiting patterns did not help to overcome her feelings of extreme distress at her father's absence. However, although visiting is crucial for the child's reassurances, the results show that visiting may also be a source of distress. While some children felt happy to be with the father, others felt sad, and more than one-third reported conflicting feelings: happiness to see their fathers and sadness when they have to leave him there.

The successful mastering of losses can also be aided by developing attachments to friends, teachers and members of the extended family (Hetherington, 1989). In this study, the children who appear to have dealt most effectively with the many losses are those who are well supported by

caring, competent adults, both within and outside the family. In cases where the child does not receive the attention and information s/he needs, it is more difficult to master the losses as s/he is denied the opportunity to express grief and frustration.

The second most powerful emotion felt by children is anger. When anger is directed towards the father, it is usually related to the child's disappointment at his failure to keep the promise of not re-offending, although not exclusively so, as some children of first offenders also reported feelings of anger towards him. When anger is directed at the legal authorities, it is mainly towards the police, particularly in cases where the child witnessed the father's arrest procedures.

All children who expressed anger towards the father seemed to have overcome this feeling at the time of the second interview. However, the anger directed towards the police, particularly in those cases in which children had personal contact with them, remained undiminished at the second interview. Therefore, it is probably realistic to anticipate that for children who witness the father's arrest, the experience leaves them with an enduring legacy of hostility towards the police.

The manner in which children deal with feelings resulting from the stigma attached to the changes to the father's

moral status has been described in the tasks above. In general, children dissociate the father's culpability for the offence, and thereby maintain his moral integrity. And within the context of peer-group interaction, the various ways by which they avoid confronting the issue have been illustrated. The extent to which children can be helped to overcome feelings of shame depends upon: the mother's positive perception of the father, the quality of the explanation given to the child about the father's absence, and the ability of significant adults to respond to the child's needs.

IV - Accepting the father's temporary separation

Like divorce, the imprisonment of the father poses the task of accepting the reality of the separation (Wallerstein, 1983). However, unlike divorce, this form of separation is not generally permanent. Rather, it is characterised by the unfolding of events particular to this type of separation, such as arrest, conviction and release, in which the child has to accommodate to the father's temporary absence. And only after the conviction and sentencing of the father is the child confronted with the task of accepting his temporary absence, for it is this event that establishes for the first time the certainty and duration of his absence.

The child's acceptance of the father's temporary absence is closely related to all of the foregoing tasks, particularly the task of successfully mastering the feelings and anxieties engendered by the imprisonment. An indication of this process can be found in children's perceptions of the situation in which they reveal they have overcome distress, accepted the duration of the separation and the periodic interaction with the father, and have re-focused on school work and their usual activities.

The results in this study show that children who appear to adjust most successfully during the post-trial period receive emotional support from caring adults, and/or are from families where the mother takes a pro-active approach to imprisonment. In these latter families, mothers have re-organised the family system by taking on the additional roles of breadwinner and disciplinarian, whilst maintaining regular contact with the husband/father. Conversely, children who appear to not adjust well to the separation are those in families where the mother does not take on the father's roles. In these cases, mothers often invoke the symbolic presence of the father when disciplining the children, rather than asserting their own authority, even though they recognise that this approach is ineffective. They report that children either ignore or resist their threats, as they know the father's return is not imminent and he does not chastise them during visits.

According to Boss (1980), in a family with an absent father, a high degree of psychological father presence is a significant predictor of the wife's as well as the family's dysfunction. For Boss, families who maintain a psychological father presence are those who do not attempt to re-organise the family system by shifting roles within the family to fill the father's former tasks. Boss uses the concept of "closing-out" to refer to the exclusion of the father from the family. She argues that families with an absent father which achieve closing out are better able to adjust to the separation. However, Boss' theoretical proposition is based primarily on the experience of military families in which the husband is missing in action; therefore, the system's boundaries are ambiguous. This is not the situation faced by families of offenders, where the father's absence is known to be temporary. Therefore, whilst we agree that the mother should take on the father's roles for the family's adjustment to the separation, a level of his symbolic presence needs to be maintained. The father is still considered to be part of the family, and to maintain a degree of family integration, he must be included in the family's processes of making decisions.

The relationship, however, between closing out the father and adjustment to the separation is not simple as successful adjustment also depends upon the psychological

resources of the mother. Consistent with those of Morris (1965), our findings suggest that dependent wives tend to shift their responsibilities to other members of the family to such an extent that it can lead to social isolation for her and distress to the children, as she makes too many demands on them.

Although the wives' success in taking on the father's roles whilst including him in the family's decision making may be functional to families' adjustment to separation, it may also lead to problems of reintegration when the father returns. As Wardell (1985) argues, adjustment to separation may hinder adjustment to reunion. For example, in a study on military families, it was found that wives who excluded successfully the father by creating an independent existence for themselves by no longer considering him in the making and execution of plans, faced their most serious crisis when he returned home (Hill, 1949).

The period after conviction is critical for those families in which the relationship was strained before the husband's arrest, particularly in those cases in which the husband receives a long sentence. Wives who were considering whether or not to separate from the husband took this opportunity to file for divorce. This decision in turn leads to a loss of contact between father and child in which s/he faces the added burden and different task of accepting the permanent absence of the father.

Studies of divorce (Wallerstein, 1980; Hetherington, 1989) have shown that acceptance of the permanent absence of the father can be a long process covering many years. While comparisons can be made with accepting the temporary absence of the incarcerated father in that it too can extend over a long period of time, its temporary nature dispenses with the need to mourn the permanent loss with which children of divorce are confronted.

Based on the findings of this research, we argue that important to the child's acceptance of the father's temporary absence is the success to which s/he is able to find his/her way back to age-appropriate normative life tasks after the family crisis.

V - Readjustment to the father's return

Children of offenders live in a world of adaptation in which the father's return to the family system is a further disruption to the organisation of the family. From the children's perspective, it entails getting to know the father once again and becoming used to his presence. However, reunion is a personal experience occurring in a context and, by its nature, there is an experiential history for the people involved in the event (Wallace, 1985). For children of offenders it involves bringing to

the reunion their experiences within the family system during the father's absence, together with the experience of the interaction with him prior to, and during imprisonment, all of which will influence the reunion. In the re-establishment of their relationship within the family system, the child's previous interaction with the father serves as a frame of reference by which s/he judges the present experience. This personal measure of satisfaction appears to become the basis on which the success and failure of the reunion is judged. Children who were young when their fathers went to prison, and/or whose fathers received long sentences have no recollection of experiences of him within the family context. They express feelings of trepidation at the prospect of interacting with a father whom they do not really know. However, it should be noted that a child's perception of the father may be at variance with how the father actually is. For example, a child may idolise the father and have a close relationship with him, but s/he may be unaware that his is a drug addict who habitually steals to finance his addiction.

The experience of getting to know the father is interrelated with the experience of getting used to the father, which implies the adjustment to the new rules that the re-distribution of roles entails. For example, children who have become accustomed to going to bed later whilst keeping the mother company find it difficult to adapt to the father's discipline and to changes in their existing

routine. However, most important for the process of reintegration is the participation of the father in the family system, by interacting with the children and giving them the attention they expect.

From the child's perspective, the expectations that s/he has of the father's reunion have been shown to be most significant to the successful reintegration of the father into the family system, as the child develops ideas about what is going to happen at the father's return. The experience of reunion is most often reported by children by comparing it to an event that the child expected to happen and which was planned during visits to the prison, and the actual experience of the father at home. Spending time together following the father's release is one of the expectations most children develop during his incarceration. However, if expectations such as these are not fulfilled by the father on his return, the child is extremely disappointed and disillusioned with the father.

Results from this study show that in the majority of cases, the father's return is problematic for the children. According to their accounts, the main reasons for this are that the attention the child expected from the father is not forthcoming, nor are his promises usually kept.

The nature of the context within which the father/child

interaction takes place during incarceration does not lend itself to the development of realistic expectations by children about their relationship with the father at his return. Although visiting is essential for children to maintain their relationship with the father and allay their concerns about his feelings for them (Hughes, 1983; Weintraub, 1976; Sack, 1977), the interaction between father and child is limited by the material and psychological conditions of the prison visit.

As we have argued above, the infrequent and short time father and child spend together, and the lack of contact with the daily reality of their relationship tends to increase the amount of fantasy concerning this relationship. During the post-trial period, families are allowed only one or two visits per month, which, coupled with the short time the family has to see one another is not conducive to emotionally satisfying visits (Fishman, 1983). As a consequence, one of the main objectives of the visit cannot be fulfilled, that is, to allow children to have their fathers' undivided attention, as well as to allow husband and wife time to discuss their material and emotional problems (Monger & Pendleton, 1977). Within this context, the father's behaviour towards the child is generated by his desire to maintain a harmonious relationship with him/her. Fathers generally avoid issues of discipline on the grounds that they see the children only infrequently and refuse to use these occasions to

chastise them, which in any case they see as the mother's duty.

As a consequence of this somewhat artificial form of interaction between father and child during incarceration, when the father eventually returns to the family system and resumes his prior roles, the child experiences conflicting feelings ranging from extreme excitement and happiness to disillusionment and resentment. Hounslow's findings also show that when the father returns, many changes have occurred in the children's lives, and a major factor affecting the father's reintegration is the degree to which actual parenting has been maintained by the imprisoned father during his enforced absence. However, this study shows that equally important is the father's ability to respond to the child's needs.

CONCLUSION

The emphasis in this thesis has been on how the child makes sense of the father's crime and his/her adjustment to his imprisonment. It has been argued that to understand fully coping strategies individuals apply when faced with a stressful event, and to determine the degree of success or failure of the outcome, it is essential to acknowledge the individual's perception and subsequent appraisal of the situation within the specific context in which the event

takes place. For it is only by seeking the child's perception of the event that the effects of imprisonment can be differentiated from the effects of separation and the impact these may have on children's adjustment to the father's absence. As this study has demonstrated, mothers are often unaware of the extent to which children know the facts surrounding the father's imprisonment or their feelings towards the event. Moreover, many mothers do not link the child's behavioural problems to the father's imprisonment.

The results have shown that the expected relationship between the change to the father's moral status and the child's negative perception of his image is not necessarily a direct result of his imprisonment, for various factors interact to moderate the child's perception of the father. These include the mother's perception of the event, the quality of the father/child relationship and the developmental stage of the child.

The child counteracts the threat posed to his/her self-esteem by the father's moral status by construing mechanisms of dissociation, which neutralise the notion of moral guilt implied in the new definition of the father as deviant. In the process of moral reasoning about the father's action, the child selects from available information a particular form of justification without denying the wrongfulness of the father's act. This serves

to maintain the father's moral integrity and, by extension, the child's self-concept.

Evaluative judgments by children who are faced with a moral dilemma in which the self is involved are not guided by categorical principle of justice, but rather by the attempt to maintain a consistent self-concept. It is proposed that these children are more likely to develop complex moral reasoning than children who do not experience such conflicts. During the process of coping with the father's change in moral status, children become aware of contextual elements that can modify the meaning of moral issues. The realisation of contextual elements which form the basis of the child's justification of the father's action facilitates his/her wider consideration of differential meaningful elements at the general societal level, thereby providing the foundation for moral development.

Variations in the mechanisms of dissociation have been found to be associated with developmental factors. Whilst both primary-school children and adolescents construe justifications of the father's action grounded in social norms and values, the younger children base theirs on external agents, whereas the older ones base theirs on principles which underlie these norms and values. The less sophisticated nature of the primary-school children's mechanisms of dissociation, make them more susceptible to

change when new information becomes available which casts doubt on their original justification. Younger children are, hence, more likely to experience difficulties when confronting and accomodating to the various challenges posed by the social environment, and less able than adolescents to adjust emotionally to these challenges.

Findings in this research support the use of an ecological framework for the study of children of offenders. The model used here provides a heuristic framework in which one can understand factors that will lead to systematic identification of coping strategies and behaviours of prisoner's children and their families. Two basic factors emerge as determining the extent to which children adjust to separation: the mother's response to the situation and the father/child relationship before and during imprisonment.

The child's success or failure in adapting to the father's imprisonment is largely governed by the mother's perceptions of and attitudes towards her husband's imprisonment, and the extent to which she makes progress in addressing the many issues resulting from this event. Mothers who have a positive perception of the husband are more likely to provide support for and consistency to the child's construed mechanisms, compared with mothers who have a negative perception of the husband which make it more difficult for the child to retain the good father

image.

The basic elements of the mother's ability to cope are role redistribution and control over the family's system. Mothers who take an active approach to deal with the changes that imprisonment engenders are more likely to facilitate the child's successful adjustment to the father's absence by providing a more emotionally and financially stable context, than mothers who manifest social and emotional paralysis. These latter mothers are more likely to deteriorate physically and emotionally during separation, which can result in children suffering from lack of direction and burdened with the mothers' emotional needs. However, this process can be buffered by the support system, particularly the mother's extended family.

The father/child relationship is also important for the child's adjustment to both separation and the subsequent reintegration of the father into the family system. Fathers who are sensitive to the child's needs are more likely to counter the effects that the change to his moral status may have on the child's trust in him. That is, fathers who are understanding and attentive to the child's needs minimise many of the losses that s/he is likely to experience during his incarceration. However, the quality of the father-child relationship is not only dependent on the father, for much

depends on the context of prison visiting within which parenting takes place, and on the mother's desire and ability to maintain a strong link between the home and the prison. At visits, parenting takes a different form to that which takes place in the family home. Within the prison setting parenting is artificial to the extent that the father is largely unaware of the day-to-day reality of the child. As a consequence, father and child develop expectations which cannot be tested until the time of the reunion. This can cause problems on the father's release when he has to deal directly with the child.

It must be emphasised that, given the exploratory nature of this research and the limitations of the sample, the propositions outlined above provide only a framework for a more comprehensive study into this subject with a larger sample. An extension of this research is required in order to complement the understanding of the complex relationship of psychological, socio-economic and cultural variables based on a different sample. Of particular interest and relevance would be the long-term impact the father's imprisonment has on the child's self-esteem and the implication this may have on moral development. Also important is further research which focuses on the father-child relationship during visits in prison and its relevance for the child's adjustment to separation. This type of research could also be linked to a longitudinal study which focuses on the process of reunion. Important

additional sources of data not used in this study are teachers and members of the extended family, whom children often mention as their main sources of support.

An important finding of this study relevant for future research into sensitive areas involving children, is that they are valuable informants of their own behaviour and feelings. Although the imprisonment of the father from the child's perspective is a particularly sensitive area of research, the results show that the children themselves respond positively to the interviews, and are, generally, enthusiastic to express their opinions and feelings.

REFERENCES

- Abelin, E.L. (1975). Some further observations and comments on the earliest role of the father. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 56, 293-302.
- Adler, A. (1958). The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Allport, G. W. (1965). Mechanisms of defense. In G.W. Allport (Ed.), Pattern and Growth in Personality, pp. 514-519 New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Alston, W.P. (1971). Comments on Kohlberg's "From is to ought". In Mischel, W. (Ed.) Cognitive Development and Epistemology. New York: Academic Press.
- Anderson, N.N. (1966). Prisoners' families: A study of family crisis. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Minnesota.
- Andry, R.G. (1971). Delinquency and Parental Pathology: A Study in Forensic and Clinical Psychology. London: Staples Press.
- Anthony, E.J. (1973). Children at risk from divorce: A review. In E.J. Anthony and C. Koupernik (Eds.), The Child and his Family, Vol. II. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Aronfreed, J. (1976). Moral development from the standpoint of a general psychological theory. In T. Lickona (Ed.) Moral Development and Behaviour: Theory, Research, and Social Issues. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Asarnow, J.R., Carlson, G.A. & Guthrie, D. (1987). Coping strategies, self perceptions, hopelessness, and perceived family environments in depressed and suicidal children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 361-366.
- Bachman, J.G. & O'Mally, P.M. (1977). Self-esteem in young men: A longitudinal analysis of the impact of educational and occupational attainment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 365-380.
- Bachmann, C., Baillif, J.P., Bieri, T., Blanchard, J. Leloup, F., Martignier, J., Popoff, L., Rossi-Bertoni, V. & Walser-Szynalski, M. (1974). Detention et famille: Etude preliminaire theorique et empirique des conditions juridiques et sociales des familles dant le pere est detenu en Suisse romande. (Report available from the Ecole de Service Social, 28, rue Prevost-Martin, 1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland.

- Baddeley, A. (1979). The limitations of human memory: Implications for the design of retrospective surveys. In Moss and Goldstein (Eds.), The Recall Method in Social Surveys. London Institute of Education Studies.
- Bagley, C., Verma, Gajendra, K., Mallick, K. & Young, L. (1979). Personality, Self-Esteem and Prejudice. England: Saxon House.
- Baker, B.P. (1980). Family change and coping patterns of wives of prisoners. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nebraska.
- Bakker, L.J., Morris, B.A., & Janus, L.M. (1978). Hidden victims of crime. Social Work, 23, 143-148.
- Baldwin, J.M. (1902). Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development. London: McMillan.
- Barnard, K.E. (1980). Maternal involvement and responsiveness: Definition and developmental course. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Infant Studies. New Haven, Conn.
- Baumerind, D. (1975). Early socialization and the discipline controversy. In N.J. Morrison, University Programs Modular Studies. General Learning Press.
- Bem, D.J. & Allen, A. (1974). On predicting some of the people some of the time: The search for cross-situational consistencies in behaviour. Psychological Review, 81, 506-520).
- Berndt, T.J. & Berndt E.G. (1975). Children's use of motives and intentionality in person perception and moral judgment. Child Development, 46, 904-912.
- Bernstein, R.M. (1980). The development of self-esteem during adolescence. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 136, 231-245.
- Biller, H.B. (1971). Father, Child and Sex Role. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath & Co.
- Biller, H.B. (1974). Paternal Deprivation: Family, School, Sexuality and Society. Lexington MA: Lexington Books.
- Bilton, T. (1981). Introductory Sociology. London: The Macmillan Press ltd.
- Bixenstine, V.E., DeCorte, M.S. & Bixenstine, B.A. (1976). Conformity to peer-sponsored misconduct at four grade levels. Developmental Psychology, 12, 226-236.

Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 88, 1-45.

Boss, P. (1980). The relationship of psychological father presence, wife's personal qualities and wife/family dysfunction in families of missing fathers. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 541-549.

Bould, S. (1977). Female headed families: Personal fate control and the provider role. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 339-349.

Bowers, K. (1973). Situationism in psychology: An analysis and critique. Psychological Review, 80, 307-336

Bradburn, M., Sudman, S. & Associates. (1979). Improving Interview Method and Questionnaire Design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brady, C.P., Bray, J.H. & Zeeb, L. (1986). Behavior problems of clinic children: Relation to parental marital status, age and sex of child. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 56, 399-412.

Brenner, M. (1981). Patterns of social structure in the research interview. In M. Brenner (Ed.) Social Method and Social Life. London: Academic Press

Brenner, M. (1985). Intensive interviewing. In M. Brenner, J. Brown & D. Canter (Eds), The Research Interview - Uses and Approaches. London: Academic Press.

Brim, O.G. (1975). Macro-structure influence on child development and the need for childhood social indicators. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 45, 516-524.

Bromley, O.B. (1986). The Case Study Method in Psychology and Related Disciplines. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1960). Freudian theories of identification and their derivatives. Child Development, 31, 15-40.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1974). Developmental research, public policy and the ecology of childhood. Child Development, 45, 1-5.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. American Psychologist, 32, 513-531.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The Ecology of Human Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1985). Interacting Systems in Human Development. Research Paradigms: Present and Future. Paper prepared for the SRCD Study Group on "Interacting Systems in Human Development" conducted at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. May 15-17.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. & Crouter, A.C. (1983). The evolution of environmental models in developmental research. In P. Mussen (Ed.) Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 1, pp. 357-414, 4th ed. New York: Wiley.
- Brown, J. & Sime, J. (1981). A methodology for accounts. In M. Brenner (Ed.), Social Method and Social Life. London: Academic Press.
- Brown, J. & Canter, D. (1985). The uses of explanation in the research interview. In M. Brenner, J. Brown & D. Canter (Eds.), The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches. London: Academic Press
- Bryman, A. (1988). Quantity and Quality in Social Research. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Bumpass, L. & Rindfuss, R. (1979). Children's experience of marital disruption. American Journal of Sociology, 85, 49-65.
- Bussey, K. & Maughan, B. (1982). Gender differences in moral reasoning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 701-706.
- Cairns, R.B. (1979) (Ed.), The Analysis of Social Interaction: Methods, Issues, and Illustrations. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cairns, R.B. (1987). Phenomena Regained: Issues in the study of development. (Paper available from the author; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.)
- Cannel, C.F. & Kahn, R.L. (1968). In L. Gardner & E. Aronson, The Handbook of Social Psychology, 2, 2nd ed. U.S.A.: Addison-Wesley Publisher Co.
- Canter, D., Brown, J. & Groat, L. (1985). A multiple sorting procedure for studying conceptual systems. In M. Brenner et al. (Eds.), The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches. London: Academic Press.
- Cherry, N. & Rodgers, B. (1979). Using longitudinal study to assess the quality of retrospective data. In Moss and Goldstein (Eds.), The Recall Method in Social Surveys. London Institute of Education Studies, 9.

- Clarke-Stewart, K.A. (1978). And daddy makes three: The father's impact on mother and young child. Child Development, 49, 466-478.
- Cohen, L.J. & Campos, J.J. (1974). Father, mother, and stranger as elicitors of attachment behaviors in infancy. Developmental Psychology, 10, 146-154.
- Colby, A. & Kohlberg, L. (1987). The Measurement of Moral Judgment. Vol.I Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Compas, B.E. (1987). Coping with stress during childhood and adolescence. Psychological Bulletin, 3, 393-403.
- Coopersmith, S. (1959). A method for determining types of self-esteem. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 59, 87-94.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The Antecedents of Self-Esteem. San Francisco: W.H.Freeman & Co.
- Copeland, A.P. (1985). Individual differences in children's reactions to divorce. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 14, 11-19.
- Copeland, A.P., Eisenstein, J.L., & Reiner, E.M. (1984). Relationships between mothers' and children's post-separation adjustment. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.
- Damon, W. (1983). Social and Personality Development: Infancy through Adolescence. London: W.W. Norton & Company Ltd.
- Damon, W. & Hart, D. (1982). The development of self-understanding from infancy through adolescence. Child Development, 53, 265-275.
- Daniel, S.W. & Barrett, C.J. (1981). The needs of prisoners' wives: A challenge for the mental professions. Community Mental Health Journal, 17, 310-322.
- Daum, J. M. & Bieliauskas, V.J. (1983). Father absence and moral development of male delinquent. Psychological Reports, 53, 223-228.
- Davis, L. (1983). A web of punishment. Social Work Today, 14, 48-21.
- De Waele, J.P. & Harre, R. (1979). Autobiography as a psychological method. In G. P. Ginsburg (Ed.), Emerging Strategies in Social Psychological Research. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Demo, D. (1985). The measurement of self-esteem: Refining our methods. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1490-1502.

Devereux, E.C., Shouval, R., Bronfenbrenner, U., Rogers, R.R., Kav-Venaki, S., Kiely, E. & Karson, E. (1974). Socialization practices of parents, teachers, and peers in Israel: The Kibbutz versus the city. Child Development, 45, 269-281.

Deykin, E. (1972). Life functioning in families of delinquent boys: An assessment model. Social Services Review, 46, 90-102.

Dill, D., Feld, E., Martin, J., Beukema, S., & Belle, D. (1980). The impact of the environment on the coping efforts of low-income mothers. Family Relations, 29, 503-509.

Dohrenwend, B.S. (1965). Some effects of open and closed questions on respondents answers. Human Organization, 24, 175-184.

Douglas, C.I. (1983). The crisis of imprisonment: Coping with stress adjustment to forced separation. Unpublished PhD thesis, Michigan State University.

Earl, L. & Lohmann, N. (1978). Notes for practice: Absent fathers and black male children. Social Work, 23, 413-415

Edelbrock, C. & Costello, A.J. (1984). Structured psychiatric interviews for children and adolescents. In G. Goldstein & M. Hersen (Eds), Handbook of Psychological Assessment. New York: Pergamon Press.

Edgar, P., Powell, R.J., Watkins D., Moore, R.J. & Azkarov, O. (1974). An analysis of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory: A discussion of two studies. Australian Psychologist, 9, 52-63.

Edwards, A. L. (1970). The Measurement of Personality Traits by Scales and Inventories. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Eisen, M. (1972). Characteristic self-esteem, sex, resistance to temptation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24, 68-72.

Ekehammer, B. (1974). Interactionism in personality from a historical perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 1026-1048.

- Emery, R.E. (1982). Interparental conflict and the children of discord and divorce. Psychological Bulletin, 92, 310-330.
- Epstein, S. (1973). The self-concept re-visited or a theory of a theory. American Psychologist, 28, 405-416.
- Erikson, E.H. (1950). Childhood and Society. New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E.H. (1968). Identidade Juventude e Crise. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores.
- Esman, A. (1982). Fathers and adolescent sons. In Stanley H. Cath, Alan R. Gurwitt and John M. Ross (Eds.), Father and Child: Developmental and Clinical Perspectives. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Espenshade, T.J. (1979). The economic consequences of divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 615-625.
- Fagot, B.I. (1974). Sex differences in toddlers' behavior and parental reaction. Developmental Psychology, 10, 554-558.
- Fein, E. (1970). Inner city interviewing: Some perspectives. Public Opinion Quarterly, 34, 625-629.
- Felner, R.D. (1977). An investigation of crisis in childhood: effects and outcomes in children experiencing parental death or divorce. Unpublished PhD thesis, The University of Rochester, New York.
- Ferraro, K.J., Johnson, J.M., Jorgenson, S.R. & Bolton, F.G. (1983). Problems of prisoners' families: The hidden costs of imprisonment. Journal of Family Issues, 4, 575-591.
- Feshbach, S. (1970). Agression. In Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, Vol. 2. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Field, T. (1989). Stress, Coping and Development. Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 18, 190-192.
- Fishman, L.T. (1984). Women at the wall: A study of prisoners' wives doing time on the outside. Unpublished PhD thesis, McGill University, Canada.
- Fishman, L.T. (1988). Stigmatization and prisoners' wives' feelings of shame. Deviant Behavior, 9, 169-192.
- Fishman, S.H. (1981). Losing a loved one to incarceration: The effect of imprisonment on family members. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 59, 372-375.

- Fishman, S.H. (1983). The impact of incarceration on children of offenders. Journal of Children in Contemporary Society, 15, 89-99.
- Fishman, S.H. & Cassin, C.J.M. (1981). Services for families of offenders: An Overview. (Paper available from the; National Institute of Corrections, 320, First Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20534.)
- Fleck, R.J., Fuller, C.C., Malin, S.Z. & Miller, D.H. (1980). Father psychological absence and heterosexual behavior, personal adjustment and sex-typing in adolescent girls. Adolescence, 15, 847-860.
- Folkman, S.(1984). Personal control and stress and coping processes: A theoretical analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 839-852.
- Francis, R.C., & Siegel, M. (1982). Rule-following behaviour and children's perceptions of significant others. Paper presented at the Second National Child Development Conference, Melbourne, Victoria.
- Freud, S. (1973). Psicologia de Las Masas y Analisis del Yo Tomo III. Madrid: Editorial Biblioteca Nueva, 1973, 2563-2610 (Originally published 1922)
- Freud, S. (1973). Duelo Y Melancolia. Tomo II. Madrid: Editorial Biblioteca Nueva, 2091-2100 (Originally published in 1917).
- Friedman, S. & Esselstyn, T.C. (1965). The adjustment of children of jail inmates. Federal Probation, 29, 55-59.
- Friedman, S., Rogers, P.P. & Gettys, J. (1975). Project reed: Increase in self-esteem as measured by the Coopersmith Inventory. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 40, 165-166.
- Fry, P.S. & Scher, A. (1984). The effects of father absence on children's achievement motivation, ego-strength, and locus-of-control orientation: A five-year longitudinal assessment. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 2, 167-178.
- Fullerton, W.S. (1972). Self-disclosure, self-esteem and risk taking: A study of their convergent and discriminant validity in elementary school children. Unpublished PhD thesis, Universtity of California, Berkeley.
- Garbarino, J. (1985). Adolescent Development: An Ecological Perspective. London: Charles E. Merrill.
- Garbarino, J. & Gilliam, G.(1980). Understanding Abusive Families. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Garnezy, N. & Rutter, M. (Eds) (1983). Stress, Coping, and Development in Children. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Gelles, R.J. (1974). The Violent Home: A Study of Physical Aggression between Husbands and Wives. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Gelles, R.J. (1978). Methods for studying sensitive family topics. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 48, 408-424.
- Gergen, K.J. (1971). The Concept of Self. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Gerson, R.R. and Damon, W. (1978). Moral understanding and children's conduct. In W. Damon (Ed.), Moral Development. (No.2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Glaser, B.G. & Straus, A.L. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Gongla, P.A. (1982). Single parent families: A look at families of mothers and children. Marriage and Family Review, 5, 5-27.
- Gove, W., & Crutchfield, R. (1982). The family and juvenile delinquency. Sociological Quarterly, 23, 301-319.
- Grossman, F.K., Eichler, L.S. and Winickoff, S.A. (1980). Pregnancy, Birth, and Parenthood. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grossberg, S.H. & Crandall, L. (1978). Father loss and father absence in preschool children. Clinical Social Work Journal, 6, 123-134.
- Haan, N. (1975). Two moralities in action contexts: Relationships to thought, ego regulation, and development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 286-305.
- Haan, N. (1977). Coping and Defending: Process of Self-Environment Organization. New York: Academic Press.
- Haan, N. (1978). Two moralities in action contexts: Relationships to thought, ego regulation, and development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 286-305.
- Hairston, C.F. (1988). Family ties during imprisonment: Do they influence future criminal activity? Federal Probation, 52, 48-52.
- Hales, S. (1981a). The Development of Self-Esteem: A Longitudinal and Cross-Sectional Analysis. (Paper available from the author; Department of Sociology, 410 Barrows Hall, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.)

Hales, S. (1981b). Understanding the relationship between self-esteem and social desirability: A longitudinal study. (Paper available from the author, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Hamilton, M.L. (1977). Father's Influence on Children. Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Harkness, S., Edwards, C.P. & Super, C.M. (1981). Social roles and moral reasoning: A case study in a rural African community. Developmental Psychology, 17, 595-603.

Harre, R. (1977). The ethogenic approach: Theory and practice. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 10. New York: Academic Press.

Harre, R. (1980). Making social psychology scientific. In R. Gilmour and S. Duck (Eds), The Development of Social Psychology. London: Academic Press.

Harre, R. & Secord, P. (1972). The Explanation of Social Behaviour. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Harter, S. (1982). The perceived competence scale for children. Child Development, 53, 87-97.

Harter, S. (1983). Developmental perspectives on the self-system. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology: Socialisation, Personality and Social Development, 4th ed., Vol. 4. New York: Wiley.

Hartup, W.W. (1979). The social worlds of childhood. American Psychologist, 34, 944-950.

Herjanic, B., Herjanic, M., Brown F. & Wheat, T. (1975). Are children reliable reporters? Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 3, 41-48.

Herjanic, B., Hudson, R. & Kotloff, K. (1976). Does interviewing harm children? Research Communication in Psychology, Psychiatry and Behaviour, 1, 523-531.

Herzberger, S.D. (1983). Social cognition and the transmission of abuse. In D. Finkelhor et al, The Dark Side of Families. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Herzog, E. & Sudia, C.E. (1973). Children in Fatherless Families. In B.M. Caldwell & H.N. Ricciuti (Eds.), Review of Child Development Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hess, R.D. & Camara, K.A. (1979). Post-divorce family relationships as mediating factors in the consequences of divorce for children. Journal of Social Issues, 35, 79-96.

Hetherington, E.M. (1972). Effects of father absence on personality development in adolescent daughters. Developmental Psychology, 7, 313-326.

Hetherington, E.M. (1979). Divorce: A child's perspective. American Psychologist, 34, 851-858.

Hetherington, E.M. (1982). Effects of divorce on parents and children. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional Families: Parenting and Child Development. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hetherington, E.M. (1989). Coping with family transitions: Winners, losers, and survivors. Child Development, 60, 1-14.

Hetherington, E.M., & Anderson, E.R. (1987). The effects of divorce and remarriage on early adolescents and their families. In M.D. Levine & E.R. McAnarney (Eds.), Early Adolescent Transitions. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Hetherington, E.M., & Camara, K.A. (1984). Families in transition: The process of dissolution and reconstitution. In R. Parke (Ed.), Review of Child Development Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hetherington, E.M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. (1978). The aftermath of divorce. In J.H. Stevens, Jr., & M. Mathews (Eds.), Mother-child, Father-child, Relationships. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Hetherington, E.; Cox, M. & Cox, R. (1982). Effects of divorce on parents and children. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional Families: Parenting and Child Development, 233-285 Hillsdale, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hetherington, E.M., Stanley-Hagan, M. & Anderson E.R. (1989). Marital transitions: A child's perspective. American Psychologist, 44, 303-312.

Hill, R. (1949). Families under Stress. New York: Harper Bros.

Hingst, A.G. (1982). Children and divorce: The child's view. Unpublished manuscript.

Hoffman, L.W. (1977). Changes in family roles, socialization, and sex differences. American Psychologist, 32, 644-657.

- Hoffman, M.L. (1970). Moral Development. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 2. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1971a). Father absence and conscience development. Developmental Psychology, 4, 400-406.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1971b). Identification and conscience development. Child Development, 42, 1071-1082.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1975a). Moral internalization, parental power, and the nature of parent-child interaction. Developmental Psychology, 11, 228-239.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1975b). Sex differences in moral internalization and values. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 720-729.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1979). Development of moral thought, feelings, and behaviour. American Psychologist, 34, 958-966.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1980). Adolescent morality in developmental perspective. In J. Adelson (Ed.), Handbook of Adolescent Psychology. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Hoffman, M.L. (1981). The role of the father in moral internalization. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The Role of the Father in Child Development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hollander, J. (1972). Sex differences in sources of self-esteem. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 38, 343-347.
- Holmes, D.S. & Houston, B.K. (1974). Effectiveness of situation redefinition and affective isolation in coping with stress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 212-218.
- Holstein, C.B. (1976). Irreversible, stepwise sequence in the development of moral judgment: A longitudinal study of males and females. Child Development, 47, 51-61.
- Homer, E.L. (1979). Inmate-family ties: Desirable but difficult. Federal Probation, 43, 47-52.
- Honig, A.S. (1986a). Stress and coping in children (part 1). Young Children, 41 (Part 4) 50-63.
- Honig, A.S. (1986b). Stress and coping in children (part 2): Interpersonal family relationships. Young Children, 41 (Part 5) 47-59.

- Hounslow, B., Stephenson, A., Stewart, J. & Crancher, J. (1982). Children of imprisoned fathers. Report available from; The Family and Children's Services Agency, Ministry of Youth and Community Services of New South Wales, Australia.
- Hudson, L. (1977). Interview with Liam Hudson. In D. Cohen, Psychologists on Psychology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hughes, J.E. (1982). "My daddy,s number is c-92760". Journal of Children in Contemporary Society, 15, 79-87.
- Hunt, M. and Hunt, B. (1977). The Divorce Experience. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill.
- Jacobson, D.S. (1978). The impact of marital separation / divorce on children: III. Parent-child communication and child adjustment, and regression analysis of findings from overall study. Journal of Divorce, 2, 175-194.
- Johnson, B.W., Redfield, D.L., Miller, R.L. & Simpson, R.E. (1983). The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory: A construct validation study. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 43, 907-913.
- Jurkovic, G.J. (1980). The juvenile delinquent as a moral philosopher: A structural-developmental perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 88, 709-727.
- Kagan, J. (1958). The concept of identification. Psychological Review, 65, 296-305.
- Kagan, J. (1976). Emergent themes in human development. American Scientist, 64, 186-196.
- Kahn, R.L. & Cannel, C.F. (1957). The Dynamics of Interviewing. Newe York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kalter, N. & Rembar, J. (1981). The significance of a child's age at the time of parental divorce. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 51, 85-100.
- Kazdin, A.E. (1982). Single-Case Research Designs: Methods for Clinical and Applied Settings. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Keasey, C.B. (1972). The lack of sex differences in the moral judgment of preadolescents. Journal of Social Psychology, 86, 157-158.
- Keller, E.F. (1985). Reflections on Gender and Science. London: Yale University Press.

Kelly, J.B. & Wallerstein, J.S. (1976). The effects of parental divorce: Experiences of the child in early latency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 46, 20-32.

Kemper, T.D. & Reichler, M.L. (1976). Father's work integration and types and frequencies of rewards and punishments administered by fathers and mothers to adolescent sons and daughters. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 129, 207-219.

Kenrick, D.T. & Stringfield, D.O. (1980). Personality traits and the eye of the beholder: Crossing some traditional philosophical boundaries in the search for consistency in all of the people. Psychological Review, 87, 88-104.

Klaff, F.R. (1985). Children of divorce: Adjustment and relationship with parents. Unpublished PhD thesis, The Fielding Institute.

Kohlberg, L. (1963). The development of children's orientations toward a moral order: I. Sequence in the development of moral thought. Vita Humana, 6, 11-33.

Kohlberg, L. (1964). Development of moral character and moral ideology. In M. L. Hoffman & L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of Child Development Research. Vol. 1. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

Kohlberg, L. (1966). A cognitive developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In E. Maccoby (Ed.), The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D.A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of Socialization and Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Kohlberg, L. (1971). From is to ought. How to commit the naturalistic fallacy and get away with it in the study of moral development. In Mischel W. (Ed.), Cognitive Development and Epistemology. New York: Academic Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T.Lickona (Ed.), Moral Development and Behaviour: Theory, Research, and Social Issues. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kohlberg, L., & Gilligan, C. (1971). The adolescent as a philosopher. The discovery of the self in a post-conventional world. Daedalus, 100, 1051-1086.

Kohlberg, L., Levine, C. & Hewer, A. (1983). Moral Stages: A Current Formulation and a Response to Critics. Basel; New York: Karger.

Kohn, M.L. (1979). The effects of social class on parental values and practices. In D. Reiss & H.A. Hoffman (Eds.), The American Family: Dying or Developing. New York: Plenum.

Kokernes, B. (1974). Grade level differences in factors of self-esteem. Developmental Psychology, 10, 954-958.

Krebs, D.L. (1970). Altruism- an examination of the concept and a review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 73, 258-302.

Kuhn, D. (1976). Short-term longitudinal evidence for the sequentiality of Kohlberg's early stages of moral judgment. Developmental Psychology, 12, 162-166.

Kurdek, L.A., Blisk, D., & Sieskym A.E. (1981). Children's reactions to their parents' divorce. Journal of Developmental Psychology, 17, 565-579.

Kurtines, W. & Grief, E.B. (1974). The development of moral thought: Review and evaluation of Kohlberg's approach. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 453-470.

Lamb, M.E. (1976). The Role of The Father in Child Development. Wisconsin: John Wiley & Sons.

Lamb, M.E. (1977). The development of mother-infant and father-infant attachments in the second year of life. Developmental Psychology, 13, 637-648.

Lamb, M.E. (1978). The effects of the social context on dyadic social interaction. In M.E. Lamb, S.J. Suomi, & G.R. Stephenson (Eds.), Social Interaction Analysis: Methodological Issues. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Lamb, M.E. (1981a). Fathers and child development: an integrative overview. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The Role of the Father in Child Development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lamb, M.E. (1981b). The Development of father-child relationship. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The Role of the Father in Child Development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lamb, M.E. (1982). Parental behaviour and child development in nontraditional families: An introduction. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional Families: Parenting and Child Development. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lamb, M.E. & Lamb, J.E. (1976). The nature and importance of the father infant relationship. The Family Coordinator-Journal of Education, Counselling and Services, 25, 379-385.

Lampert, W. (1986). The relationship of the mental structures and the social spheres of application of moral judgment. Paper available from the author; Max Plank Institute for Human Development and Education, Berlin.

Langlois, J.H. & Downs, A.C. (1980). Mothers, fathers, and peers as socialization agents of sex-typed play behaviours in young children. Child Development, 51, 1237-1247.

Lazarus, R. S. & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, Appraisal and Coping. New York: Springer.

Lee, G. (1979). Effects of social networks on the family. In W.R. Burr, R. Hill, F. Nye, and I. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary Theories About the Family (vol. 1). New York: The Free Press.

Leming, J.S. (1978). Intrapersonal variations in stage of moral reasoning among adolescents as a function of situational context. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4, 405-416.

Levine, C. (1976). Role-taking standpoint and adolescent usage of Kohlberg's conventional stages of moral reasoning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 41-46.

Levine, M. (1974). Scientific method and the adversary model: Some preliminary thoughts. American Psychologist, 29, 661-677.

Lewin, K. (1931). Environmental forces. In C. Murchison (Ed.). A Handbook of Child Psychology. Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field Theory in Social Science: Selected Theoretical Papers. New York: Harper.

Lewis, C. (1986). Becoming a Father. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Lewis, C. (1986). The role of the father in the human family. In W. Sluckin and M. Herbert (Eds.), Parental Behaviour. Oxford: Basil Blackwell ltd.

Lewis, M. & Feiring, C. (1978). The child's social world. In R.M. Lerner & G.D. Spanier (Eds.). Child Influences on Marital and Family Interactions: A Life-span Perspective. New York: Academic Press.

- Lickona, T. (1976). Moral Development and Behaviour: Theory, Research and Social Issues. New York: Holt Rinehard and Winston.
- Longabaugh, R. (1973). Mother behaviour as a variable moderating the effects of father absence. Ethos, 1, 456-465.
- Lowenstein, A. (1986). Temporary single parenthood: The case of prisoner's families. Journal of Applied Family and Child Study, 35, 79-85.
- Lynn, D.B. & Cross, A.R. (1974). Parent preferences of preschool children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 555-559.
- Maccoby, E.E. & Jacklin, C.N. (1974). The Psychology of Sex Differences. California: Stanford University Press.
- Magnusson, D. (1981). Toward a Psychology of situation: An Interactional Perspective. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Magnusson, D. (1985). Implications of an interactional paradigm for research on human development. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 8, 115-137.
- Magnusson, D. (1988). Individual Development from an Interactional Perspective. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mahler, M.S. (1968). In Human Symbiosis and the Vicissitudes of Individuation. New York: International University Press.
- Mahler, M.S., Pine, F. & Bergman, A. (1975). The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant. New York: Basic Books.
- Marcus, R.F. (1975). The child as elicitor of parental sanctions for independent and dependent behavior: A simulation of parent-child interaction. Developmental Psychology, 11, 443-452.
- Marsh, P. Rosser, I & Harre, R. (1978). The Rules of Disorder. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Matthews, J. (1983). Forgotten Victims. London (NACRO).
- McCarthy, J.D. & Hoge, D.R. (1982). Analysis of age effects in longitudinal studies of adolescent self-esteem. Developmental Psychology, 18, 372-379.

- McCrae, R.R. (1984). Situational determinants of coping responses: Loss, threat and challenge. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 919-928.
- McCubin, H.I., Joy, C.B., Cauble, A.E., Comeau, J.K., Patterson, J.M. & Needle, R.H. (1980). Family stress and coping: A decade review. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 855-871.
- McDermott, J. F. (1968). Parental divorce in early childhood. American Journal of Psychiatry, 124, 1424-1432.
- McDermott, J. (1970). Divorce and its psychiatric sequelae in children. Archives General Psychiatry, 23, 421-427.
- Meacham, J.A. (1975). A dialectical approach to moral judgment and self-esteem. Human Development, 18, 159-170.
- Mead, G.H. (1934). Mind, Self and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviourist. Chicago: University Press.
- Miall, D.S. (1986). Emotion and the self. The British Journal of Psychology, 77, 389-397.
- Miller, T.M. (1984). Paternal absence and its effect on adolescent self-esteem. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 30, 293-296.
- Mills, M.C. (1985). Adolescents' reactions to counselling interviews. Adolescence, 77, 83-95.
- Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychology Review, 80, 252-283.
- Mischel, W. (1979). On the interface of cognition and personality. American Psychologist, 34, 740-754.
- Mitchell, J.C. (1982). Case and situation analysis. Sociological Review, 31, 186-211.
- Moerk, E.L. (1973). Like father like son: Imprisonment of fathers and the psychological adjustment of sons. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4, 303-312.
- Monger, M. & Pendleton, J. (1977). The prison visit. Social Work Today, 34, 8-10.
- Montemayor, R. & Eisen, M. (1977). The development of self-conceptions from childhood to adolescence. Developmental Psychology, 13, 314-319.

- Moos, R.H. & Schaefer, J. (1986). Life transitions and crises: A conceptual overview. In R. H. Moos (Ed.), Coping with Life Crises. London: Plenum Press.
- Morris, P. (1965). Prisoners and their Families. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Morris, P. (1967). Fathers in prison. The British Journal of Criminology, 7, 424-430.
- Morrison, T.L., Thomas, M.D. & Weaver, S.J. (1973). Self-esteem and self-estimates of academic performance. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41.
- Mostyn, B. (1985). The content analysis of qualitative research data: a dynamic approach. In Brenner et al. (Eds.), The Research Interview: Uses and Approaches. London: Academic Press.
- Mullener, N. & Laird, J.D. (1971). Some developmental changes in the organization of self-evaluations. Developmental Psychology, 5, 233-236.
- Murphy, J.M., & Gilligan, C. (1980). Moral development in late adolescence and adulthood: A critique and reconstruction of Kohlberg's theory. Human Development, 23, 77-104.
- Murphy, L.B. & Moriarty, A.E. (1976). Vulnerability, Coping, and Growth from Infancy to Adolescence. London: Yale University Press.
- Mustin, J.W. (1984). The family: A critical factor in corrections. Paper presented at the 29th annual Southern Conference on Corrections.
- Nadelman, L. (1976). Perception of parents by London five-year-olds. Paper presented to the American Psychological Association, Washington D.C. (September).
- Newman, B.M. & Newman P.R. (1975). Development Through Life: A Psychological Approach. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.
- Newson, J. and Newson, E. (1976). Seven Years Old in the Home Environment. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Nisan, M. & Kohlberg, L. (1982). Universality and variation in moral judgment: A longitudinal and cross-sectional study in Turkey. Child Development, 53, 865-876.
- Nisbett, R.E. & Wilson, T.D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal report on mental processes. Psychological Review, 84, 231-259.

- Noller, P. (1980). Cross-gender effect in two-child families. Developmental Psychology, 16, 159-160.
- Osofsky, J.D. & O'Connell, E.J. (1972). Parent-child interaction. Developmental Psychology, 7, 157-168.
- Parikh, B. (1980). Development of moral judgment and its relation to family environmental factors in Indian and American families. Child Development, 51, 1030-1039.
- Parish, T.S. & Kappes, B.M. (1980). Impact of father loss on the family. Social Behavior and Personality, 8, 107-112.
- Parish, T.S. & Wigle, S.E. (1985). A longitudinal study of the impact of parental divorce on adolescents' evaluations of self and parents. Adolescence, 20, 239-244.
- Parke, R.D. (1979). Perspectives on father-infant interaction. In J. Osofsky (Ed.), Handbook of Infant Development. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Parker, W.C. (1984). Interviewing children: Problems and promise. Journal of Negro Education, 53, 18-28.
- Parsons, T. and Bales, R.F. (1955). Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. New York: Free Press.
- Patterson, G.R. & Reid, J.B. (1984). Social interaction process within the family: The study of moment-by-moment family transactions in which human development is imbedded. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 5, 237-262.
- Patterson, S.E. (1971). Twenty older natural helpers: Their characteristics and patterns of helping. Public Welfare, 29, 400-403.
- Pearlin, L.I., & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social Behaviour, 19, 2-21.
- Peck, J. S. (1989). The impact of divorce on children at various stages of the family life cycle. Journal of Divorce, 12, 81-103.
- Pedersen, F. A. (1975). Mother, father and infant as an interactive system. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Chicago.
- Pedersen, F.A. (1981). Father influences viewed in a family context. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), The Role of the Father in Child Development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Pedersen, F.A., Yarrow, L.J., Anderson, B.J. & Cain, R.L. (1979). Conceptualization of father influences in the infancy period. In M. Lewis & L. Rosenblum (Eds.), The Child and its Family. New York: Plenum.

Pedersen, F. A., Cairn, R. & Anderson, B. (1981). Second order effects involving interactions mother, father and infant. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research on Child Development. Boston.

Peterson, J.L. & Zill, N. (1986). Marital disruption, parent-child relationships, and behavior problems in children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 295-307.

Piaget, J. (1954). The Construction of Reality in the Child. New York: Basic Books.

Piaget, J. (1962). Play, Dreams and Imitation in Childhood. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Piaget, J. (1968). The Moral Judgment of the Child. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Piaget, J. and Inhelder, B. (1969). The Psychology of the Child. New York: Basic Books.

Pilling, D. & Pringle, M.K. (1978). Controversial Issues in Child Development. London: Paul Elsk Ltd.

Podd, M.H. (1972). Ego identity status and morality: The relationship between two developmental constructs. Deveopmental Psychology, 6, 497-507.

Prawat, R.S., Grisson, S. & Parish, T. (1979). Affective development in children grades 3 through 12. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 135, 37-49.

Radin, N. & Russell, G. (1983). Increased father participation and child development outcomes. In M.E. Lamb & A. Sagi (Eds.), Fatherhood and Family Policy. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Raush, L.H. (1979). Epistemology, metaphysics, and person-situation methodology. In D.W. Fiske (Ed.), Methods for Studying Person-Situation Interactions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reschley, D.J. & Mittman, A. (1973). The relationship of self-esteem status and task ambiguity to the self-reinforcement behavior of children. Developmental Psychology, 9, 16-19.

- Rest, J.R. (1973). The hierarchical nature of moral judgment: A study of patterns of comprehension and preference of moral stages. Journal of Personality, 41, 86-109.
- Rest, J. R., Cooper, D., Coder, R., Masanz, J. & Anderson, D. (1974). Judging the important issues in moral dilemmas: An objective measure of development. Developmental Psychology, 10, 491-501.
- Rest, J.R., Davison, M.L. & Robbins, S. (1978). Age trends in judging moral issues: A review of cross-sectional, longitudinal, and sequential studies of the defining issues test. Child Development, 49, 263-279.
- Rich, J. (1972). Interviewing Children and Adolescents. London: Redwood Press Ltd.
- Ricoeur, P. (1981). Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, R.R. & Renzaglia, G.A. (1965). The influence of tape recording on counselling. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 12, 1, 10-16.
- Rogers, C.R. (1970). Tornar-se Pessoa. Lisbon: Moraes.
- Rosenberg, M. (1972). Society and the Adolescent Self-Image. Princeton: University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the Self. New York: Basic Books.
- Rosenhan, D. L. (1972). Prosocial behaviour of children. In Hartup (Ed.), The Young Child: Reviews of Research, Vol.2 (National Associations for the Education of Young Children, Washington).
- Ross, H. & Sawhill, I.V. (1975). Time of Transition: The Growth of Families Headed by Women. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Runyan, W. M. (1978). The life course as a theoretical orientation: Sequences of person-situation interaction. Journal of Personality, 46, 569-593.
- Rutter, M. (1971). Parent-child separation: Psychological effects on the children. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 12, 233-260.
- Rutter, M. (1979). Maternal deprivation, 1972-1978: New findings, new concepts, new approaches. Child Development, 50, 283-305.

- Rutter, M. (1983). Stress, coping, and development: Some issues and some questions. In N. Garmezy & M. Rutter (Eds), Stress, Coping and Development in Children, pp.1-43 New York: McGraw Hill.
- Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57, 316-331.
- Rutter, M. & Graham, P. (1968). The reliability and validity of the psychiatric assessment of the child: I. Interview with the child. British Journal of Psychiatry, 114, 563-579.
- Ryan, W. (1971). Blaming the Victim. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sack, W.H., Seidler, J. & Thomas, S. (1976). The children of imprisoned parents: A psychosocial exploration. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 46, 618-627.
- Sack, W.H. (1977). Children of imprisoned fathers. Psychiatry, 40, 163-174.
- Sameroff, A.J. (1975). Early influences on development: Fact or fancy? Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 21, 267-294.
- Santrock, J.W. (1970). Influence of onset and type of paternal absence on the first four Eriksonian developmental crises. Developmental Psychology, 3, 273-274.
- Santrock, J.W. (1975). Father absence, perceived maternal behaviour and moral development in boys. Child Development, 46, 753-757.
- Sarnoff, C.A. (1982). The father's role in latency. In Stanley H. Cath, Alan R. Gurwitt and John M. Ross (Eds.), Father and Child: Development and Clinical Perspectives. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Schafer, N.E. (1978). Prison visiting: A background for change. Federal Probation, 42, 47-50.
- Schlenker, B. R. (1987). Threats to identity: Self identification and social Stress. In C.R. Snyder & C. E. Ford Coping with Negative Life Events. London: Plenum Press.
- Schneller, D.P. (1976). The Prisoner's Family: A Study of the Effects of Imprisonment on Families of Prisoners. San Francisco: R. & E. Research Associates.
- Schorr, A L. & Moen, P. (1979). The single parent and public policy. Social Policy, 9, 15-21.

- Schwartz, M. & Weintraub, J. (1974). The prisoner's wife: A study in crisis. Federal Probation, 38, 20-26.
- Sears, R.R.(1970). Relation of early socialisation experiences to self-concepts and gender role in middle childhood. Child Development, 41, 267-289.
- Sears, R.R., Rau, H., & Alpert, R. (1965). Identification and Child Rearing. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Selman, R. (1971). The relation of role taking to the development of moral judgment in children. Child Development, 42, 79-91.
- Shavelson, R.S., Hubner, J.J. & Stanton, G.C. (1976). Self-concept: Validation of construct interpretations. Review of Educational Research, 46, 948-967.
- Shaw, Roger (1987). Children of Imprisoned Fathers. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Sheperd, E. and Watson, J.P. (1982). Personal Meaning. Chichester: Wiley & Sons.
- Sherwood, R. (1980). The Psychodynamics of Race. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Shinn, M. (1978). Father absence and children's cognitive development. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 295-324.
- Shotter, J. (1977). Agency and accounting: Criticism of Harre and Secord's "open souls" doctrine. Paper presented to the British Psychological Society, social psychology section annual conference, University of Durham, September.
- Shotter, J. (1978). Action, joint action and intentionality. In M. Brenner, The Structure of Action. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Simmons, R.G., Rosenberg, F. & Rosenberg, M. (1973). Disturbance in the self-image at adolescence. American Sociological Review, 38, 553-568.
- Sinha, V. (1972). Age differences in self-disclosure. Developmental Psychology, 7, 25 -258.
- Smith, S.A. (1986). House arrest: prisoners' wives. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Essex.
- Smith, J.C. and Hogan, B. (1983). Criminal Law. London: Butterworth
- Spatz, C.K. & Johnstone, J.O. (1973). Internal consistency of the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 33, 875-876.

Starr, J. & Raykovitz, J. (1982). A multimodal approach to interviewing children. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 16, 267-277.

Stone, A.A., Helder, L. & Schneider, M.S. (1988). Coping with stressful events: Coping dimensions and issues. In L. H. Cohen (Ed.), Life Events and Psychological Functioning: Theoretical and Methodological Issues. London: Sage Publications.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of Qualitative Research. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Struckhoff, D.R. (1977). Adjustment of prisoners' wives to separation. Unpublished PhD thesis, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Sudman, S. & Bradburn, N. (1974). Response Effects in Surveys: A Review and Synthesis. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Sullivan, E. (1977). A study of Kohlberg's structural theory or moral development. A critique of liberal social science ideology. Human Development, 20, 352-376.

Sullivan, H.S. (1953). The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc.

Svanum, S., Bringle, R.G., & McLaughlin, J.E. (1982). Father absence and cognitive performance in a large sample of six- to eleven-year-old children. Child Development, 53, 136-143.

Switzky, L., Vietze, P. & Switzky, H. (1979). Attitudinal and demographic predictor of breast-feeding and bottle-feeding behaviour by mothers of six-week-old infants. Psychological Reports, 45, 3-14.

Thomasson, F.L. (1984). Women at the wall: A study of prisoners' wives doing time on the outside. Unpublished PhD thesis, McGill University, Canada.

Thompson, S.C. (1981). Will it hurt less if I can control it? A complex answer to a simple question. Psychological Bulletin, 90, 89-101.

Tomlinson-Keasy, C. & Keasy, C.B. (1974). The mediating role of cognitive development in moral judgment. Child Development, 45, 291-298.

Trainer, F.E. (1977). A critical analysis of Kohlberg's contributions to the study of moral thought. Journal Theory Social Behaviour, 7, 41-63.

- Tschann, J.M., Johnston, J.R., Kline, M. & Wallerstein, J.S. (1989). Family process and children's functioning during divorce. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51, 431-444.
- Turiel, E. (1974). Conflict and transition in adolescent moral development. Child Development, 45, 14-29.
- Van Nuland, J. (1970). The problem of prisoners' children. (Report available from the Secretariat: c/o Ecole de Criminologie, Tiensestraat 41, - B 3000 Louvain, Belgium).
- Van Lieshout, C.F.M. (1986). Children's coping and the structure of their self-concept. (Paper available from the author; Catholic University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands).
- Van Velsen, J. (1967). The extended case method and situational analysis. In A. L. Epstein (Ed.), The Craft of Social Anthropology. London: Tavistock.
- Verrijdt, J. (1975). Les familles de detenus. (Report available from the; Bureau International Catholique de L'Enfance (BICE): 65, rue de Lausanne, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland.)
- Walker, L.W. (1984). Sex differences in the development of moral reasoning: A critical review. Child Development, 55, 677-691.
- Wallerstein, J. S. (1983). Children of divorce: stress and developmental tasks. In N. Garnezy & M. Rutter (Eds), Stress, Coping and Development. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Wallerstein, J.S. (1984). Children of divorce: Preliminary report of a ten-year follow up of young children. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 54, 444-458.
- Wallerstein, J.S., Corbin, S.B. & Lewis, J.M. (1988). Children of divorce: A 10-year study. In E.M. Hetherington & J.D. Arasteh (Eds), Impact of Divorce, Single Parenting, and Step-Parenting on Children. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wallerstein, J. & Kelly, J. (1976). The effects of parental divorce: Experiences of the child in late latency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 46, 256-269.
- Wallerstein, J.S., & Kelly, J.B. (1980). Surviving the Breakup: How Children and Parents Cope with Divorce. New York: Basic Books.

- Wardell, W. W. (1985). The reunion of the male prison inmate to his family: A humanistic exploratory study. Unpublished PhD thesis, Fielding Institute.
- Weiner, B. & Peter, N. (1973). A cognitive-developmental analysis of achievement and moral judgements. Developmental Psychology, 9, 290-309.
- Weintraub, J.F. (1976). The delivery of services to families of prisoners. Federal Probation, 40, 28-31.
- Weisbroth, S.P. (1970). Moral judgment, sex, and parental identification in adults. Developmental Psychology, 2, 396-402.
- Weisel, J.E. (1976). Single mother attitudes and characteristics related to the self-esteem of her son. Unpublished Phd thesis, School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles.
- Weiss, R.S. (1979). Growing up a little faster: The experience of growing up in a single-parent household. Journal of Social Issues, 35, 97-111.
- Wells, E. and Stryker, S. (1988). Stability and change in self over the life course. In P.B. Baltes, D.L. Featherman and R.M. Lerner (Eds.), Life-Span Development and Behavior. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Westman, J. (1972). Effect of divorce in a child's personality development. Medical Aspects Human Sexuality, 6, 38-55.
- Woody, J.D., Colley, P.E., Schlegelmilch, J., Maginn, P. & Balsanek, J. (1984). Child adjustment to parental stress following divorce. Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 65, 405-412.
- Wylie, R.C. (1974). The Self-Concept. Vol.1. Lincoln, U.S.A.: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wylie, R.C. (1979). The Self-Concept. Vol.2. Lincoln, U.S.A.: University of Nebraska Press.
- Yarrow, L.J. (1960). Interviewing children. In P.H. Mussen, Handbook of Research Methods in Child Development. California: Wiley.
- Yin, R.K. (1989). Case Study Research: Design and Methods. London: Sage Publications.
- Youniss, J. (1980). Parent and Peers in Social Development. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Yussen, S.R. (1977). Brief reports: Characteristics of moral dilemmas written by adolescents. Developmental Psychology, 13, 162-163.

APPENDIX 1

A = MOTHER INTERVIEW

1: How many children do you have? How many boys and girls? How old are they? Do they all live here with you? Was..... ever separated from you? If yes, Why? Where did she or he stay? Has s/he ever been ill? If yes, what kind of illness?

2: Can you tell me about your husband/partner? How long have you been married/living together? How did you meet? What are the good things about your relationship? What things would you like to change about your relationship? Is there anything that causes a lot of disagreement between you and your husband/partner?

3: Can you tell me why your husband is in prison? When was he arrested? Where was he arrested? Did your child see him being arrested? How long has he been in prison (if he's on bail or remand)? Did you expect your husband/partner to be arrested? What did you feel when he was arrested?

4: How many times has he been in prison? If more than one, when was he in prison? For how long? Can you tell me why?

5: Has your husband/partner been sentenced? If yes, what did you feel when he was sentenced? Do you think he deserves the sentence he got? Why or Why not? Do you think he got a fair trial? Why or why not?

6: Who do you blame for his imprisonment? Why? How did.....know about his/her father's arrest? Did anybody give an explanation to the child? If yes, what kind of explanation? How did s/he react?

7: Can you tell me how your life has changed since your husband/partner's imprisonment? What were the most difficult things for you to cope, after his imprisonment? Do you feel the same towards your husband since his imprisonment? In what ways? If no, In what ways do you feel differently towards him?

8: Do you still think of your husband/partner as a part of the family? What things did you use to do together to enjoy yourselves as a family? In what ways does he contribute as a father? (before imprisonment and after) And as a husband?

9: Do you think about the future? How do you feel about him coming back?

10: Have you noticed any changes in your child since the imprisonment of your husband/partner? What kind of changes?

Do you feel that you know about most of his/her thoughts and fears or do you think there's quite a lot s/he keeps to him/herself? Has s/he ever been in trouble in school or elsewhere? How do you cope with these changes? Can you tell me any other particular problems with the child? Are there any special problems about being a mother with a husband/partner away in prison?

11: How frequently do you visit your husband? and what about the child? What do you think about the prison visits? What do you think are the main difficulties related to prison visiting? Do you talk about his/her father while he is away? What kind of things do you talk about?

12: Does anybody at school know about your husband/partner's imprisonment? If yes, how did they know? Does your child come in for any teasing or bullying related to your husband/partner's imprisonment? If yes, how does s/he react? How does s/he cope with the teasing? What do you do on such occasions?

13: How much alike would you say you and your husband are in your idea of bringing up children? Does he treat them the same or differently from you? If different, in what ways are you different from him? Would you say he is close to the child?

14: Who makes the main decisions about the child? (before and after imprisonment) Do you think it will be the same when your husband returns home?

15: Have you noticed any changes in your neighbour's attitudes since your husband's imprisonment? If yes, in what ways? What do you feel about this?

16: How did your family react to your husband/partner's imprisonment? What do you feel about that? And about his family, how did they react? What do you feel about that? And about your friends, how did they react? What do you feel about that?

17: Do you get any special help from the social services? What kind of help? Did you ask or was it offered to you? Did the help from social services meet your needs? Why or why not? Has there been a time when someone offered help and you did not want it? Why not?

18: Would you mind telling me your date of birth? And your husband/partner's? What kind of secondary school did you attend? And what about your husband/partner? At what age did you leave school? Did you have any further education part-time or full-time after you left school? And what about your husband/partner? If yes, what kind was it? Did you gain any qualifications and what were they? Have you ever worked outside the home? What kind of jobs? Was your

husband/partner working before his imprisonment? What kind of work?

B = CHILD INTERVIEW

1: How old are you? Who lives here with you? Are you the only child, the eldest child, the youngest child or the middle child? How old is your brother/sister?

2: Do you belong to any club or groups? What do you like about these clubs or groups? What do you normally do when you are not at school? Why?

3: Some people have lots of friends, others have only one best friend, some don't have any friends. What about you? Do they go to the same school as you? What do you do with your friends? What is your favourite thing about a friend?

4: Do your friends know about your dad's imprisonment? If yes, how did they know? Do you talk about your dad with your friends? Do they pick on you because of your dad's imprisonment? If yes, what do you feel about it? Has anybody caused you trouble? If yes, what kind of trouble? How do you feel about it? What do you do about it?

5: What sort of things make you especially happy? Why? What sort of things upset you? Why? Tell me something that makes you angry. Have you had a big disappointment over anything?

6: Who is your favourite grown-up who you can talk with? What do you like about him/her? If you are in trouble to whom would you go for advice? Why would you go to....? Would you go toall the time? If not, when would you go to and when to.....? Why would you go to ? Did you talk with your dad about your problems before he went away? When your dad is back will you go to him to talk about your problems? Will you accept the advice your dad gives you when he comes home? Does it make any difference now that he has been in prison? Why or why not?

7: Who do you think you take after, your mum or your dad? Why do you think that? In what ways do you think you look like.....? Who do you think should tell you what to do: your mum or your dad? Why? If answer both: When do you think your dad should tell you what to do and when your mum?

8: How do you get on with your dad? and with your mum? Can you give me an example when you think you get on well with your dad/mum? And an example when you think you don't get on well with your dad/mum? What is the best thing you like about your dad/mum? Why is that the best thing? What is the worse thing about your dad/mum? Why is that the worse thing? If you could change anything about your mum/dad, what would you change? Why?

9: Do you think your dad/mum understand how you feel about things? Can you give me an example when you think s/he understands you? And an example when you think s/he does not understand you? Do you think your dad/mum keeps his promises? Can you give an example when you think s/he doesn't keep his/her promises?

10: What sort of things did you enjoy doing with your dad? Why? Would you still like to do these things with your dad when he comes back? What sort of things do you enjoy doing with your mum? Why?

11: Do you see your dad now? How often? Do you like to see him? What things do you like to talk about when you are with your dad? How do you feel when you are with your dad? Why do you think you feel that way?

12: Why do you think he's in prison? How did you know about your dad's arrest? Did anybody explain anything to you about your dad's imprisonment? If yes, what kind of explanation did.....give you? What did you feel at that moment? Can you tell me what you feel about your dad's imprisonment?

13: Who do you blame for your dad's imprisonment? Why do you blame.....?

14: Has anything changed for you since he's been away? In what way? What about your feelings toward your dad, have they changed? Why or why not? Since your dad has been away what do you miss the most? Why? What was the most difficult thing to cope with after your dad's imprisonment? What did you do to cope with this difficulty? Do you look forward to having your dad back home?

15: How do you feel about me asking these questions? Why? What did you think about the questions I have asked you?

C = CHILD INTERVIEW AFTER THE MORAL DEVELOPMENT INTERVIEW

1: Should your father have committed the offence? Why or Why not?

2: Do you think your dad should be sentenced or let free? Why or Why not?

APPENDIX 2

MORAL JUDGMENT INTERVIEW

Dilemma I - Joe is a 14-year old boy who wanted to go to camp very much. His father promised him he could go if he saved up the money for it himself. So Joe worked hard at his paper route and saved up to £40.00 it cost to go to camp and a little more beside. But just before camp was going to start, his father changed his mind. Some of his friends decided to go on special fishing trip, and Joe's father was short of the money it would cost. So he told Joe to give him the money he had saved from the paper route. Joe didn't want to give up going to camp, so he thinks of refusing to give his father the money.

1 - Should Joe refuse to give his father the money?

1a- Why or why not?

2 - Is the fact that Joe earned the money himself the most important thing in the situation?

2a- Why or why not?

3 - The father promised Joe he could go to camp if he earned the money. Is the fact that the father promised the most important thing in the situation?

3a- Why or why not?

4 - Is it important to keep a promise?

4a- Why or why not?

5 - Is it important to keep a promise to someone wyou don't know well and probably won't see again?

5a- Why or why not?

6 - What do you think is the most important thing a son should be concerned about, in his relationship to his father?

6a- Why is that the most important thing?

7 - What do you think is the most important thing a father should be concerned about, in his relationship to his son?

7a- Why is that the most important thing?

Dilemma III - In Europe, a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging 10 times what the drug cost him to make. He paid £ 200 for the radium and charged £ 2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband Heinz went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about £1,000 which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later but the druggist said: "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it". So Heinz gets desperate and considers breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife.

1 - Should Heinz steal the drug?

1a- Why or why not?

2 - If Heinz doesn't love his wife, should he steal the drug for her?

2a- Why or why not?

3 - Suppose the person dying is not his wife but a stranger: Should Heinz steal the drug for the stranger?

3a- Why or why not?

4 - (If you favor stealing the drug for a stranger) Suppose it's a pet animal he loves. Should Heinz steal to save the pet animal?

4a- Why or why not?

5 - Is it important for people to do everything they can to save another's life?

5a- Why or why not?

6 - It is against the law for Heinz to steal. Does that make it morally wrong?

6a- Why or why not?

7 - Should people try to do everything they can to obey the law?

7a- Why or why not?

7b- How does this apply to what Heinz should do?

Dilemma III' - Heinz did break into the store. He stole the drug and gave it to his wife. In the newspaper the next day, there was an account of the robbery. Mr. Brown, a police officer who knew Heinz, read the account. He remembered seeing Heinz running away from the store and realized that it was Heinz who stole the drug. Mr. Brown wonders whether he should report that Heinz was the robber.

1 - Should officer Brown report Heinz for stealing?
1a- Why or why not?

2 - Officer Browns finds and arrests Heinz. Heinz is brought to court, and a jury is selected. The jury's job is to find whether a person is innocent or guilty of committing a crime. The jury finds Heinz guilty. It is up to the judge to determine the sentence. Should the judge give Heinz some sentence, or should he suspend the sentence and let Heinz go free?
2a- Why?

3 - Thinking in terms of society, should people who break the law be punished?
3a- Why or why not?

4 - Heinz was doing what his conscience told him when he stole the drug. Should a lawbreaker be punished if he is acting out of conscience?
4a- Why or why not?

Questions 5 to 10 are designed to elicit the subject's theory of ethics and should be considered optional.

APPENDIX 3

COOPERSMITH INVENTORY (SEL)

School Form

- 1 - Things usually don't bother me.
- 2 - I find it very hard to talk in front of the class.
- 3 - There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could.
- 4 - I can make up my mind without too much trouble.
- 5 - I'm a lot of fun to be with.
- 6 - I get upset easily at home.
- 7 - It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.
- 8 - I'm popular with kids my own age.
- 9 - My parents usually consider my feelings.
- 10- I give in very easily.
- 11- My parents expect too much of me.
- 12- It's pretty tough to be me.
- 13- Things are all mixed up in my life.
- 14- Kids usually follow my ideas.
- 15- I have a low opinion of myself.
- 16- There are many times when I'd like to leave home.
- 17- I often feel upset in school.
- 18- I'm not as nice looking as most people.
- 19- If I have something to say, I usually say it.
- 20- My parents understand me.
- 21- Most people are better liked than I am.
- 22- I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me.
- 23- I often get discouraged at school.
- 24- I often wish I were someone else.
- 25- I can't be depended on.
- 26- I never worry about anything.
- 27- I'm pretty sure of myself.
- 28- I'm easy to like.
- 29- My parents and I have a lot of fun together.
- 30- I spend a lot of time daydreaming.
- 31- I wish I were younger.
- 32- I always do the right thing.
- 33- I'm proud of my school work.
- 34- Someone always has to tell me what to do.
- 35- I'm often sorry for the things I do.
- 36- I'm never happy.
- 37- I'm doing the best work that I can.
- 38- I can usually take care of myself.
- 39- I'm pretty happy.
- 40- I would rather play with children younger than I am.
- 41- I like everyone I know.
- 42- I like to be called on in class.
- 43- I understand myself.
- 44- No one pays much attention to me at home.
- 45- I never get scolded.
- 46- I'm not doing as well in school as I'd like to.

- 47- I can make up my mind and stick to it.
- 48- I really don't like being a boy/girl.
- 49- I don't like to be with other people.
- 50- I'm never shy.
- 51- I often feel ashamed of myself.
- 52- Kids pick on me very often.
- 53- I always tell the truth.
- 54- My teachers make me feel I'm not good enough.
- 55- I don't care what happens to me.
- 56- I'm a failure.
- 57- I get upset easily when I'm scolded.
- 58- I always know what to say to people.

APPENDIX 4

Table 1a Demographic characteristics of the families who dropped out, at the second interview.

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
1-Erratic or chronic unemployment.	4	57%
2-In regular receipt of social security benefits.	4	57%
3-Heavy drinking or drug abuse.	2	30%
4-Frequent absence from home whilst spend time with peers.	3	43%
5-Lack of participation in family matters.	3	43%
6-Engaging in various forms of criminal activities.	4	57%
7-Living in poor council accomodation, generally in an inner city state	5	71%

APPENDIX 5

Table 2 Moral stages assigned to the children according the dilemmas I, III and III' of Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview.

	Dilemma I		Dilemma III		Dilemma III'	
	T1*	T2**	T1	T2	T1	T2
Walter	2(1)	2	1	2	1(2)	1
Roger	1/2	2/3	1	2(1)	1	1
Daniel	2	2	1/2	1/2	1	1
George	2	2/3	2/3	2	2	2/3
Larry	2	2	1	2	1/2	1(2)
Jamie	2	2	1	2	2(1)	1
Janet	2(3)	2	1	2	1/2	1
Lola	2/3	2/3	1(2)	1(2)	1	1
Natalya	2(3)	2/3	2/3	3	2/3	3
Sally	2(3)	2/3	3(2)	3(2)	3	3
Mara	2	2/3	3	3	3(2)	3
Louise	2	2(3)	1	1	1	1
Sousie	2/3	2/3	1	3	1	2/3
Tanya	2(3)	2(3)	1	3(2)	2	2
Lauren	3(2)	3	2	3	2	3
Peter	3	3	2(3)	3	3	3(4)
Paul	2/3	3	2/3	3	2(3)	3
Dennis	2	3(2)	2	3(2)	1	3(2)
Jaber	2	2(3)	2	2/3	2	3
Donald	2(3)	3	2	3	2/3	3
Ronald	2	3(2)	2	3(2)	2	1/2
Tom	3	3	3(2)	3	3	3/4
Laura	2/3	2/3	2/3	2	2	2

* Time 1

**Time 2

FAMILY A

Mother: Sybil, 27 years old

Father: Joe, 30 years old

Children: Sousie, Walter and Dave, 10, 8 and 3 years old respectively.

Demographic Data

Family A live in a three-bedroom flat on a council estate in South East London. The estate consists of a number of concrete blocks with no green area. It is in a condition of disrepair with rubbish littering the common area. Many of the flats are boarded up, and it is said that the estate is due to be demolished. The interior of the family flat is adequately furnished and is fairly clean and tidy. The children's bedrooms are full of toys.

Sybil is a straightforward person, rather abrupt and loud. She screams frequently at the children at what appears to be the most trivial matters, such as if they leave the doors open, or if they have the television on too loud.

Sybil left school at 15 years of age and soon after became pregnant with Sousie. When Sousie was born, Sybil went to live with her husband-to-be. They eventually married when Sybil was 18 years old. She has had various jobs such as bar work or cleaning. At the time of the first interview, she was not working and living on social security benefits. Before his arrest Joe worked as a bus driver.

At the time of the second interview, Sousie was living with her grandmother, as Sybil had suffered a nervous breakdown and spent two weeks in hospital. Until this occasion neither Sousie or Walter had ever been separated from their mother.

Husband's criminal data

Joe was arrested for murder. He stabbed a man he met "by chance" at a bus stop, and with whom he had an argument earlier in a pub. On arriving home, he told Sybil what had happened and she advised him to go to the police station and give himself up. Joe has no previous criminal history.

By the time of the second interview Joe had been sentenced to nine years imprisonment for murder. This was subsequently reduced to seven years on appeal.

Mother's perception of the event

Sybil never thought that the police would arrest her husband. She felt "shocked and absolutely mad" at everybody: her husband, his friends and the police. She cannot believe that he is in prison or could be involved in

this kind of trouble. She says that it has not "sunk in" and that she cannot think about the future: "I take a day at time. I can't think, I can't do much, can I? It's difficult!"

When Joe was sentenced to nine years imprisonment, Sybil felt "totally shocked", as she thought he did not deserve such a sentence. She feels very bitter towards the barrister for convincing her husband to confess, saying that his offence should have been categorised as manslaughter and then he would have received a shorter sentence. She is also angry with the judge for sentencing her husband to nine years imprisonment, despite saying that he is an honest man. Sybil repeatedly refers to the police and prison officers as "pigs". She gives the example of the occasion she was waiting to see her husband at a prison with the children, only to be told two hours after that they had moved him to another prison far away.

Feelings towards the husband

Sybil blames her husband's friends for his imprisonment. She says that after the fight, her husband left the pub and the man was "all right", but when Joe found out that the person had died, he went to the police on his own account. His friends took the side of the victim as they were only interested in avoiding being implicated in the crime.

Sybil is "confused" about her feelings toward her husband. On the one hand, she is very "annoyed with his "selfish" and uncaring attitude (he leaves her at home whilst he goes out to the pub with his friends), but on the other hand, she emphasises that he is very good to the children, and always makes sure she has her housekeeping money. Sybil still considers Joe to be part of the family, and has not thought of facing the future without him, she simply lives "day by day".

At the time of the second interview, Sybil's feelings toward her husband have changed. She now blames him for the crime and emphasises that he should not have gone out all the time with his "silly friends", but rather he should have stayed at home with her. She repeats over and over again that Sousie will be nineteen and Walter seventeen years old when her husband is released from prison and finds this difficult to accept. Although she recognises that Joe is a very good father who loves the children and gives them plenty of attention, she is not prepared to stay "locked up in the house while he's in prison".

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Sybil's main difficulty is coping with the family's finances on the £50 a week she receives in social

benefits. She says this is insufficient to pay for essential food, gas, and electricity, and to give the children their pocket money. She complains angrily that they only gave her £9 to buy school uniforms for the children.

Sybil feels very tired and lacks the energy to demand obedience from the children (on each of the five visits that were made to Sybil's flat she did not know where the children were, or at what time they would return home). Joe used to make the main decisions about the children and discipline them.

According to Sybil, Walter was very upset when she told him about his father's imprisonment. He cried for a long time and was frightened that she would leave him as well. He went very quiet at the time and now he frequently disobeys her and answers her back. He also accuses his mother of keeping his pocket money and demands sweets. His teacher informed Sybil that he often cries at school but does not say why.

Sousie does not do "what she's told" either and also answers her mother back. She accuses her mother of not giving her what she used to receive when her father was at home, such as sweet money every day. Initially, Sousie became quiet and wrote "I love daddy" on the walls of the estate.

Although Sybil's main difficulties are keeping out of debt and controlling the children, she also dislikes living alone and misses sexual contact. Sybil also complains about the location of the prison and the cost of the journey: she leaves the flat at eight o'clock in the morning and returns at nine in the evening. She feels very angry and says: "this can't be right, all day for a visit of half an hour with three children". She believes that the prison is a bad environment for the children; it is too crowded, and they do not provide any facilities to occupy them: "you can't expect young children to sit quiet for the whole visit with nothing to do". As a consequence of the above difficulties, Sybil does not take the children on every visit.

At the time of the second interview, Sybil had decided to divorce Joe as she does not believe he can change his "selfish" behaviour (heavy drinking and going out without her). She no longer considers him to be part of the family, and now sees him as "just a friend". Sybil has told the children about her decision to divorce their father and they "don't seem to care". She believes this is due to the fact that they used to argue frequently and "the children know it is better this way". Sybil has told the children that they can visit their father when he leaves the prison, but that he is not going to come back to live with them. She is now seeing another man whom she has introduced to

Sousie and Walter.

Unlike Sousie, who does not give her any trouble, Walter's behaviour and school work have deteriorated since the last interview. Sybil complains that she is unable to control him and says that he has become "audacious and wants all his own ways"; he is selfish, has no respect for people and that he looks "right through you". She adds that Walter talks to her as if she were "dirt", is "quick-tempered" like his father and is always in trouble fighting with other children. On one occasion, she told him "as a laugh" that he could not come in to watch the video and he threw the skate board at her. As a result, she "battered him". She says that after "battering him" she has to leave him alone to calm down or he would do himself "a self-injury, just go into a fit". Sybil says that Walter obeyed his father when he was at home. She goes on to say that she does not know what to do as Walter never tells her anything because he does not trust adults in general. When his father was arrested he would confide in his grandmother, but now Sybil says that he feels that his grandmother does not have time for him as Sousie is staying with her and she receives most of her attention. She suggests that Walter is jealous of his sister.

Explanation of the event to the child

Initially, Sybil did not give the children a full explanation of their father's offence as she thought he would be released soon. It was only after Sousie became aware of her father's offence by reading a report in a newspaper, that she was "forced" to give the children an explanation of the event. She told the children that their father was in a fight, and when he left the pub the victim was alive. His friends accused him to free themselves of any suspicion from the police.

Sybil found it most difficult to tell the children that their father had received a nine-year prison sentence as they believed he was innocent and the judge would release him. When Sybil informed Walter of the result of the trial, he "cried badly" as he had been so certain that his father would be coming home. He demanded to see his father immediately. Sybil felt very sad as she realised that Walter did not grasp the length of time his father would be away as he was still talking in terms of going to the park and the pub with him in the near future. Sousie was also shocked at the length of the sentence and kept repeating that she would be 19 years old when her father would return home.

Support System

Sybil does not interact with her neighbours, or receive any help from her husband's family, who she refers to as

"pigs"; they are not interested in her or the children. She has not sought any help from the social welfare services as she is afraid that they may place her children in care, or they would not leave her alone. The Prisoner's Wives organisation have visited Sybil and arranged a holiday for her and the children, but she does not care whether they talk to her again or not. In her view they are "too nosy". Sybil's main source of help is her mother, who takes care of the children when she is working and gives her some financial support. Her friends also have been very supportive, particularly one friend who visits her every day and whose husband is also in prison.

At the time of the second interview, Sybil says she wants to move desperately as she believes the neighbours disapprove of her behaviour: she feels "a bit ashamed to go out with another man" as everybody knew her husband.

As a result of having a nervous breakdown, Sybil has been receiving regular visits from a social worker. She has been offered therapy but declined, believing that "everybody at the hospital is mad" and she is not.

The friend who used to visit Sybil regularly does not now do so as she has a new boyfriend and is expecting a baby. However, Sybil's mother continues to be very supportive; she has been taking care of Susie since she had a nervous breakdown, and she still helps her financially.

Child's perception of parents

Walter believes that he gets on "all right" with his father; he says that he is very kind, and he enjoys playing games and going to the pub with him. This makes Walter feel very important as he can talk with his father's friends. Walter cannot remember any time when his father did not keep his promise, and believes firmly that his father is going to keep his promise of taking him to the pub when he returns home. Walter could not think of anything he did not like about his father. If his father were at home, Walter would tell him some of his problems, such as arguments with friends. At the moment Walter chooses his grandmother as his favourite person in whom to confide. She spends time with him and "is very nice" as she gives him sweets and money. His mother is "usually not at home" and Walter feels she has no time for him.

Walter believes that he only gets on well with his mother "sometimes", such as when she sews badges on his clothes. He does not think she understands him. According to Walter, the best aspect about his mother is when she buys him sweets, and the worst is when she hits him or "yells" at him.

At the time of the second interview, Walter reiterated the

positive aspects of his father made in the first interview. He still believes his father understands him because when he visits him in prison, "he sits down, listens to me and does not shout". However, with regard to his mother, Walter only emphasises her negative aspects. He says that he does not get on well with her, and that she now hits him more frequently than before, sometimes with a table tennis bat, and he does not understand why. His mother often breaks her promise to take him out. He recalls sadly the times when she used to take him to the park, but now she is "too busy to take me anywhere". This is in contrast to his father, who used to take him everywhere.

Currently, Walter does not trust anyone to talk about his problems. He now only goes to his grandmother "sometimes" as she is now "grumpy and moans" at him, especially when he gets into trouble at school. Walter would only confide in his mother if he had to, as his father is in prison. For Walter, his father's imprisonment has not changed the way he feels towards him. He still likes him and will tell him his problems when he leaves the prison, although he believes this is not going to happen soon, as he is going to be away for a long time. He explains that he loves his father because "he's my dad" and misses him very much.

Child's attribution of responsibility

When Walter's mother told him that his father had been arrested and would not come back home immediately he felt "really bad" and could not believe it. However, he still thought that he would return soon. But this was not to be the case, and it came as a great shock to him. Walter blames his father's friends, especially a man who works with him, for his imprisonment. He explains that when his father left the pub, the person was still alive, and when he went back the person was dead. His friends told his father that he had killed this person. Walter does not accept that his father could have committed this offence, and thinks that he is innocent and should be free "because I want him home, I like my dad a lot". He repeatedly denies that his father killed the man as he is very kind to him and could not kill anybody.

At the time of the second interview, Walter thinks that his father is in prison because "someone thought he killed a man" but he does not apportion blame to anyone. Walter does not elaborate further as he does not think about the event anymore. His mother told him about his father's imprisonment, but he cannot remember what explanation she gave him or what he felt at that time. Walter says that his father "should not have done it, because now he's in prison, but he should be free, because he has been in there for a long time".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Walter feels very sad because after his father's imprisonment they had to sell the cat as his mother could not pay for his food. Walter's pocket money has also been reduced from 50p to 20p per week, and recently he has not received anything, not even sweet money. He feels very angry and believes his mother spends his pocket money instead of giving it to him. He is also frightened that his mother could be taken away like his father was.

Walter cannot go to the pub anymore and talk to his father's friends, and he misses talking and playing the "smarties" game with his father. He explains sadly that every day when his father came home from work, he would hide smarties around the house and Walter and his sister would have to find them.

At the time of the second interview, Walter complains bitterly that he does not go anywhere anymore and is confined to playing with his friends around the estate. He still receives only 20p pocket money per week, and is very upset about not having enough money to buy sweets. Walter knows that his mother is getting divorced, and when asked what he thought about this, he answered angrily "I don't care".

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Walter visits his father every week. He looks forward to the visits, but he complains that he does not have the opportunity to "speak to him much" as his mother has many things to say to his father, and there is no time left for him. Walter is confused about his feelings during visits; he loves to be with his father but sometimes he cries as his father upsets him. This is when Walter tries to talk to him, and he tells Walter to "shut up".

At the time of the second interview, Walter does not know how often he visits his father, but he says it is not very frequently. This is because his mother does not visit his father anymore, therefore he has to wait for his grandmother to take him. Walter likes to see his father and wants to know how he is getting on in the prison. When he is with his father he feels "just normal".

Interaction with friends

Almost all of Walter's friends know about his father's imprisonment as his sister told her friends, who in turn told his friends. He feels very "bad" thinking what his friends may think about his father. However, no one bullies him and if one of his friends should ask where his father is, Walter responds: "mind your own business" and "that's

it".

Moral Development Interview

Time 1: Walter thinks that people in general should obey the law because they "might get caught", and they should be punished so they do not offend anymore.

Moral stage: 1(2)

Time 2: Walter says that people in general should obey the law otherwise "you get into trouble", and they should be punished "because they break the law".

Moral stage: 1

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Walter in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	17	18
Social self-peer	6	5
Home-parents	8	2
School-academic	4	1
General self score	70	52

Child's impression of the interview

Walter felt "all right" about the interview and did not mind answering all the questions. He only thinks they are too long.

Child's perception of the parents

Sousie believes she gets on "well" with her father. She likes everything about him, "he's kind and tells the truth". He also keeps his promises unless something serious happens like an accident.

Sousie feels she can trust her father and would go to him for advice if she were in trouble. Now that he is in prison, she talks to her mother, but she says it is not the same because her mother does not have time to listen to her as she has to look after the children. When he is released she will go to her father for advice, but she does not think that she will have any problems by then. The fact that her father went to prison has not changed her feelings towards him, as he "is in the right and did nothing wrong". Sousie also gets on well with her mother. However, she does not like her mother "shouting all the time" and wishes she would change her tone of voice. Sousie is not sure if her

mother keeps her promises or not.

At the time of the second interview, Sousie is not sure if she gets on with her father as he "is not around to compare". She cannot remember much about her relationship with him. What she likes most about her father is his "joyfulness"; he tells jokes and laughs and makes her happy. Sousie's feelings towards her father have not changed. But she adds that "he is on his own now", and as long as he is "all right" she is not worried about him.

If in trouble, Sousie would go to her grandmother (with whom she now lives) for advice, but she also likes to talk to her aunt. Her grandmother understands her because she "sits down, takes the time, listens to me and don't walk away". Sousie trusts her grandmother but would not trust her father as she believes that he cannot keep a secret and would tell everybody about her problems. For Sousie, it does not matter if he is in prison: "he's still my dad and the same person".

Sousie does not get on well with her mother when she "gets on my nerves", such as when she "keeps on, and on, and on" about taking the medicine or putting on a jumper. Sousie also does not like it when her mother shouts at her and makes her "shake". If she could, she would stop her shouting. However, Sousie knows that she cares and loves her, therefore she feels secure.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Sousie learned about her father's imprisonment by reading about it in a newspaper. She could not believe that her father has committed such an offence and thought it was all a mistake. However, her mother confirmed that he had been arrested and told her that he had a fight with a person, but when he left the pub this person was alive and that his friends accused her father for fear of being arrested themselves. Sousie believes that her father is innocent, and feels angry because "they" (representatives of the legal system) should not have put him in prison, but rather believed his account of the event and not his friends. She feels very upset about the whole matter. Sousie believes that her father "hasn't done anything wrong because my dad wouldn't do a thing like that. She says that he should be free, because "they're stupid the people who put him in prison".

At the time of the second interview, Sousie says that she cannot remember what her mother told her about her father's arrest and does not blame anyone for his imprisonment, "it just happened, the other bloke probably started the fight". She felt very sad and upset and could not believe that this really had happened. Sousie adds that her father "shouldn't

fight, but if he did it he should be sentenced, if he never done it, he should be free, depends if they've proof. ("What do you think?") It's hard, I really don't know."

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Sousie rarely goes out now that her father is in prison. She misses going to the park and fun fair with him. She mentions also that her pocket money has decreased from 50p to 20p per week, and that she is allowed to play with a friend in the estate nearby. However, the most difficult change for Sousie to cope with is not having her father at home to cuddle her. She says that she "can't wait to have my dad back", and feels very sad because her father is taking longer than she expected to return home.

At the time of the second interview, Sousie says that her mother has changed: "she is sad and does not take notice what's going on", and although she does not understand these changes, she worries about her. When asked about her mother divorcing her father, Sousie replied "it's up to her", and that she does not mind and understands her mother's position. Sousie is now living with her grandmother and is getting used to her father's absence. The only time she feels upset is when she sees other children with their fathers, or when she cannot go out as much as she used to. She loved to go out with her father and feels very sad because this is never going to happen again as she will be 18 years old when he comes out of prison.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Sousie visits her father fortnightly. She loves to see him and feels happy to talk to him. She tells him about how much she misses him and what she does at school. However, Sousie feels very angry to leave her father in the prison, as she believes he should not be there.

At the time of the second interview, Sousie does not know how often she visits her father. The last time she saw him was five months ago. She would like to see him more frequently, but at the same time she does not like to go to the prison and the trip is very boring. Now that her mother has separated from her father, she has to wait for her grandmother to take her. Sousie says that her father looked happy the last time she saw him, but she does not know if he is really happy. When she is with him she feels "just normal".

Interaction with friends

Although Sousie told her friends about her father's imprisonment, "before they discovered for themselves", she

was anxious about how her friends would respond to this information. However they do not bully her "otherwise, they wouldn't be my friends". They were just "amazed" to know about her father's arrest. Since telling her friends about her father, Sousie avoids talking about him with them because she feels "bad", and believes "nobody understands that he didn't do it and shouldn't be in prison in the first place".

Moral Development Interview

Time 1: Sousie thinks that people in general should obey the law as "you don't want to go to prison", and they should be punished "because they've broken the law".

Moral stage: 1

Time 2: Sousie thinks that people in general should obey the law "because they could involve other people, they could go mad in the road and kill people"; and "if they've done really bad things, and if they've got proof they've done wrong, yes, they should be punished".

Moral stage: 2/3

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The score attained by Sousie in the four sub-scales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	20	14
Social self-peer	7	6
Home-parents	8	6
School-academic	2	1
General self score	74	54

Child's impression of the interview

At first Sousie thought that the interview would be boring, but now she thinks the questions are quite difficult. She feels "okay and happy" to help as she wants to contribute to the research.

FAMILY B

Mother: Joanna, 34 years old

Father: Trevor, 43 years old

Children: Lola and Holly, 8 and 5 years old, respectively.

Demographic Data

Family B live in a large, two-bedroom flat, which is part of a house they own in West London. The property is located in a suburban residential area and has common land to the front. The rooms of the flat are spacious and well decorated. The children share a large bedroom, which contains two desks, bookshelves and a vast range of toys.

Joanna is an active and determined person. She attended grammar school followed by a business course which she did not finish. She left school at 18 years old to work as a nanny in France to learn the language. She has also worked in an office doing general clerical work. Joanna has been married to Trevor for 13 years. During the first few years of their marriage they travelled abroad extensively, with Trevor working in various jobs and businesses. Joanna was never allowed to participate in her husband's business activities, as he feared being exploited should they ever divorce, as had apparently happened with his first wife. However, since her husband's arrest, Joanna has taken over his business of converting houses into flats.

Husband's criminal data

Trevor is currently serving a seven-years prison sentence for illegally importing drugs of which he has already served four years. He has one previous conviction for a similar offence, for which he served a two-year sentence.

Mother's perception of the event

Joanna did not expect her husband to be arrested. However she had a feeling of "impending doom" and although she felt shocked and still remembers vividly the knocks on the door and the police search of the home, she thought that it "was almost a good thing, that would stop him to be sucked into a life of destruction". Joanna says that Trevor was mixing with the "wrong people" when he began to sniff cocaine. However, she feels a certain responsibility, as she was unable to accompany him because of the children, and thinks that he felt neglected.

Trevor was arrested at home but the police were "very civilised" and the children did not realise what was going on. The only complaint Joanna has about the police is that they insisted she attend at the police station for questioning, which, had it not been for her neighbour looking after the children, would have resulted in them

spending a night in care, which Joanna thinks is "preposterous".

When Trevor was sentenced she "really felt shocked", as she never expected such a long sentence. She believes that his sentence was unjust compared with those given for other offences and thinks that the court wanted to make an example of his case. She argues that the solicitor did not pay much attention to her husband's trial, and that Trevor was badly advised by him. He should have told Trevor to plead guilty because "technically he was", but as he did not, the judge penalised him. She also felt "terribly sad" not only for herself, but for him, as he is a man who likes to be on the move all the time.

Feelings towards her husband

Joanna blames Trevor for his imprisonment. She feels very angry because he should not have mixed with those friends, as he knew they were dealing in drugs and the risks he was taking. Although, she adds, he had "bad luck", as at that time there was a sudden "crackdown on drug dealers". She also feels responsible and guilty, as most of the money made from drugs was spent on her and the children.

Joanna still loves her husband and cares for him, but she feels apprehensive that prison may have changed him and made him bitter. She is aware that they have had different experiences and have not had sufficient time together to talk about them. However, she still considers him to be part of the family, but emphasises that she is determined not to relinquish her newly found independence.

At the time of the second interview, Trevor had spent three weekends with the family on home leave. Concerning his release Joanna has mixed feelings: on the one hand, she is excited by the thought of having her husband home again, but on the other, she is very frightened that the changes they have undergone may make them incompatible. However, lately she feels "warmer" towards her husband. Now that he is due to be released in a matter of months, she allows herself to relax and be "a bit excited". Until this time, Joanna has "blocked him off" completely and "blanked" her feelings towards him in order to cope with life on her own. If she thought about how much she missed him, she would have driven herself insane.

Joanna is hopeful that he will not return to the drug scene and will be the wonderful person he was before they had the children. She believes that as soon as he is home and realises how many good things he has, such as a successful business, nice children and a wife who waited for him all this time, he is going to feel very lucky. However, she also expects that he is going to be depressed for some time when he realises that life has still the same problems to

overcome. The main problem with her husband is that he is bitter and blames everyone for his situation but himself. Joanna is prepared to be understanding for sometime, but in the long term she is adamant that Trevor must be a family man rather than go out without her. They have been discussing this matter and he says that he wants to be with her and the children "forever" but he also agrees that if he feels unhappy, restricted and restless in a "domestic stationary situation", then they will talk openly about the subject. Joanna is also determined to "discuss" her methods of controlling the children with Trevor and hopes that he will try to adjust to them. Although Joanna likes his "paternalistic" side as the children see him as a strong father figure, she does not want him to spoil them to "death".

Changes after husband's imprisonment

When Trevor went to prison, Joanna took over the responsibility of the business. Now she works, takes care of the house and the children on her own. In addition she visits Trevor every week wherever he might be (he changes prison frequently). The first year, while on remand, he was moved every three weeks due to shortage of space. This was an enormous source of stress for Joanna, as she was seeing him nearly every day; she felt exhausted and could not make any plan for the future, "I just carried on". Joanna has not missed a visit since her husband's arrest as she feels that it is essential to keep in touch as frequently as possible to maintain a "degree of normality" and also for the sake of the children. Joanna even arranged additional visits as Lola was extremely distressed with the separation and "would cry non-stop".

For Joanna the most difficult thing to cope with was the children's disappointment and sadness. To help them she tried to spend more time with them and made sure that they would be busy during the weekends, either by going out together or inviting their friends to the home. Joanna is aware that she is "lucky" as she does not have the financial problems of most women in this situation. She has a car, so she can drive to the prison which makes her life easier, and she can afford holidays every year with the children.

At the second interview, Joanna said that the children were happier, excited and "bubbling" with the prospect of their father's release, and she now realises how unhappy they were before they knew their father was returning home. Lola's school work has improved dramatically and Joanna hopes that her "exceptional imagination" can be channelled into a concrete goal. She adds that when Trevor returns home, she will have more time to help Lola with her school work. Joanna thinks that not everything is negative in her situation. She believes that Lola has gained in maturity by

realising that women are quite capable of working at what they want, and she may be able to use her mother's experience to her advantage in the future. Joanna mastered the business and the children equally well, which she would never have discovered if her husband had not been away.

According to Joanna, during the last year Lola has accepted the situation and it has become a norm to her. However, Lola still cries frequently for no apparent reason and often has nightmares, although Joanna is unsure if this is due to her father's imprisonment or a consequence of her own imagination. Joanna says that Lola "latches" onto anything morbid like starving children or news about "slashed, strangled children in the Daily Mail". She adds that Lola regrets having told her friends about her father's imprisonment as they may think he is a "wicked" person as they do not know him well.

Explanation of the event to the child

Initially Joanna told Lola that her father was working away. Joanna maintained this explanation even though she was aware that Lola overheard a telephone conversation in which she mentioned her husband's imprisonment. In response to Lola's crying and questions, Joanna told her that she had misunderstood the word prison for the word present. Lola seemed to accept this explanation as it was at a time close to her birthday.

Joanna eventually told Lola the truth when Trevor was sentenced, and she read the word prison on the gate, although she did not tell her the truth about the crime. She explained that it was about money problems and her father had to pay a debt to the government. Joanna was reticent to tell Lola the whole truth as, at that time, there was an anti-drug campaign at Lola's school. According to Joanna, Lola was "numbed" by the knowledge that her father was in prison. The full extent of Lola's reaction to her father's imprisonment became apparent when she suddenly realised, some months after his sentence, that her father was taking a long time to come home. Lola became very upset, tearful and withdrawn and pined for her father. Initially Lola felt "abnormal", but as she gradually came into contact with other children in the same situation, she felt "she was just one of many". However, she is "restless" and if Joanna does not keep her busy, she becomes depressed. Another "characteristic" that Lola developed after her father's imprisonment, and one that "shocks" Joanna, is that Lola knows the visiting days of most prisons in England. She adds that Lola told her friends at school about her father's imprisonment and became a "star". Everybody wanted to know what was happening to her father.

Support System

Joanna's relationship with her neighbours has not changed since her husband's imprisonment. They continue to be supportive and helpful.

Initially Joanna's parents were very angry with Trevor for the problems he was giving his family, but then they decided to give Joanna their full support. Trevor's father visits Joanna regularly and has promised to disown his son if he gets into more trouble. He adores his grandchildren and would do anything for them.

Joanna's friends have been "absolutely marvellous" and she has discovered how really good they are. They often invite Joanna and the children to spend weekends with them and listen to her problems.

Joanna has never asked any organisation for help. She does not believe they can help her in what she needs. At the moment she would like to have some sort of counselling to help prepare her for the reunion with her husband, but she could not wait for the time needed to obtain help from the social services. The only person Joanna has been in contact with is the probation officer. The first officer that was allocated to her husband was totally inadequate for him. He just sat very quietly looking at Trevor and said a few ambiguous things that implied she might not be waiting for him when he leaves the prison. Trevor became very insecure. The second probation officer was very encouraging and much more sympathetic.

Child's perception of parents

Lola gets on well with her mother. She makes sure that everything is all right at school and at home and understands her when she is in a good mood. Sometimes her mother does not understand her, an example being when she does not believe Lola's account of the problems she has with friends. Lola would change her mother's habit of shouting at her, as this makes her angry and upset, as she is a "sensitive girl". Lola would also like her mother to stop "working all the time" and give her more attention.

Lola thinks that she has the same "cheeky" laugh as her father. She likes it when he tells jokes and makes her feel happy, as long as they are not aimed at her. She dislikes it when he becomes angry and shouts at her, and gets upset and "red all over the face". When he reprimands her, he is really "awful". However, she knows that he understands her, as after a while, he realises that there is no need to shout at her.

In general, Lola says that her father keeps his promises,

although when the promise is said very quickly she knows that he does not intend to keep it. Lola says she feels that she can trust her father to talk about her problems and would seek his advice, but she is not totally sure about this matter as he has been away for a long time and she was only four years old when he left home. She talks to her aunt about her problems as she is very understanding and knows how to calm her, especially when she cries about her father being in prison. She adds that she loves her father and that his imprisonment has not made any difference to the way she feels about him.

At the time of the second interview, Lola does not feel that she can talk to her father about her problems, as he would punish her "the second" she tells him about them. She is also frightened to tell him the problems she has with her friends, as he becomes very angry and would shout to her friends, or tell her to "chop off a branch of a tree" and hit them with it. She now only tells him "small problems". Lola still prefers to talk to her aunt about her problems. She is calm and can understand her, unlike her mother who "gets aggravated" when Lola wants to talk to her.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Lola does not know clearly why her father is in prison; she knows only vaguely that he was "making cigarettes with a man". She firmly believes that this man is responsible for her father's arrest, as he was the one that was "playing the game" when her father was arrested.

At the time of the second interview, Lola blames "the man who got my dad in prison because he started making alcohol" and when the police came to arrest this man, he accused her father of being the owner of the "stuff", and he (father) did not have time to tell the truth to the police. She also believes he is in prison because he was trying to make money by not paying taxes.

Lola recalls the day her father was taken away and she thought he was going to be "killed" as he was "stucked in a police car". She felt "funny" and started to cry, although she soon found out that he just went to prison, which relieved her of the idea of him being killed, but she still did not like it and felt "really sad". However, Lola was reassured only when she visited her father and saw for herself that he was well. Her mother acted as if nothing had happened, but Lola would have preferred it if she had told her what was happening from the beginning. Lola says that her mother only told her that he was in prison because he was trying to make money for them.

Lola thinks that her father "didn't really do it, the man R made him do it" and that he "should be punished but not for

a long time, only a month. He didn't do it, the man made him do it". At the time of the second interview, Lola thinks that her father "shouldn't have done it because it's not fair on other people but he didn't have enough money so that's why he did it. However, she thinks he should be free, "just a bit of punishment but he shouldn't have that much. My dad just had an unlucky sentence. The judge must've been thick".

Child's perception of changes after imprisonment

Lola has perceived a great change in her father since his imprisonment. He used to be happy and they would go to "fun places" such as children's shops to buy masks and toys. Now "he's more sad and angry". Although Lola is now more used to not having her father at home, she does not feel safe now there is not a man in the house in case "something happen. She feels upset at night thinking of her father, especially if she has "horrible nightmares". Lola says that she does not have support as do her friends at school, who have their fathers at home, as when they need him they call for him. She also says that the family has moved three times and she feels sorry that her father did not see the houses in which they were living. She adds that "it's quite lonely without my dad here, there is only three people in this house".

At the time of the second interview, Lola says that it is very difficult to cope with her father's absence for such a long time, and adds that she really does not know him well, as visiting him is not the same as being with him all the time. She goes on to say that, although she feels very happy when her father receives home leave and feels very excited at the prospect of him coming home permanently, she believes that her father's sensitivity may be a problem when he returns home. If she does something wrong he will be angry with her and vice-versa, and even though she tells him to "cool down", he does not listen to her. Lola is very concerned about her father's impulsiveness and adds that "I rather he go back to prison for just a few more days but not for that long, then it would be more exciting when he did come home, like he does now".

Interaction between father and child

Lola sees her father fortnightly and feels happy to see him. During the visits he never "gets cross" with her. However, she does not like to go to the prison because it is a "dirty place", of a "horrible nature". At the time of the second interview, Lola says that when she is with her father she has mixed feelings; on the one hand, she feels happy because they talk about what they are going to do when he returns home; on the other hand, she feels apprehensive as his return may bring new problems, such as the necessity to deal with his impulsiveness.

Interaction with friends

Lola has many friends at school and one best friend. She likes her best friend to be kind, which means that when she feels lonely, her best friend should always be ready to play with her. Lola "hates" to lose friends. Although most of her friends know about her father's imprisonment, she does not like to talk about him with them, as some of them have been bullying her about her father being in prison. For example, one friend used to "insult" her by saying that her father would never leave prison. On these occasions, "I make them cross and I make them understand what it is like. I sort of shout to them: well, that's not very nice. I don't think you would like it if that happened to you". She feels very upset when a particular friend told her "horrible things", such as "I wish you were with your mother when she had the car crash". However Lola answers back saying "horrible things to her". In return, she makes this friend cry.

At the time of the second interview, Lola says that she now regrets telling her friends about her father's imprisonment, as she has to face "insults" from them. She told everyone because she wanted them to know in order that they would be kind to her. The teachers have been very kind to her.

Moral Development Interview

Time 1: Lola thinks that people in general should obey the law because "you have to do what the queen say, and they should be punished "because they've done bad things".
Moral stage: 1

Time 2: Lola thinks that people in general should obey the law "because you should obey the government to stop the stealing", and they should be punished because it is against the law.
Moral stage: 1

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Lola in the four sub-scales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	14	11
Social self-peer	8	6
Home-parents	5	5
School-academic	4	2
General self score	62	48

Child's perception of the interview

Lola felt both "excited" and "funny" at the prospect of being interviewed. She says that she feels "delighted" to have answered the questions. She just thinks the interview is too long with some questions interesting and some boring.

FAMILY C

Mother: Vera, 32 years

Father: Bill, 35 years

Children: Peter, Laura, William and Michael. Ages 12, 6, 5 and 3 years respectively.

Demographic Data

Family C live in a three-bedroom terraced house in North London. The house is located near a park and has a fairly spacious living room simply furnished with a profusion of artificial flowers arrangements. The house is kept clean and tidy.

Vera attended a comprehensive school until she was 16 years old, after which she trained as a telephonist. However, Vera has never worked as she met her husband at the age of 17 and became pregnant immediately. They eventually married after living together for four years. Vera is very friendly and seems a placid person. Her husband was not working before his imprisonment. It appears that his main source of income derives from his criminal activities. At the time of the second interview Vera was receiving social security benefits.

Husband's criminal data

Bill has had many previous convictions for crimes related to fraud and has served a number of short custodial sentences ranging from six to four years. It was during the four-year sentence that Peter was born, and he was three years old when Bill was released. Bill is currently in custody on remand for fraud, which appears to be more serious than his previous convictions. Vera has also been charged for her involvement in the offence as cheques were deposited in her bank account. At the time of the second interview, Vera's husband had been sentenced to four years' imprisonment, but Vera was found not guilty. However, Bill has been charged with a further offence and the trial proceedings are currently taking place.

Mother's perception of the event

Vera's husband's arrest was not unexpected as the police had a warrant for his arrest for two years. She just wondered when and how they would find him. She even wanted it to happen as she and her son Peter were living in a constant state of anxiety. However, when he was eventually arrested she felt as if her whole world had collapsed. It was a "weird" feeling of loneliness and emptiness. But, when she thought about the children she made an effort to come to terms with reality: "I livened myself up and got on with my life".

At the time of the second interview, Vera feels relieved as she has been acquitted for her involvement with her husband's offence. She says that Peter was also very relieved as he was very frightened at the prospect of losing his mother as well. However, she is very upset with her husband's sentence and thinks he does not deserve it. She believes that the police had "the hump" and "topped him up", because Bill gave them aggravation for two years. She is also very worried about her husband's second trial and hopes he is found not guilty which would entitle him to be moved from category AA (high security) and allow visits with less restrictions.

Feelings towards the husband's

Vera does not blame anyone for her husband's imprisonment, only the circumstances. She says that, first, blaming him is not going to solve anything, and second, the situation in which he became involved led him to commit the offence. Vera adds that many people commit the same offence but are not found out. Bill is a person who is always going to make his living by "ducking and diving", this is the only way he knows of earning money and he is not going to change. When she feels that his criminal activities are becoming too dangerous, she tries to control him, but on the whole she "lets him take care of things". She does not want to cause arguments, and believes that he commits these crimes as "he wants everything to be all right" with her and the children.

Vera still feels the same towards her husband; she accepts his way of life and all the risks that it entails. Although Bill can be "a bit nasty sometimes", such as when he is at home and leaves her alone for long periods of time, she feels she "can't turn my back on him and it's just a matter of standing by him and help him as I can". As a husband he is more loving now that he is in prison than before. Vera feels content when he gives her a kiss "over the table" during visits. When he was at home he was too busy to give her attention, but now she feels more relaxed as she knows where he is and she is enjoying his affection. Vera goes on to say that he is very concerned about the children, especially Peter to whom he writes frequently, letting him know that he is always thinking of him. He insists on having as much contact with the children as possible, and should Peter want to have a "private chat" with his father, Vera leaves the visiting room on the pretext of going to the lavatory.

At the time of the second interview, Vera still feels the same way towards her husband. In fact the longer he is away, the more she wants him back. She has decided to wait for him as long as it is necessary. She tries to keep herself occupied as much as possible with the children and not think about the matter. When he returns home she will

be "flipping round like a school girl".

Changes after husband's imprisonment

After Bill's imprisonment, Vera has taken on the sole responsibility of managing the children and the family's financial situation. She finds it difficult to perform both roles, and waits to visit her husband before making decisions about the family, such as holidays or how to deal with problems concerning Peter's school. She cannot adopt the "hard handed approach" when the occasion requires it, as she is too easy-going. She also feels that she cannot adequately answer Peter's questions related to experiences she has never had, such as how his father coped with the move to a secondary school. Vera also finds it very difficult to maintain the "lie" concerning her husband's whereabouts to the younger children as they continually question her as to why he does not come home from work.

Although her financial life has changed drastically, she claims that she is managing reasonably well. However, she adds that she does not go anywhere as she cannot afford any leisure, and is too tired to even contemplate going out. As she says: "at 10 (p.m.) I'm ready to go to bed. It's hard long day visiting him everyday, cooking him a meal, and taking care of four children". She adds that she is very "nervous" and frightened to live alone especially in the evenings. She has fitted locks on all the doors, but this does not compensate for having a man living in the house, even though her son Peter locks all the doors in the evening and makes sure that everything is secure before going to bed. Vera says that Peter has matured a great deal and she believes he feels like the "man of the house". They have long conversations during the evenings which prevents Vera from "cracking up". She says that she cannot contemplate a future without her husband.

At the time of the second interview, although Vera was still frightened to live alone and would "jump at a knock on the door", she is now more settled and carries on her daily routine with the children. She does not have to go to the prison everyday as when he was on remand. She finds it easier to visit her husband every week for two hours and feels happier with the time of the visit. Now she can relax and have a "proper" conversation with her husband, whereas before, the 15 minutes were not enough even to go through the initial greetings which greatly added to her frustration. However, she finds the location of the prison too far away from home, and the environment of the prison not suitable for children; the children are tired from the long journey, they have to wait in queues and there is nothing there for them to do while she is talking to her husband. She says that she cannot keep four children quiet for two hours, particularly the younger ones, therefore she only takes two to the prison once a month.

Vera says that she has no incentive to do anything and feels that she has nothing to look forward to. Vera misses the "normal life, silly things like who to invite for dinner".

Vera still finds it very difficult to take decisions alone about the children or to attend parents meetings at Peter's school as both parents of Peter's friends are there. She goes on to say that Peter and his father are very close, and he has turned Peter into a "proper boy". When Bill returned home from a previous prison sentence Peter "was holding on to my skirt". He taught him to ride a bicycle, climb trees and play football. He also used to talk to Peter about things related to men, whereas she as a woman, does not understand the problems of boys at school. She says that Peter "torments" his brothers and sister, which she believes is an expression of his frustration. When his father was arrested Peter became very quiet and used to wake up during the night and wander around the house. But now he is coping well with the situation. She tells him everything about the court proceedings so he can follow the process.

In the second interview, Vera says that Peter has become more mature and responsible, and he looks after his brothers and sister. However, he is "getting a bit out of hand" and "takes liberties" with her. Vera is very worried about what can happen when he becomes older as a few weeks ago he and three other children stole a radio from a car and sold it to a receiver. Peter has also played truant from school. Vera says that if his father was at home he would deter Peter from mixing with the wrong people, but she adds that he has his father's mischievous ways and hopes he will not "end up forever in trouble like his father".

Although Vera insists that Bill is a family man and likes family life, she expects some changes in his behaviour when he returns home. She hopes he will restrict his social life and give her and Peter more time than he did before he went to prison.

Explanation of the event to the child

Vera says that she did not have to explain anything to Peter as he knew that his father could be arrested at any time. She only asked him not to tell to his brothers and sister and said: "look, they've got your dad now, so you've got to help me, we've got to try to go through this together, we've got to look after him" (father). Vera adds that Peter is a very sensitive boy and understands the situation.

Support system

Vera believes that her neighbours know about her husband's imprisonment, but she does not interact with them. Neither does she interact with her friends anymore; she has no time to go out with them and she has too many problems to cope with, which are different from the ones her friends have, therefore, they cannot understand her situation.

Vera's parents are her main source of help; they take care of the children, help with the family budget or just listen to her. Although she is friendly with her husband's family, contact with them is limited to a few telephone calls as they have disowned Bill due to his behaviour.

Vera has not sought, nor has she been offered any help from organisations. She believes that as she has seven brothers and sisters she has enough people with whom to discuss her problems. She adds that is pointless asking help from organisations as they "don't give any, anyway". Moreover, they are nosy and want to know how you cope with the children.

Child's perception of parents

Peter admires the way his father interacts with people and he would like to be like him in that respect. He says that, in general, he gets on well with his mother, although she does not understand that he is old enough to go out on his own to places like football, or to stay out longer in the evenings. He also complains that she only listens to him when she is not busy, and does not cook the same "lovely dinners" in the evenings as she used to when his father was at home.

Peter feels he can trust his father. Before his imprisonment, he used to spend time explaining things to Peter and he took him "everywhere". He would only prefer that his father let him "have his own ways", as his mother does. Peter feels that his father understands him as he would listen to Peter's reasoning over an issue before giving a positive or negative answer. Now that he is in prison, he talks to his mother because "she is there", but in the first place he would talk to his father as he is sensible and explains what can happen if he does "wrong things". He believes that now his father "knows more" about the consequences of doing wrong things, and adds emphatically that when he grows up and has children he will not "get into trouble" like his father.

In general his father keeps his promises, even though some pressure is needed to make him comply. However, Peter knows that the promise his father made to go to shops with him in a couple of weeks cannot be kept as he is not going to leave the prison in such a short time. Peter is looking

foreward to having his father back home again to do all the things they used to do together.

At the time of the second interview, Peter still admires his father's ability to make friends, and says that he would like to get on with his future children as well as his father gets on with his.

Peter says that his mother understands that he does not have a father at home, therefore she forgives him for many of the "bad" things he does. Nevertheless, Peter resents the fact that his mother does not consider him adult enough to go to certain places alone, or allow him to stay out until later in the evenings. He also does not like it when his mother tells his father about his "bad" behaviour. Although Peter is proud to be treated as the man of the house by his mother, he cannot "come to terms" with the responsibility of looking after his brothers and sister while all his friends are enjoying themselves. He thinks "that's not fair". Peter still believes that his father understands him better than his mother as he is a "male". Currently, he tells his problems to his mother when she is not busy, but on some occasions she cannot help him. For example, she just did not understand his fears of changing to the new school as she is not a boy and did not go through this experience. He recalls sadly the many times his father introduced him to exciting activities such as football and riding the motorbike. What he admires most about his father is his liveliness and way of life, that is, he goes out frequently and is happy all the time.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Peter knew that someday his father would be arrested, therefore his arrest was not a total shock to him. He believes it was best the way it happened as he was arrested "calmly and not being chased through the streets by the police", in which case he could get hurt. He knows that his father "did something with cheques", but he does not have a clear idea what that means. He only wants his father home "very soon" and does not blame anyone for the event. Peter says that his father needed the money to keep the family.

Peter thinks that it is his father's decision if he should break the law or not, and that he explained to him that he offended to make money to share with the family. Peter cannot say if his father should be punished or not because he did not "hear the case well", but he knows that his father offended for a good reason. However, he adds that his father "shouldn't get much (sentence)", but he thinks he will.

At the time of the second interview, Peter still does not understand the nature of his father's offence, and does not blame anyone for the event. He says that it was hard

for his father to get a job so he tried to earn some money for the family. As he explains: "Well, like what I'm saying, he thought about the circumstances, about disobeying the law, and like he never had a father, so that was the reason, and by that time he had a wife and four kids, so he had to support them as well".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

The main changes perceived by Peter since his father's arrest are: first, he does not have his father at home should he need him to sort out problems; second, he cannot go to all the places he used to such as restaurants, parks, football and fun fairs; third, he could stay out with his friends longer as his father trusted him, whereas his mother is too scared to let him stay out in the evenings; fourth, his father always "made sure that we'll get a good meal inside us" whereas now his mother only "makes sure we got something to eat". He concludes by saying that "this is not a family anymore". But for Peter, the hardest thing with which to cope is the feeling of being on his own without the possibility of exchanging "men's things" with his father. He says that his father talks to him as an adult, and that he took it for granted that his father would be available when he needed someone to turn to. However, he adds that his father will "still be there inside me like", and he can still tell him many things when he visits him in prison.

At the second interview, Peter says that he has become older and now understands his father's and mother's situation better. He has just realised how much responsibility his mother has taken on, and adds that the older his brothers and sister are the more difficult it is to control them. However, he complains that his mother has reduced his pocket money to £1 per week, whereas his father always gave him extra money when he asked for it. He also complains bitterly that his mother makes him baby-sit while she goes out, and he dreams about the day his father returns home and life can "go back to normal again".

Peter is resigned to the fact that his father is in prison and it is going to be a long time before he returns home. Nevertheless, he says that he feels much closer to his father now compared to before he went to prison for now they discuss problems concerning Peter's future, whereas before the conversation would be limited to comments about football or television.

Peter identifies the open day, when the family has the opportunity to look at the children's school work, as the event most difficult to cope with as his father cannot attend. He feels "left out as everyone else's dad is there". He believes that he is the only one at school who

has a father in prison.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Peter sees his father everyday when he is on holiday and his mother can arrange someone to look after the younger children. During school terms he sees his father every Saturday. He would not miss a visit and feels happy to talk to his father and listen to his advice.

At the time of the second interview, Peter had not seen his father for about two months. This is because he is on his second trial and Peter cannot attend the court as he is under age. Peter is looking forward to the day when he can visit his father again, but until then they write letters to each other.

Interaction with friends

Peter does not know who is aware of his father's imprisonment, but he told his best friend whom he says understands and accepts the situation. Peter does not talk about his father to anyone. However, if this matter "comes out" he will not "be shy" to "say things" about his father. But he still feels "bad" for what his friends can think of his father as they do not understand the reasons why his father committed the offence.

Moral Development Interview

Time 1: Peter thinks that people "should obey the law if possible; they shouldn't just feel like breaking the law". People should be punished depending on what they've done. "If it's just silly things, like picking something from a shop no, but he adds that "it's up to the judge anyway" to punish them or not.

Moral stage: 3

Time 2: Peter thinks that, if possible, people should obey the law. But it "depends what they're going to do about the way not to obey the law. Like if it's something silly, like taking something from shops no, but if it's a big case, like rape or murder, they must just as well obey the law". They should be punished depending "on the conditions really, because anyone who breaks the law, if they haven't got a reason, if they've done it just to make them feel good, they should be punished, but if they've special reasons, they shouldn't be punished.

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Peter in the four sub-scales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	21	20
Social self-peer	7	7
Home-parents	7	5
School-academic	7	4
General self score	84	72

Child's impression of the interview

Peter felt excited to be interviewed and thinks it is good to talk about his father to someone who listens to him so that he can understand about the situation better. He thinks the questions are interesting.

FAMILY D

Mother: Tina, 37 years old
Father: Chris, 44 years old
Children: Lee and Paul, 18 and 13 years old.

Demographic data

Family D live on the ground floor of a highrise block of council flats in East London. The flat has two bedrooms, is well furnished and kept clean and tidy. Tina runs a new car and attends regularly a local gymnasium to keep fit.

Tina attended a comprehensive school until the age of 16, and worked in an office until she married at 19 years old. She is outgoing self-confident, active and has an optimistic outlook towards life. Tina's husband, Chris, was a self-employed car dealer before his imprisonment. After her husband's arrest Tina began to work as croupier in a casino.

Husband's criminal data

Chris was arrested for armed robbery. He has a previous conviction for conspiracy charges for which he received a one year sentence when he was 18 years old. At the time of the second interview, he was sentenced to 14 years.

Mother's perception of the event

For Tina, her husband's arrest came as a "big shock". She never imagined that this kind of thing could ever happen to her. She cannot stop thinking about the matter and feels "lost". Moreover, her husband was injured by the police during his arrest and had to have an operation on his leg, which added to her distress. The 14 year prison sentence her husband received came as a "tremendous shock" to Tina. She just kept "running around" and did not know what she was doing. Tina does not understand the court proceedings, and although she knew her husband would receive a sentence, she did not think it would be "that much". However, when she visited Chris, he told her that he could have received a much longer sentence and that they were not going to be apart forever, which made Tina feel much better.

Feelings towards the event

Tina does not blame anybody for the event. She says that her husband's brother was "under a lot of pressure" because his wife was dying of cancer, and he convinced Chris to take part in the robbery. She adds "what's done is done, and now I just want him to come home as soon as possible". Tina insists that "he is the only man for me, he wouldn't let the wind blow on me". She is adamant that she is going to wait for her husband however long his sentence may be.

After her husband's conviction, Tina felt very depressed, but emphasises that they both are positive people and they will "get on with it". She says that her husband has already settled down in the prison; he has a job and goes to the gym. The last time she visited him "he was laughing and looked really good". He is also more affectionate towards her than before. She only feels very angry that her husband is considered to be a high risk category prisoner. This entails her following restricting rules for visiting.

Tina still thinks that the "circumstances" are to blame for her husband's imprisonment, and that he only wanted to help his brother. She says that her husband has "morals", he is "a very good man", and she has no intention of separating from him. She is living for the day when he returns home and says that the future is not so "bleak" because he is not dead and she can still see him. Although Tina feels very bitter about the length of the sentence, at least now she knows where she stands and can make plans about her life.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

The financial changes experienced by Tina have been dramatic. During her 19 years of marriage she never had to work or worry about bills as her husband earned sufficient to provide the family with a good standard of living. Now she is forced to live on social security, although she is considering to work full-time. However, at the moment, she cannot make plans for the future; her life revolves around cooking, travelling to the prison and discussing the case with solicitors. She also has the sole responsibility of Paul's upbringing, and although she is very active, she sometimes feels that it is all too much for her to cope with. Chris is more "authoritative" than her, therefore her sons obey him whilst they "get round me". Tina also finds it most difficult to accept the thought of being alone for a long time without the daily interaction and physical contact with her husband. This is the first time during their 19 years of marriage that she has been separated from her husband.

At the time of the second interview, Tina was working as a croupier in a casino and her eldest son had left home. She visits her husband regularly, although she thinks that the two hours every two weeks allowed for visiting are insufficient to say everything they want to each other. She feels very frustrated and lonely after the visits.

Tina has not noticed any great changes in Paul's behaviour. Initially, Paul could not believe that his father had been arrested and showed no reaction. Then he became very upset and quiet, and did not want to go out or play with his friends. He was also very worried about his father's health and whether he was being cared properly in prison. He

also felt frustrated at not having his father's help when he needs it. Paul has become closer to his older brother with whom he has long conversations and goes out with sometimes. According to Tina, Paul's school work has not changed, but she has noticed that he has become more helpful towards her. She attributes this lack of negative changes to her husband's personality, for he "never moans, is very positive, cheerful and strong, he's a man's man", therefore Paul also feels confident and positive about the whole matter.

Explanation of the event to the child

Tina says that she did not have to explain to Paul about her husband's arrest as he was at home when the police surrounded the block and searched her flat. Regarding her husband's injury she initially told Paul that he had had an accident on a motor bike, but when the story appeared in the newspaper, she told him the whole truth. Tina also told Paul not to worry what people said to him, just "hold your head up". At the time of the second interview Tina says that Paul understands better why his father became involved in the robbery; he has accepted the idea that it was unavoidable, and he tries to carry on his life as normal as possible.

Support system

Tina believes that her neighbours gossip about her, but she is not affected by this as she thinks they are "backward" and never "identified" with them. Her family give her "a hundred per cent" support, as do her sister-in-law and the few friends she has.

At the time of the second interview Tina still receives "total support" from her family. However, all her friends have "disappeared", apart from one who has helped her through the crisis. She has now made new friends at work, but they do not know anything about her husband's imprisonment.

Tina says vehemently that she would not ask for any help from the social services; she can cope alone and does not want anyone intruding in her life.

Child's perception of parents

In general Paul gets on well with his mother, although he dislikes it when she does not allow him to go out with his friends, or when she raises her voice. He says that she is the only one, apart from his father, who understands him and cares for him. Paul says that if he was in trouble, such as a fight, he would go to his father for he knows what action to take. However, if the trouble was at school he would go to his mother as she is more able than his

father to deal with this sort of problem. Since his father's arrest, he confides in his older brother, mainly because he "knows what it's like" as "he's been through it himself". Paul insists that he trusts his father and that his imprisonment has not changed his feelings towards him. He adds that when he has a son he will take him to football, boxing and snooker clubs like his father used to take him.

At the time of the second interview, Paul still admires his father and says that he would like to be strong and cheerfull like him. He says that his father's optimism has helped all the family to cope better with the situation, particularly when he was sentenced to 14 years, and convinced everyone that this sentence was a good result. Paul recalls the "horrible" feelings he experienced when his mother told him the result of the trial and his relief to see his father "in a happy mood". However, if he could change anything it would be to turn the clock back to before his father's arrest and be able to talk to him anytime he needed to. Paul has become closer to his mother during the last year and talks to her about his problems, although he still complains that she does not allow him to stay out after 10 p.m., and does not let him go to Liverpool to watch a football match alone.

Child's attribution of responsibility

The first indication that Paul had about his father's offence was when the police surrounded the estate and entered the family's flat to arrest his father. Only Paul and his brother were in the flat at the time; his mother was at the gymnasium and his father was "at work". Later in the day, he learned that his father had been shot in the legs by the police while he was trying to resist arrest. When his mother explained about his father's imprisonment, Paul could not believe it and he felt "really sick" and extremely worried about his father's injuries.

Paul does not blame anybody, he thinks that "it's just one of those things" that could not be avoided as the circumstances leading to the event compelled his father to commit the offence. Paul thinks that his father was "helping out his brother so it was the right thing to do". He believes that his father should not be punished because "really, he wouldn't have done it but he had to help his brother, so that's why he did it. He's not a criminal".

At the time of the second interview Paul says: "I wanted him to go free, but it's not the way it goes. He has to be punished by law. But he had to do what he had to do, because his brother is his own blood and he was helping him, because if he don't he would feel guilty really"

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Paul misses greatly going out with his father, particularly on Sundays when all the family used to go to a restaurant for lunch. He also misses talking to his father when he wants and going to his garage to help him wash cars. Paul goes on to say that before his father's imprisonment, he never had cause to worry about him, but now he keeps "thinking if he's alright and what's happening in the prison". Since his father's imprisonment, he has not been on holiday abroad as they used to, but he has been on holiday with the school, which is not the same. Paul feels very sad as he misses his father watching him play football and "sitting down" with him to watch television. His mother cannot now afford to buy him expensive clothes or give him the same presents as his father used to. Paul emphasises that he still admires his father and if he is "lucky", his father could be at home on his 21st birthday.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Paul visits his father once a week and has mixed feelings when he is with him. He feels happy because he is talking to him, but he also feels frustrated as there is not sufficient time to say all the things he has done, and to ask him what has been happening in the prison. He also feels sad because he leaves him in the prison.

At the time of the second interview, and after his father's conviction, Paul visits him every three weeks. Maintaining regular contact with his father is very important for Paul; if he had to make a choice between going out with his friends or visiting his father, he would choose the latter. He feels happy to see his father as he can talk to him and they exchange a few jokes.

Interaction with friends

None of Paul's friends mention his father's imprisonment. He believes that they do not know about his imprisonment. Only on one occasion a neighbour said to Paul that he was "just like his father" during an argument over a dog. Paul emphasises that he would talk about his troubles in general to his friends, but he would not talk about his father or the sadness he feels about his absence. At the time of the second interview, although his friends now know about his father's imprisonment, Paul stresses that if they attempt to go beyond the question "how is he (father) going? I cut them short".

Moral development interview

Time 1: Paul thinks that "it's not worth going to prison. It's silly really, unless you really have to do it (commit

an offence). People who break the law should be punished, because "once you've done something wrong you have to learn by your own mistakes".

Moral developmental stage: 2(3)

Time 2: "They (people in general) should do what they can to obey the law, you should try, but if they can't, like my dad, if they've got to do what they've got to do, then they've got to do it".

Moral developmental stage: 3

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Paul in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	22	23
Social self-peer	6	8
Home-parents	7	8
School-academic	8	7
General self score	86	92

Child's impression of the interview

Paul feels "good" to cooperate for a "good cause". However, at the beginning of the interview he felt very nervous as he did not know what was expected of him. At the end of the second interview Paul says that he enjoyed the opportunity to talk about his father to someone who can understand the situation.

FAMILY E

Mother: Sara, 36 years old
Father: Tim, 38 years old
Children: Roger, Michael and Chris, 7 4 and 3 years old respectively.

Demographic data

Family E live in a three-bedroom council maisonette in Middlesex. In front of the block there is a communal garden. The interior of the flat is tidy but sparsely furnished and in need of repair.

Sara attended a secondary modern school until the age of 16 years, when she left to work as a bar maid. She married her husband when she was 26 years of age, after having lived with him for a year. Sara's husband is a builder, and since his imprisonment she has been receiving social security benefits.

Husband's criminal data

Since Sara has known her husband, he has served two prison terms of three years each for grievous bodily harm. At the time of the first interview, Tim had served two years of a six-year sentence he received following a fight in a pub.

Mother's perception of the event

Sara was not totally surprised at her husband's arrest. He often arrived home very drunk and she knew something would happen sooner or later, even though she hoped he would control himself for fear of returning to prison. When he was arrested her "heart sunk", and she felt very angry towards him for putting himself in that situation again. When he was sentenced to six years imprisonment Sara was shocked and felt he was treated very unfairly. She believes that the judge was severe with her husband because he and other members of the family have been in front of this judge before, and also because he wanted to shock her husband as the last two sentences did not work.

Feelings towards the husband

Sara blames her husband for the event, although she says that he is an honest man, not a violent criminal. She adds that he is "just stupid" and "soft as mud", and that his drinking habit is his only problem. Once he is in a pub he will not leave until he is "kicked out". She finds this behaviour very strange as he never drinks at home. Sara still considers Tim a member of the family, and says that her feelings towards him have not changed.

At the time of the second interview, Sara reiterates that Tim is very close to the children, particularly Roger. He used to take him to many places like museums and parks, and now he sells his tobacco to buy Roger toys made by another prisoner. She still thinks he is a good husband and recalls the times when he was at home cooking, washing and Hoovering for her, and looking after the children in the evenings while she went to work. She only wishes that he would stay away from pubs and control his bad temper, which she expects him to do in the future.

Sara's husband spent a weekend at home four months ago and will receive another home leave soon. She recalls the "weird feelings" she experienced during the weekend: whilst he was at home Sara felt as though he had never been away but when he returned to the prison she felt as though he had not been at home. She adds that, although she felt happy, she also felt a "bit" let down as she expected it would be like a second honey-moon, but it was just like any other routine weekend. The children behaved "marvellously" and her husband did not drink, apart from one or two cans of beer. Sara only wishes he would be at home permanently and is just "surviving" until this day.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Sara recalls the time soon after her husband's arrest as being a nightmare. She couldn't make any plans for the future and believes she "would have gone mad", if his mother was not living with her, taking care of the household while she was visiting her husband everyday.

Sara finds it difficult to control the children and says, very discouragingly, that she does not know what action to take. When she tries to do the washing up or ironing they "run riot", but when they are with their father they are "as good as gold" (while Sara was interviewed they turned the settee and the armchairs upside down playing war games). Since her husband's imprisonment, Roger has become very aggressive and has tantrums if he does not get his own way. He breaks his and his mother's things; "just throws things across the room". He is also very disobedient and spiteful towards his two brothers. Sara goes on to say that Roger is very frightened and follows her everywhere, even to the lavatory, and refuses to sleep in his own bed. He is now sleeping with her.

Sara believes that Roger does not have any opportunity to use his energy constructively as most of the day he remains in the house and cannot go to parks, football or just play games with his father. She is very worried about Roger's behaviour because it is affecting the other children as they are acting in the same way. Roger's school work has deteriorated and he is now attending a special unit in the school to bring him up to the standard of the other

children. Sara often feels like "closing the door behind me and disappearing". She adds bitterly that Tim works in the prison and eats better than her and the children, while they are suffering all sorts of aggravation.

Sara complains that the prison is a long way from the family home, which makes the cost of the journey expensive. She finds it difficult to keep her three children occupied during the long coach journey. She takes "a load of food and keeps shoving it at them". She says that the children are a hindrance during visits: "they run amok, just like all children because there is nothing for them to do". She also complains that the visiting room is too crowded, and "everyone listens to what you've got to say". As a consequence, Sara says that she would not take the children to the prison as often as she does if she could find someone to look after them.

Concerning the financial situation, Sara is currently on social security and says that she definitely cannot manage to keep three children with this money. She has to buy the children's clothes in jumble sales, which makes her feel very depressed. Her mother lived with her until eight months ago when she died, therefore Sara had to stop working in the local pub during the evenings. Tim used to earn "good money" and provided everything the family needed. He also used to help her with the house work and decorate the flat, but now the flat is "falling down" and she is unable to do the necessary work.

At the time of the second interview, Sara says that "we still live hand to mouth", however she is no longer frightened to live alone as she has discovered she is able to cope with the situation and is becoming more independent each day. She has even done some urgent decorating in her maisonette. The younger child goes to a day nursery and the middle child now goes to school all day, leaving her some free time to rest.

Roger continues to ignore his mother's rules. Even if she shouts and screams he does not take any notice and is rude, cheeky and answers her back. She says that Roger and his brothers have "wrecked" her decorating already, although she adds that he is not so destructive as he used to be. She marvels at her husband's ability to make Roger obey him: "he only has to tell him once".

Explanation of the event to the child

Tim gave the explanation to Roger about his imprisonment. Sara thought that it was his duty as he was the one who committed the offence. He told Roger that "I went out, got drunk and got involved in a fight". Roger asked his father the reason why he became involved in the fight, to which his father answered "because I'm stupid". After that Roger

became very quiet and did not want to play with anyone or anything. Then "suddenly" he became very angry with his father and refused to visit him. This behaviour went on for a month, until one day Sara tempted him to go to the prison by telling him that they would go to a toy shop after the visit. Since that day he looks forward to seeing his father. She adds that, at the beginning, Roger did not want to leave his father in the prison and he could not understand why he had to stay there so long. Sara never discusses her husband's imprisonment with Roger, and she told him that he must not tell his brothers where he is. They think that he is working away from home, although Sara says that she never told them: "I've never told them a lie, they just went on with this idea". However, she always takes them to the prison to visit their father.

Support system

Sara only interacts with a family who live near her. She says that they have been "terrific"; they look after her children when she asks them, and they listen to her when she feels depressed. Sara also receives emotional support from an old school friend. Sara's mother was also very supportive, before she died. She used to live with Sara and looked after the children while she was working or visiting her husband. Her husband's family live in Ireland and therefore cannot help in any way. The only relative of her husband who lives in London is his sister, but she stopped interacting with Tim after his imprisonment.

Since the last interview, Sara has become closer to her brother and his wife. They have provided support by inviting the family for dinner and giving the children clothes. Sara has also renewed her friendship with her husband's sister, after her husband had made "the peace" during his home leave. Sara and the children visit her almost every Sunday in order that she can have a "good rest for a day". Sara also receives help from a Catholic Organisation; they give her clothes, Christmas presents and send a social worker to talk to her. Sara would not seek help from the social services as they may think that she is not coping.

Child's perception of parents

Roger says that, in general, he gets on well with his mother. She understands him and keeps her promises most of the time. However, he feels very angry towards her when she stops him playing and sends him to bed. Neither does he like it when she takes him to visit his father and it coincides with the "best day of school" (a school trip).

Roger is not sure whom he takes after, but his mother told him that he is impatient, excitable and does "silly things" just like his uncle. If he has any problems Roger confides

in his mother as she is "nice" and loves him, but if he is in trouble, he prefers to talk to his best friend. Roger trusts this friend as he "thinks the same as me" and would never tell anyone his secrets. Roger is not sure whether he would tell his father his problems as he may not understand him now. Roger does not remember whether or not his father kept his promises when he was at home. He only remembers the times when he used to take him to the museum or to the park. He says that the worse aspect of his father is that he is "in this kind of jail thing". If he could change anything about his father it would be to stop him going to the pub.

At the time of the second interview, Roger says that he still gets on well with his mother, apart from the occasions when she "smacks" him for being "naughty", but adds that it does not really hurt. He recalls the occasion when she picked up the wooden spoon to hit him, but it broke before reaching him (laughs). He says that her best aspect is when she buys him sweets after school. According to Roger, his mother does not make any promises, she only says "may be". Neither does she always understand him, like the day he wanted to practice football with his friends and she did not allow him to go. However, he would talk to her about his problems.

For Roger, the best aspects about his father are: he lets him go anywhere he wants to, and he takes him to many interesting places. He would only like to be able to change his father's drinking habit, and explains that his father drinks that much because he may not be able to "handle us properly and sometimes wants to have a rest". However, Roger believes that his father now understands that he does not want him to drink anymore and, although he always failed to keep his promises in the past, this time Roger is hopeful that he will be able to control himself. To support this belief, Roger emphasises that during the weekend his father was at home, he only drank "one or two" cans of larger.

Child's attribution of responsibility

When his father was arrested he told Roger that he "was going out somewhere for a long time". Roger did not understand but felt sad, especially when "this car came and picked him up" and he thought they (people in the car) may do something bad to his father. His father explained about the fight on the first visit, but Roger did not "really worry too much" as he never thought he would be away for so long. Now he feels even "more sad" as he realised that they are not going to do things together for a long time. Roger blames the "people who make the larger" for his father's imprisonment. These people "shouldn't make larger and make people drunk". He adds that if he was a father he would only go to the pub to drink a can of orange juice or eat

some crisps. However, Roger acknowledges that his father should not fight as he says: "he shouldn't have done it because that's kind of naughty and he knew he would go to prison". But he thinks that his father "should stay there (prison) only for a couple of months, because many men don't get away with it, but some men do, they travel to other countries when the police is looking for them".

At the time of the second interview, Roger blames the man "who started pushing and pulling" his father for the event, and he is now able to understand why his father had to fight. However, Roger continues to think that his father "shouldn't even have gone to the pub because he'll get drunk", and that he should only be imprisoned for two or three months. Roger also admits that his father has done something "naughty", but "he (father) told the judge that he was guilty and the other man started the fight in the first place". Roger adds that he does not want his father in prison, and that he has promised him he will not be "naughty again".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Since his father's imprisonment, Roger has become very "sad and bored" as "life is not exiting anymore". His mother has many things to do and she does not have the time to take him to the "exiting places" his father used to take him, or play "proper games" with him such as manopoly. He also complains that his brothers do not "leave me in peace"; they insist on playing with him when he would rather play alone. Before his father went to prison, his brothers would play with each other and he would go out with his father to play "man's games" such as football.

Although Roger feels safe with his mother, he feels "safer" with his father at home as he is not sure about his mother's ability to cope with "anything that can happen". Roger cannot elaborate on this matter, he only knows that his father is better able to look after the family than his mother. Roger is also frightened that his mother may be taken away, as was his father.

At the time of the second interview, Roger still complains that he does not go anywhere anymore and that his life at home is very boring. He felt very happy the weekend his father spent at home, although he had to be "really good" otherwise he would be punished. When his father went back to the prison he felt really sad as they could do "better things together", such as play monopoly or decorate the house together. He is now saving money to buy wall-paper for when his father returns home.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Roger visits his father fortnightly. He likes to see his father and feels happy talking to him. He tells him what has been happening at home and school since the last visit. Although Roger looks forward to seeing his father, he finds the journey very boring. Since last year he also writes "proper letters" to his father, not only cards with "I love you daddy".

Interaction with friends

Roger has many friends and one best friend who he likes because they enjoy playing the same games. None of his friends know about his father's imprisonment, not even his best friend. When the latter asked him where his father was, Roger told him that he was working away from home. Roger thinks that his father's imprisonment is a "family secret" and "it's nobody's business". Since the last interview, Roger has told his best friend about his father's imprisonment but "he didn't say much, he just listened".

Moral Judgment Interview

Time 1: Roger thinks that people in general should obey the law, otherwise they will be arrested, and they should be punished "because they have been naughty".

Moral stage: 1

Time 2: Roger thinks that people in general should obey the law as "it's not worth being arrested, going to court and prison", and they should be punished because they are "naughty".

Moral Stage: 1/2

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Roger in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	16	16
Social self-peer	7	6
Home-parents	7	7
School-academic	5	2
General self score	70	62

Child's impression of the interview

Roger felt "all right" during the interview and says that

he likes to talk about his father. In fact he says that he felt excited when he was informed that he was going to be interviewed for the second time. He says the questions are "easy".

FAMILY E

Mother: Karen, 29 years old

Father: Roy, 31 years old

Children: Daniel and Wendy, 8 and 2 years old respectively.

Demographic data

Family F live in a bed and breakfast hotel in central London. The room has two beds and is crammed with clothes, suit cases and toys. As there are no facilities for cooking, Karen receives an allowance from the social security to buy meals out.

Karen left comprehensive school at 15 years of age and married her first husband two years later. This marriage only lasted three months. Ten years ago Kate met Roy and after four years of an unstable relationship they decided to marry. Two years ago Roy became unemployed and they lost their house. While Karen and the children went to live with her mother, Roy went to live with his mother. Eventually they were provided with bed and breakfast accomodation by the local authority. They have many arguments and on these occasions Roy stays with his mother, leaving Karen alone with the children. Eventually he returns and behaves as though nothing had happened. Karen has never worked and the social security benefits she receives are her only income.

By the time of the second interview, Karen had been rehoused in a three bedroom flat in north London. The flat is untidy and the children appear to do just as they please.

Husband's criminal data

Roy was arrested for attempted burglary and criminal damage. Although he has been in prison several times before meeting Karen, this is the first time he has offended since they have been together. Roy was setenced to 18 months imprisonment but only served 8 months, therefore at the time of the second interview he had been released.

Mother's perception of the event

Karen felt both angry and relieved after her husband's arrest. On the one hand, she felt annoyed as he did not consider the consequences of his action for her and the children, but on the other, she believes that now there may be some hope for him to "grow up" and change. Since they have been together, Karen believes that Roy has taken her for granted and that his behaviour is unpredictable: "one minute he can be very violent and then laugh an hour later". When Roy was arrested he declared his love for her and promised never to offend again. Karen felt distressed, lost and sorry for herself when she learned

about her husband's sentence. She also felt very angry as she was not given the date of her husband's trial and was informed of his sentence by the solicitor.

Feelings towards her husband

Although Karen blames her husband for the event, she also blames the circumstances as Roy was unemployed and they lost their house. There was nothing to look forward to and they used to argue frequently as they "can't get away from each other" in the hotel room. The children also could not sleep well due to the noise in the building which added to their frustration. She feels a little guilty as just prior to her husband committing the offence, she put the phone down on him when he wanted to come back after they had a fierce argument (he was at his mother's house). However, she is resentful at the fact that she has to endure terrible living conditions; living in one room with Daniel and the baby, being unable to go anywhere for lack of money and having no friends, whilst her husband is spared these burdens. She feels extremely lonely, and is very frightened to face the future.

Karen has decided to give her husband another chance, but she has made it clear to him that she is not prepared to be "a part time wife anymore", and will not tolerate him going out with friends and forgetting about the family.

At the time of the second interview Karen's husband has been released from prison and is living in the family's new home. She is very apprehensive about his willingness to change his behaviour as he still leaves her and the children alone to go out with his friends, although she still believes they may "have a future together". She is also feeling "terrible" as she is pregnant and considering having an abortion.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Roy has always made the decisions about the children and controlled the finances of the family, but now that he is in prison, Karen has attempted to take over these roles. She feels "terrified" to deal alone with all the necessary "hassle" of family life. In particular, she finds it extremely difficult to deal with the social security bureaucracy and managing the money she receives from them. By the time she received the first payment she was already in debt and her financial situation was deteriorating rapidly. The money she spends on the journey to the prison, and on food and cigarettes for Roy contributes significantly to her indebtedness. Going almost everyday to the prison with the baby totally disrupts her life, and she wonders if he deserves all this sacrifice.

Soon after her husband's conviction, Karen was moved, under

the order of the social services, to a smaller room in the hotel. For Karen this move was inconceivable and most unfair as she was already living in cramped accommodation. This event, compounded by her financial problems, difficulty controlling the children and total lack of social life, lead to a "nervous breakdown". She first became ill with pneumonia and spent two weeks with her mother, but still ill, she had to return to the hotel for fear of loosing the room. She then began to have "panic attacks". When she was forced to go out to buy food for the children, she used to be in such a hurry to return to the hotel that she would often bang the head of her daughter on walls and lamp-posts on her way back home. She stopped taking the anti-depressant pills the doctor prescribed her as she began sleep-walking. She would go down to the reception of the hotel in a T-shirt, or turn the tap on and leave the water running. On more than one occasion, Karen's mother tied her arms to the bed to stop her sleep-walking. Karen was also concerned that she would not wake up if her children needed her. After many letters from doctors pleading the urgency to move her, the council rehoused Karen to the present flat. Now the panic attacks have stopped and she feels better.

Karen is very worried at the prospect of living alone and having to discipline the children. She defines herself as a "placid" person and feels she is unable to demand obedience from them. Sometimes she "smacks" Daniel just because she is frustrated, as on the occasion her husband was moved to another prison and she was not informed. Roy on the other hand is very firm with Daniel and many of the arguments between them are over this issue. Roy thinks Karen should be stricter with the children and insists that she should encourage Daniel to stand on his own two feet and not avoid confrontation with other children. Karen says that Daniel is a coward like her and runs away from problems. For this reason he needs a man to tell him what to do as she is too weak to enforce rules. When Roy was at home she never had to preoccupy herself with the children's discipline as they would obey their father. Recently, Daniel has become difficult to manage, he shouts at Karen and takes no notice of what she tells him. Apart from his disobedience, Karen has not noticed any changes in Daniel's behaviour since his father's imprisonment. She believes this is because his father used to stay away from the family frequently and Daniel became very close to her. Daniel now spends many days with his grandmother, which he enjoys very much.

Explanation of the event to the child

Karen did not give Daniel an explanation of his father's imprisonment. He "just knew what was going on all the time" as he was present when the police came to inform her that her husband had been arrested. She thinks that Daniel may be confused as to the meaning of the offence because he is

young. She thinks he may not care if his father is at home as he is quite happy going to clubs three nights a week and to his grandmother's house. She adds that Daniel becomes "terrible and unhappy" if he cannot go to his grandmother as he is very close to her.

Support system

Karen has received emotional support from a friend who lives in the room below her, but as this friend now has a boy friend, she cannot talk with her in the evenings. Karen now watches the television "day in and day out". Since Karen has been living in her new home, she has not made any friends and does not interact with her neighbours. Her family was pleased with Roy's arrest, but when they knew that Karen was visiting him, they became very hostile towards her. Although Karen feels angry at her mother's domineering attitude she misses her friendship and her financial help. Karen says that because of all the troubles that she brought upon her parents they now look forward to his release as he will take her "off their hands". Karen has no contact with her husband's family.

Karen thought to ask for help from organisations, such as prisoner's wives, but she is too shy to approach them and does not know what to say to them. The probation officer offered Karen help, but she refused for fear of having the children taken into care. When the probation officer was in her flat making a report on her husband, her daughter had one of her tantrums (shouts and "chucks herself about") and she feared he may have mentioned it in his report.

Child's perception of parents

Daniel gets on "fine" with his mother and believes she understands him, but complains that normally she does not buy him sweets, even though she has received her "giro". He would like her to change her attitude about money, that is, give him more. He also wishes she would stop shouting and smacking him "all the time" and listen to him "a bit more". He goes on to say that she should change her clothes as "she is wearing them for the last five days".

At the first interview, Daniel chooses his father as his favourite adult with whom he can talk with, as he "plays the most" with him and gives him money. He feels happy playing drums and karate with his father and adds that they get on quite well, even though he feels let down as he promised to give him a fruit machine and he never bought one. His father also promised to take him on holiday to Spain, but they never went as he spent all the money he was saving on drink.

If in trouble Daniel would go to different people according to the nature of the trouble. For example, if it was a

fight he would go to his father, as "he's fat and strong and would hit them", if he had problems at school, he would rather be reprimanded by the school staff than tell anyone.

At the second interview, Daniel chooses his grandmother as his favourite adult with whom to confide as she always gives him money and plays "many things" such as cards and darts with him. If Daniel were in trouble at school he would tell his grandmother or his mother, but not the teachers as he has only moved to this school recently and does not know anyone there.

Although Daniel still accepts his father as a legitimate person to tell him what to do, he would not tell him his problems, neither would he ask his help if in trouble. He prefers to "keep it a secret". He says that he is not used to his father anymore as he has been away for a long time, and he does not know him well. He "hates" when his father "shouts his big mouth", and adds that he does not understand him anymore. At these times Daniel tries to "cut down most of the noise" by thinking of something else. If a boy hits him and he complains to his father, he tells him to pick up something and hit the boy back. But this is not what Daniel wants, he just wants to be comforted. He also says that he does not get on well with him as he has changed, especially his best aspect which was when he used to take him out, for now he does not take him anywhere.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Daniel knows that his father is in prison, but does not have a clear idea as to why he was arrested. He believes that he must have broken into a bank or a jewellery shop and blames both his father and his uncle for the offence. He adds that his father's brother "must've had a few drinks", and while he "was standing guard" did not warn his father "that the police was coming". Daniel thinks that the police's "siren went off". He felt really "sad about it all" because "he is my dad". Daniel thinks that his father should not have committed the offence because "is kind of naughty" and that he should be punished, "but not for a long time, a month. He's my dad and I want him home".

At the time of the second interview he says that his father was arrested because he and his uncle "must've broken into someone's house or stolen something", but he does not think about the matter anymore. He only remembers that one day he was playing and his mother told him they were going to see his father "somewhere down Brixton". When asked about his feelings about his father's sentence he said that he did not know anything about it and he cannot understand the situation because "no one tells me anything". He does not know whether or not his father should be punished as he does not think about "this anymore, I don't get on with him (father) anymore, I just play".

Child's perception of changes after father's imprisonment

For Daniel "lots of things" have changed since his father's imprisonment. First, "we only have the giro money", which is always arriving late, therefore his mother cannot give him pocket money or buy him anything, not even sweets. However, he adds that "it's not so bad" as his grandmother gives him some money. Second, Daniel and his father "have no more fun together", like when they used to play "karate games" which makes Daniel feel very sad. He also complains that he does not go anywhere anymore.

At the time of the second interview, Daniel's father had been released from prison and he says that "I'm not used to him no more" and "anyway, he used to beat up my mum and I don't like this". He goes on to say that initially he cared "a bit", but now he "don't care no more". He concludes that his father goes to the pub all the time and does not talk with him or take him out.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Daniel visited his father almost every day during the remand period, however, after conviction the visits became less frequent, but he could not be precise how often he now goes to the prison. He likes to visit his father and feels happy to talk to him. He also likes to go to the prison because afterwards his mother takes him to the sandwich bar and he plays on the fruit machine. He thinks that his father does not pay much attention to him. For example, when he told his father about his holidays in Spain with his grandmother, he says his father was not interested because on the next visit he asked Daniel "the same thing again" (about the holidays).

Interaction with friends

Daniel's friends from the hotel know that his father is in prison but no one bullies him. None of the new friends he has made since he moved know about his father's imprisonment, except his best friend. When his best friend asked why his father was in prison Daniel could not tell him as he did not know himself. However, his best friend kept on asking about his father so Daniel told him that his father "robbed a bank". After that his friend never mentioned his father again. Daniel would not talk about this matter with any other friends.

Moral Development Interview

Time 1: Daniel thinks that people in general should obey the law "because you can go to jail if you don't, and they should be punished so "they wouldn't do again".

Moral stage: 1

Time 2: Daniel thinks that people in general should obey the law as they "don't want to go to prison and want to stay with his wife if they've got one". They should be punished "otherwise they would do it again".
Moral stage: 1

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Daniel in the four sub-scales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	18	19
Social self-peer	6	5
Home-parents	7	2
School-academic	7	3
General self-score	76	58

Child's impression of the interview

Daniel feels "okay" about the interview and likes to answer the questions. He adds that nobody ever talks to him about his father. For Daniel the questions are difficult.

FAMILY G

Mother: Marion, 36 years old

Father: Terry, 35 years old

Children: Laura, Jamie and Joseph, 13, 10 and eleven months respectively.

Demographic data

Family G live in a small three-bedroom semi-detached council house in the Midlands. The interior of the house is kept clean and tidy. To the front of the property there is a small garden overgrown with weeds.

Marion attended school until the age of 15 and married her present husband when she was 21 years old. She appears to be a placid person and is rather inarticulate.

The family's main source of income has been social security benefits as Terry was unemployed before he was incarcerated. Currently, Marion works in a pub from 8 p.m. until midnight.

Terry was released four weeks prior to the second interview. During his imprisonment he trained as a painter and decorator and is currently seeking employment.

Husband's criminal data

Terry was arrested for burglary and sentenced to three years imprisonment. At the time of the first interview, he had been convicted and served 9 months of his sentence. He has two previous convictions for similar offences for which he served 6 months and 12 months.

Mother's peception of the event

Terry's arrest did not come as a complete surprise to Marion as she had been warned by a friend that the police were looking for him. However, she still felt "very bad" when he was eventually arrested, and most "bitter" with the three year sentence he received. She thought the length of sentence was most unfair as the man arrested with her husband only received 18 months. Marion feels guilty that she was unable to attend the trial and "speak up" for her husband due to the birth of her third child.

Feelings towards the husband

Marion seems resigned to her husband's criminal activities and does not blame anyone for the event. She knew what he was doing but could do nothing to stop him. As she says: "he's like that, it's just him". She adds that she married him therefore she has to "stand by him". Marion's feelings towards her husband have remained unchanged since his

imprisonment. She still considers him to be part of the family and believes he is a good father and an "average" husband.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Marion says that she has had enormous difficulties managing the family's finances and controlling the children. Although the family lived on social security before her husband's arrest, he would supplement this with "money he got doing various jobs", thus they were able to buy "better food", clothes and toys for the children, and go out to places such as bingo and the local social club. An additional financial burden for Marion is the cost of one of the two visits she makes each month to the prison (the other is paid by social security). She complains that after all the sacrifices she makes to take the children to visit their father, the prison does not offer any facilities to occupy them so that she could have some time to talk alone with her husband.

Marion has found it difficult taking over her husband's role as disciplinarian and adopts a fatalistic attitude towards the situation: "life must go on" and "when he's back he'll put things right". Meanwhile she "cannot think" and takes "everyday as it comes". During the last year the children have become "aggressive" and "a bit out of hand"; they do not obey her and do "just as they want". When Marion tries to control them, they become "cheeky". Both Jamie and Laura have also had problems at school. Jamie's teacher told Marion that he has been "pulling and pushing" other children, and Laura's school work has deteriorated. Marion's response to the children's misbehaviour has been to threaten them that their father will punish them when he returns home.

The problems Marion has had with the children and managing the finances has made her feel "sick and depressed", and for long periods: "I just sit down doing nothing". Marion longs for the day when her husband will be released so that he can "take them in hand". Until then she "will just carry on".

A further problem for Marion has been coping with the baby as he was only two months old when her husband went to prison. She had a cesarian and experienced a very difficult recovery. Her daughter has not helped the situation as "she's got a very bad attitude" toward her whenever she asks her to help. However, as this is her husband's third sentence, Marion says that "nothing is new" to her, and that she can manage "one way or another".

At the time of the second interview, Marion had stopped working in the evenings as her husband had been released. The family had returned to their previous routine; the

father had taken over the disciplinarian role and was seeking employment.

Explanation of the event to the child

Marion simply told the children "he's gone away again". She says that she did not have to elaborate as the event was widely publicised in the newspapers. The children became very upset; Jamie became very quiet and did not want to leave the house; Laura cried frequently and was "very angry at everybody". They also had to cope with abusive remarks such as "arse holes", "your dad's in the papers", and "he's gone to prison" from their friends at school.

Support system

Generally, Marion does not interact with her neighbours and does not expect any help from them. The same is true for Marion's and her husband's families, as they both live in Ireland, although his father continues to send some money to Laura and makes telephone calls to Marion. Marion's friends have been supportive by visiting her frequently.

Marion does not receive any help from the social services or the prisoner's wives organisation. She says that no one has offered her any help, and she will never ask "any of these people". She explains that the first time her husband went to prison she went to the social security for help and they sent her to the social services, who in turn sent her back to the social security. Marion does not know what the social services are supposed to do, but after this experience she does not "bother with them" as she thinks they do not want to help her. Marion says that she saw the probation officer only once when he had to make a report, and he only wanted to know if she was going to have her husband back. Marion believes they are not interested in her or the children: "they only want to check on you".

Child's perception of parents

Jamie says that he "has no problems" with his mother and gets on "very well" with her, except when he asked her a bicycle and she would not give him one. He emphasises that "I like my mum the best" and she is his favourite adult to go to if he wants to talk about his problems, although if he were in trouble he would go to different people depending on the situation. He stresses that he would not get in trouble with the police, but if he had a fight at school, he would go to the "lady who writes letters" as "she's got first aid and would put a plaster on you". However, if it was serious trouble he would go to his mother as he believes she would help him and listen to him. When he tells her his problems she does not "shout back" and does not tell him "to go away".

Jamie misses his father very much and he often imagines that "he's still here". He explains that he sits in front of the arm chair where his father used to sit and thinks he is still there, and this thought "calms me down". However, Jamie does not feel that he can tell his father his problems as he would most probably punish him. He insists that his father's imprisonment has not made any difference to the way he feels about him: "he's still my dad". Unlike his mother, his father does not always keep his promises. For example, his father promised he could watch "children's TV" when he returned from school, but he did not keep his promise and "he watched horse racing as usual". However, he believes that his father is going to keep his promise of taking him fishing as soon as he returns home.

At the time of the second interview, Jamie was deeply disappointed with his father. He says that his father does not understand him and he does not keep his promises. Jamie cannot elaborate on the former, but concerning the latter he says that he never kept the promises he made during prison visits of taking him fishing or buying a dog. For Jamie, the best aspect about his father is when he gives him money, and the worst, when he does not give him money. Jamie now says that he does not confide in anyone as he cannot trust anyone.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Initially, Jamie learned about his father's imprisonment through a report in the newspaper. His mother confirmed that his father "was nicked again", but she did not give any explanation about the event. Jamie said: "well he did some burglary". However, he says that he does not know what really happened, and therefore, he cannot blame anyone. He only knows that he felt very sad and "pretty bad" when his father went to prison. Jamie thinks that his father shouldn't have committed the offence "because it's bad", but he adds that he should not be punished "because he did not take a lot".

At the time of the second interview, Jamie did not know who to blame for the event as he still does not know what happened and does not "think about this no more".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment.

Apart from his pocket money being halved and not being able to go to the places he used to go with his father (holidays, fun fair), Jamie cannot think of any other changes in his life since his father's imprisonment. He says that "nothing much" has changed, the only important difference is his father not being at home. They used to play football in the back garden, and his father used to

fix his bicycle. Now the bicycle is too old and as there is no one to fix it, he cannot use it. Jamie also does not have to return home at 5 p.m. as he did when his father was at home; he can now stay out "until late" (It was observed during the various visits to the family that Jamie played with his friends in the street until 10 p.m. while his mother was working).

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Jamie visits his father every second Saturday of the month. He likes to see his father and feels happy to talk about what they are going to do together when he returns home. During the visit he wants to know how his father is keeping and if he will take him fishing when he returns home. He worries if his father is well and what they (the police) can do to him as "they can beat people up". His father reassures him that "they haven't even touched him".

Interaction with friends

Most of Jamie's friends know about his father's imprisonment as it was reported in the local newspapers. Initially, they used to bully him about the matter, but now "they don't say anything anymore". Jamie does not talk about his father with his friends. As he says: "I keep my business to myself".

Moral development interview

Time 1: Jamie thinks that people in general should obey the law "because they could get in prison forever", and they should be punished "because it's bad to break the law".
Moral stage: 2(1)

Time 2: Jamie thinks that people in general should obey the law "because they could go to jail", and they should be punished "because it's bad to steal".
Moral stage: 1

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Jamie in the four sub-scales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	16	9
Social self-peer	4	3
Home-parent	5	3
School-academic	4	3
General self score	58	36

Child's impression of the interview

Jamie felt "bored" during the interview and he thinks that the questions are boring and difficult. However, he does not "mind" to talk about his experience.

Child's perception of the parents

Laura says that, although she argues "a lot" with her mother, she likes her "good personality". Her mother is kind and does not "keep moaning or telling me off. She sits down, talks and understands me". Laura can talk about "personal things" with her mother, such as about her boy friend, therefore she is her favourite adult with whom to confide. Her mother tells her about the old days and her past experiences which Laura thinks "is fun". However, Laura adds that her mother does not always listen to her as her brother gets all the attention now that her father is in prison. She explains that her brother "always interferes" and her mother "lets him carry on". According to Laura, she is her father's "pet", whereas her brother is her mother's "pet".

If in trouble Laura would go to different people depending on the situation. If the trouble was at school, she would go to her teacher as she understands her; if at home, she would talk to her mother as she is able to "sort things out" for her. Laura says that she will accept her father's advice when he returns home, "probably after arguing with him a bit" as he says "things" she does not like. Laura cannot give any examples of what these "things" could be as she does not remember any.

Laura believes she gets on "quite well" with her father and that he spoils her "the most". She likes his "good manners" when he is in company, but does not like it when he "tells her off" because he might send her to bed or hit her. She also does not like her father's laugh and his style of dressing, which is out of fashion. For Laura, her father does not understand "too much" how she feels about things. When she told him how her friends "pick on" her about his imprisonment he just answered: "Oh forget it and nothing else". Although Laura felt really bad when her father was arrested, and at first refused to believe that he could have committed the offence again, his imprisonment has not made any difference to the way she feels about him. If she does something bad her father should tell her what to do, otherwise she would feel that he does not care about her. However, she prefers that her mother tells her what to do because, unlike her father, "she gives in" to her. Laura thinks that she has her father's temper and her mother's "brain", as her mother knows right from wrong and also helps her with her school work.

Child's impression of the interview

Jamie felt "bored" during the interview and he thinks that the questions are boring and difficult. However, he does not "mind" to talk about his experience.

Child's perception of the parents

Laura says that, although she argues "a lot" with her mother, she likes her "good personality". Her mother is kind and does not "keep moaning or telling me off. She sits down, talks and understands me". Laura can talk about "personal things" with her mother, such as about her boy friend, therefore she is her favourite adult with whom to confide. Her mother tells her about the old days and her past experiences which Laura thinks "is fun". However, Laura adds that her mother does not always listen to her as her brother gets all the attention now that her father is in prison. She explains that her brother "always interferes" and her mother "lets him carry on". According to Laura, she is her father's "pet", whereas her brother is her mother's "pet".

If in trouble Laura would go to different people depending on the situation. If the trouble was at school, she would go to her teacher as she understands her; if at home, she would talk to her mother as she is able to "sort things out" for her. Laura says that she will accept her father's advice when he returns home, "probably after arguing with him a bit" as he says "things" she does not like. Laura cannot give any examples of what these "things" could be as she does not remember any.

Laura believes she gets on "quite well" with her father and that he spoils her "the most". She likes his "good manners" when he is in company, but does not like it when he "tells her off" because he might send her to bed or hit her. She also does not like her father's laugh and his style of dressing, which is out of fashion. For Laura, her father does not understand "too much" how she feels about things. When she told him how her friends "pick on" her about his imprisonment he just answered: "Oh forget it and nothing else". Although Laura felt really bad when her father was arrested, and at first refused to believe that he could have committed the offence again, his imprisonment has not made any difference to the way she feels about him. If she does something bad her father should tell her what to do, otherwise she would feel that he does not care about her. However, she prefers that her mother tells her what to do because, unlike her father, "she gives in" to her. Laura thinks that she has her father's temper and her mother's "brain", as her mother knows right from wrong and also helps her with her school work.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Laura discovered about her father's arrest through the newspapers, after which her mother confirmed his arrest but did not give any explanation about the event. Laura says that her father "has done wrong" but "it's not really as bad as something like rape or things like that". She blames the judge for sentencing her father to three years imprisonment; she believes that he has been treated unfairly when compared to the one year sentenced a rapist received.

At the time of the second interview, Laura still thinks that her father should not have committed the offence, "so he keeps himself out of trouble", and reiterates the comparison of his offence with those of a more serious nature like rape or murder.

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Laura complains that her pocket money has been reduced from £5 to £2 per week and that she cannot buy any new clothes, whereas before her father's imprisonment, her mother used to buy her many nice clothes. Laura now has to look after her baby brother in the evenings while her mother works in a pub. She misses her father not being at home to do jobs about the house or to take her out. However, the worse change for Laura is that her father is not there all the time to give her love and attention. She feels "left out" and "very angry" because her brother is her mother's favourite and she is her father's favourite.

At the time of the second interview, Laura was very happy to have her father back home: "everything's back to normal", he takes her to the fair on Sundays and gives her love and attention.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Laura visits her father every other Saturday. She looks forward to seeing him and would not miss a visit: she feels happy when she is with him, but feels sad and depressed when she has to leave him in prison.

Interaction with friends

All Laura's friends know about her father's imprisonment as it was reported in the newspapers. Laura felt really "bad" having to face her friends at school; initially, they used to bully her and would not play with her. Laura would answer them back, and if they become "very bad" and she could not control herself, she would hit them. Children

would say things such as: "at least my dad is not in prison", or "at least my dad is not a burglar". Laura would respond by saying: "shut up, why should you worry about my dad because is not your dad, is it?" At the time of the second interview, the bullying had ceased.

Moral Development interview

Time 1: Laura thinks that people should obey the law "so they don't get into trouble", and should be punished depending on the nature of the offence. If it is a "little thing like taking something from a shop", they should not be punished, but if "it's a big thing like killing people or rape", they should be punished.

Moral Stage: 2

Time 2: Laura thinks that people in general should obey the law "to avoid trouble". In regard to punishment, she says that "sometimes they should be punished and sometimes not; if it's something silly, like taking things from shops, no, but if it's something serious like rape or murder, yes".

Moral stage: 2

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Laura in the four sub-scales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	15	14
Social self-peer	5	7
Home-parents	6	7
School-academic	4	7
General self score	60	70

Child's impression of the interview

Laura says that she likes to talk about her father to someone who can understand the situation. She feels that this has been a good opportunity to express her feelings about him, although she felt a "bit scared" when she knew she was going to be interviewed. However, during the interview she felt "all right" and thinks that some of the questions are easy and some difficult.

FAMILY H

Mother: Judy, 27 years old

Father: William, 26 years old

Children: George and Jean, 8 years old and four weeks respectively.

Demographic data

Family H live in a two-bedroom council flat on an estate in East London. The flat, although littered with baby clothes, is kept fairly clean and tidy.

Judy attended a secondary modern "church school" until the age of 15. She has worked part-time in cleaning and bar work, but never full time. Just before her husband's imprisonment they began a course of "general office work" which they had to give up. William was unemployed and in receipt of social security, although unofficially he worked in a betting shop. At the time of her husband's arrest, Judy was seven months pregnant. During the period between the first and second interviews, William and Judy were married in the prison chapel. Judy is a very talkative, easy going and emotional woman.

Husband's criminal data

Judy's husband was arrested for receiving and handling stolen goods. He was initially released on bail but was re-arrested and remanded in custody after five months for breaking the conditions of his bail. He has served a previous sentence of three years for the same offence. At the time of the second interview, William had been sentenced to 8 years imprisonment.

Mother's perception of the event

For Judy her husband's arrest was a complete surprise. She never thought a thing like that could ever happen to her. She felt completely "devastated" and "collapsed in the chair without being able to say a word". She firmly believes that the police were harassing her husband "like vultures waiting to pounce on him".

Judy learned about her husband's sentence through her aunt, as she could not attend the trial. The shock she felt was so great that she could not cry and felt like a "zombi". When she realised the time he would be away from home, she felt empty and helpless. She states: "having a baby is in itself a moving experience let alone having to face a sentence of eight years imprisonment for my husband". Soon after she began to feel tired and drained which led to her having depression. Judy went to see her doctor, but he only gave her tranquillizers, which she would not take. All she wants is some form of help such as

counselling. Judy feels very angry towards the legal system and believes that the judges are prejudiced "against people like us".

Feelings towards the husband

Judy still loves and cares for William and they have now decided to get married. She says William is a good husband and father and they see "eye to eye" on how to bring up the children. She thinks that William is quite firm with George, and emphasises that he never used to go out "socially", and that he does not drink or smoke. She is adamant that she is going to wait for him and dreads the future without him.

At the time of the second interview, Judy says that, although her husband has some responsibility for the offence, she thinks that he "got mixed up with the wrong crowd of friends", and that he needed help because of his gambling problem.

Currently, she is trying to "make sense" of the whole matter as she is unable to understand, either what her husband was doing on the evening he was arrested, or what went on during the trial.

She says that William is reluctant to talk about the subject and tells her that he just wants to forget everything and start a new life. Judy thinks that this is the "wrong way to go about it" and emphasises that she needs to release her feelings and tensions before she can put all the story "behind her". As she has been loyal and faithful to him she feels she deserves to be trusted. They used to be able to talk before his imprisonment and Judy cannot see any reason why they should not clarify the matter. She knows he has a gambling problem and is prepared to be understanding about the whole affair. Now he realises that he was wrong and Judy has no doubt he has changed. She firmly believes he would not have married her just to make her suffer all these years waiting for him if he intended to return to his old ways.

Judy still considers her husband to be part of the family; he is very close to George and loves her very much. They did not go out very often together as William "just likes to lay down on the settee" with her and watch videos.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

When William was at home he used to look after George if she did not feel well (she suffers from epilepsy), and he did many jobs about the house as she has "a curvature in the spine". Now that he is in prison, Judy struggles to pay all the bills with the money she receives from social security, whereas before he worked in a betting shop and

earned sufficient to keep the family.

Judy found it most difficult and upsetting to cope with the birth of her child without her husband's presence and support. She also finds it a strain to visit him with a young baby as she has to take "buses and trains in the cold and rain, just for a 15 minute visit". She says that the money she spends on fares could be used to buy better food, but she needs to see her husband as much as possible to relieve her anxiety.

Since his arrest, her husband has been moved many times, and on one occasion he was moved to a prison in the north of England and she was unable to see him for six weeks, which was very upsetting for both of them. Judy finds the restrictions placed on physical contact during visits very distressing; they "forbid cuddling or even standing up". Judy thinks it is very difficult to maintain a relationship "only verbally".

Judy has noticed that George demands much more attention from her since William has been in prison. Initially, she thought it was because of the new baby, but then she realised he was very frightened that she could go away too. When Judy was in hospital having the baby, George cried continuously and pleaded with her to come home whenever he visited her.

George's attitude toward the police has become hostile. When he sees them on television he makes very "low comments" about them. He would often ask Judy "why do they keep coming for him? and "why do they follow him?" She tells him that they wanted her father convicted, but does not elaborate further.

Judy dreads to think about Christmas as George is asking for many toys and she does not have any money. She feels very upset at the prospect of having to explain to him that she only receives £26 from the social security and cannot afford to buy any toys. Recently, George has been trying to emulate his father's keep fit "fanaticism" and repeatedly shows his mother how his muscles are developing.

At the time of the second interview, Judy says that, although she is determined to wait for her husband as long as necessary, she finds it difficult to cope alone with the practical and emotional problems of the family. By this she refers to: "struggling to pay all the bills" and bringing up two children with the money she receives from social security; not being able to rely on her husband when she is ill; and having to travel 10 hours (6 hours to arrive at the prison and 4 to return home) to visit her husband with her two children. Judy also complains that the visiting room is too crowded and the children do not keep quiet. She finds it very difficult to control the children when they

have to queue and there is nothing to entertain them. Judy says that she does not take the children to the prison as frequently as she would like to see her husband, as she cannot have a "normal" conversation with him when they are there. She adds that since his imprisonment her husband has become very insecure, and this has led to arguments over "petty little things". She explains that his imagination "runs wild" about what she is supposed to be doing at home, and once, when he forbade her to go out alone, she had to remind him that she has two children and has to carry on her life as normal as possible.

Judy complains bitterly that, at the moment, she has "all the bad things of the marriage", such as no support and no physical contact, and feels very lonely and isolated, "couped up in the flat all day and all night". She has become moody, angry and irritable, and George has suffered the consequence as she shouts at him over the most trivial matters. However, Judy "desperately" misses her husband's presence and thinks of him "every minute of the day". She recognises that if their relationship had finished she could get on with her life, but as she is now a married woman, and has decided to remain so, she cannot pretend that he does not exist, and therefore cannot reorganise her life.

Since the last interview, George has been answering his mother back and wants to sleep in her bed, but Judy does not allow him to do so. George's teacher has also complained that he does not sit still, or pay attention to what is said to him. Judy finds this behaviour completely out of character as he was normally a very compliant and sensible child.

Explanation of the event to the child

At first Judy did not tell George anything about his father's arrest as he was released on bail. But when he was re-arrested for breaking his bail, and brought back to the flat by the police, George witnessed the event. He was on his own at the time as Judy had gone to the corner shop. He opened the door to confront his father in handcuffs accompanied by 12 policemen who searched the flat for evidence. Judy returned after "minutes" and when faced the situation her legs became like "jelly" and she was "shaking all over". As George was crying and very scared, a policeman told him he could sit on his father's lap, which reassured him for a while. But when his father left the flat with the police, George started to cry and stamp his feet, shouting "Oh no, no, no, it's not fair" and demanded to know why the police wanted his father. Judy said to George that the police needed a conviction for the offence, and were harassing his father.

At the time of the second interview, Judy says that she

never really "sat down" with Geroge and explained the whole matter to him. She does not know what to say to him as she is not sure what occurred herself. He only knows that the police took his father away to prison and that he has to stay there for a long time.

Support System

Judy's neighbours have been very good to her, however, she believes that they do not make any connection between the absence of her husband and his imprisonment, otherwise they would probably become hostile towards her. The newspapers described her husband as a "callous monster who would pray on elderly and disabled people". Apart from her sister, Judy's family rarely visit her. Her parents have never offered support as they think she has sufficient strength to carry on without their help. Judy's main source of help comes from William's mother, who makes regular visits often bringing groceries or a cooked dinner. Judy has one friend who visits her everyday and gives her "moral support". However, at the second interview their relationship came to an end after an argument over the reporting of her husband's offence in the newspaper. This friend said that the newspaper and the police were telling the truth and that her husband was lying.

For Judy, the social services do not have the right attitude as they do not want to know what kind of help a person needs. When she approached them for advice and support, they suggested she should ask for help to her mother, with whom she was not talking at the time. She is also frightened that they may take the children into care. Judy was offered help from a prisoners' wives organisation and she receives visits from one of their workers. They have paid for a one-week holiday for her and the children and sent money at Christmas.

Child's perception of parents

George says that he has always got on well with his mother, but since his father's imprisonment she has been crying and shouting at him, which upsets and confuses him. If he could, he would make his mother "happier". He is also very frightened that his mother might be taken away like his father, and feels very anxious when she goes out without him.

George chooses his mother as his favourite adult with whom to confide. She can understand his problems better than his father, as she is "under more pain than me" as a result of his father's absence, and she knows everything about him, therefore she is able to comfort him. His mother also understands when he gets hurt and tries to help him. But currently she is not keeping her promises as she used to. She promises to buy George presents and then says that she

does not have sufficient money. He adds that when he is older and has children, he will "get money and give it to them everytime they ask". George is very upset as before his father's imprisonment they promised to buy him a bicycle for his birthday, but now his mother cannot afford it.

If in trouble, George would talk to his mother, although he says that he can talk to his father and would be very happy if he could do that now. His father's imprisonment has not affected George's trust in him and he still loves him. His father does not "get in a temper" with him, but rather listens to him and understands when he is angry and upset. He believes that he gets on well with his father and that he keeps his promises most of the time. They would often "sit down and talk" together. What George likes most about his father is that he gives him pocket money, but he does not like it when he sends him to bed.

At the time of the second interview, George believes that his father understands him "a bit", but he prefers his mother to tell him what to do. He says that when his father returns home he will talk to him as well, but not about serious problems. Currently, his father cannot give him any advice or help as he does not "see what's happening at home". However, George thinks that his father is the same person as before his imprisonment and that he gets on well with him. George does not remember if his father kept his promises or not, but he remembers how he used to enjoy fighting with him.

Child's attribution of responsibility

George vividly remembers when his father was arrested and returned home with the police. He was alone at the time, and when he opened the door he was shocked to see his father handcuffed to two policemen. They came in and five sat down while the others walked around the flat. George felt very frightened and began to cry. He felt "a bit better" when his father told him to sit on his lap. After searching the flat, the police took his father away. George thought they might beat his father, but he does not know why he thinks this. At the time, he thought that his father would return home soon.

Although George says that he does not know why his father is in prison as his mother did not explain anything to him, he stresses that the accusations made against him "are all lies" and that his father is "really kind and don't hurt anybody". He blames "those who got my dad in trouble" for his imprisonment, but he does not have a clear idea who those people are. George is adamant that his father "definitely didn't do it, is all a lie, therefore he should be free, because "he don't hurt anybody or anything".

At the time of the second interview, George still does not understand what really happened and does not know clearly why his father is in prison. He explains that when his father was on bail, the police were outside the flat watching him, which for George they were not supposed to be doing: "they want just to put my dad in prison". The police saw his father going out after 9 p.m. and then "grabbed and handcuffed him". George knows all this because he "saw some policemen round the corner" hours before his father's arrest.. George adds that he does not know what happened: "I really don't understand what's going on". He maintains that his father should not be in prison, because "whatever he's done it's not his fault, because he's a kind man and wouldn't hurt anybody".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

For George, the main change is the family's reduction in financial resources; he does not receive any pocket money, new clothes or presents, nor does his mother take him out. George feels very sad and angry when his friends talk about their fathers and tell him what presents they are going to receive for Christmas. He believes that his mother could do something about it. He also feels his mother has changed and become very "miserable" and does not give him the attention she used to. George also misses the "exercise to keep fit" he used to do with his father.

At the time of the second interview, George still thinks that the main change is the lack of financial resources. However, he feels "less sad" since the last interview, as his mother does not now cry all the time. He goes on to say that his mother feels worse than him, which upsets George because he cannot do anything to help her.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

George cannot say how often he visits his father, although he likes to see him and to talk with him about his friends. However, he feels very frustrated as the visits only last for 15 minutes and he cannot say everything he wants as his mother has many "important things" to decide with his father.

After his father's conviction, George visits him once a month. Although he looks forward to seeing his father, he becomes bored with the long trip to the prison and feels upset during the visits as his mother talks with his father "most of the time".

Interaction with friends

George has many friends and likes the ones who agree to play the games he wants. He never mentions his father to

his friends, and believes that none of them know about his father's imprisonment. If someone asks about his father he says that "he works very hard and comes home late".

Moral judgment Interview

Time 1: George thinks that people in general should obey the law because they can "get into trouble if you don't", and they should be punished because "they know they are doing the wrong thing".

Moral stage: 2

Time 2: George thinks that people in general should obey the law "because you could go to prison", and they should be punished because "they are doing something wrong" and "the judge cares about it".

Moral stage: 2/3

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by George in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	19	16
Social self-peer	7	7
Home-parents	6	7
School-academic	5	2
General self score	74	64

Child's impression of the interview

George feels "a bit sad" talking about his father, but he is happy to have had the opportunity to express what he feels about the situation. He thinks the questions are difficult.

FAMILY I

Mother: Julia, 27 years old

Father: Charles, 26 years old

Children: Tanya, Larry, Mary and Rosa. Ages 10, 8, 6, and 3 years respectively.

Demographic data

Family I live in a four-bedroom council flat in north London. The flat is clean and relatively tidy. Julia attended school until the age of 15. Julia went to live with Charles soon after she became pregnant when she was 16 years old. Before his arrest, Charles worked as a coach driver for a travel firm, but, according to Julia, he never contributed much financially to maintaining the family. Social security benefits have always been her main source of income.

Husband's criminal data

Charles was arrested for stabbing a man he found with Julia on an occasion he arrived home from work unexpectedly. Charles was released on bail, but subsequently sentenced to five years imprisonment for grievous bodily harm. At the time of the first interview, Charles had been convicted and served 7 months of the sentence. This is his first offence. At the time of the second interview, Charles had successfully appealed against his sentence and it was reduced to two years. During the past year he has spent two weekends at home on leave.

Mother's perception of the event

After her husband's offence, Julia called an ambulance and accompanied the victim to the hospital where she was interviewed by the police. She felt so angry with Charles that she told the police where they could probably find him. She felt "shattered" and extremely "frightened" about the consequences of the event and did not know what to do. She used to wander around the house aimlessly unable to think or do anything.

Julia also finds the judicial system totally confusing. She thinks that the trial was most unfair as it was over in "five minutes" and the barrister was "useless". When Charles was sentenced to five years, Julia was totally shocked: "I heard the words but they didn't sink in". She thought that her husband would receive a much lighter sentence. Julia feels responsible for the event, although she never expected her husband to react so violently. She says that she felt sorry for the victim and visited him many times in hospital, which has provoked arguments with Charles. Although Julia believes that she bears the main

responsibility for the event and feels very guilty, she also thinks that all involved are to blame: her husband for reacting violently, and because he should not leave her alone for long periods of time; the victim for his lack of sense for going to her flat, rather than taking her to his own house; and herself, because she should not have taken her boy friend to her flat.

Feelings towards the husband

At the beginning of his imprisonment, Charles used to write "horrible" letters to Julia but she just read "between the lines" and persevered in trying to save their relationship. She likes and appreciates Charles more now than before his imprisonment, and has realised that her relationship with the victim was only infatuation and would never have worked. Julia is aware that she and her husband still have many problems to resolve, but she now believes that everything has improved and that they have a future together. She goes on to say that maybe this event, as bad as it is, had to happen to make them realise how much they needed each other. At the time of the second interview, Julia had given birth to her 5th child, which was conceived whilst Charles was on bail awaiting trial.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Julia has felt lonely and depressed since Charles has been in prison, even though he used to be away working most of the time. She says that, financially, she has not been affected as he never gave her a significant amount of money, although he used to take the family out and buy many things for the children. However, Julia adds that she finds it difficult to pay the fares for five children to visit the prison.

A major change for Julia has been her attempt to reorganise her life, that is, to give up drinking and to improve her relationship with Charles. To this end, she is seeking spiritual help through the Church, and practical support from prisoners' families organisations.

A major difficulty for Julia has been to come to terms with the guilt she feels for her role in the event, which has been exacerbated by the emotional blackmail imparted by the children. For example, on some occasions when Julia tries to enforce discipline, they remind her of her own misbehaviour of having a man in the house.

In general, Julia does not find controlling the children to be more of a problem since Charles's imprisonment, as he was rarely at home before. She says that she has not noticed any radical changes in the children, which she believes is a result of their immaturity: "they don't really understand what is going on", therefore, "they

carry-on as usual". However, Julia acknowledges that she cannot say how much this situation has affected the children as they do not show their emotions: "something might be killing them inside, but they would just shrug their shoulders as if it's nothing to do with them", which apparently was their reaction when she told them that their father would be home soon.

Julia says that Charles is very close to Larry "as he's a boy", and although he did not have much time to interact with his son, he used to take him to work whenever he could.

At the time of the second interview, Julia still finds it very difficult to cope with her feelings of insecurity, particularly since the baby was born. It was "horrible" for her when the baby was born as Charles was not there to see his son and share the proud feelings of having a new baby in the family. Charles continually reminds her that what he had done was totally her fault, which has resulted in Julia having a low opinion of herself. His attitude has led to disagreements and resentments, particularly over the fact that she has five children by him and he is still reluctant to marry her. She tries to reassure him that she has changed "drastically", and that her decision to stop drinking and live "peacefully" with him and the children is a serious one. However, he is still suspicious of her good intentions and does not fully trust her. During his weekend leave he was "on edge", concerned about her drinking. For example, he was annoyed when a friend of Julia came to the flat with a bottle of wine.

Since the last interview, the children have become more settled. As a consequence of the change in Julia's life style they seem happier and more relaxed. They do not return home from school to a flat with "half a dozen blokes" there, and a mother with "a can of beer in her hands". Currently, they attend school regularly and their work has improved.

Explanation of the event to the child

Julia told the children the truth "in the best possible way". She told them that she was unhappy with their father's absence and that she met someone else. Their father was very angry as he did not want Julia with another man. Their father had a fight with this man and he stabbed him and went to prison for that. She also told them that this was a good lesson for never using any kind of weapon.

The children listened to the explanation but did not make any comment. The only reaction Julia noticed was that they just stared at her as if she had gone "mad". Julia believes that they are shy like their father, and adds that something may kill them inside but they don't know how to

express it, they just carry on". After Julia's explanation to the children, she has not mentioned the matter anymore. She has decided to explain the whole event in more detail when they are old enough to understand, then she will "put my side of the story" because she does not want the children to think bad of her.

Support Systems

Both neighbours and friends have been supportive to Julia during the crisis period. But the main financial and emotional support has been provided by Julia's parents with whom she has maintained a close relationship. Charles's mother has also been supportive and Julia attends church with her. However, Charles's brother feels that Julia is responsible for Charles's imprisonment and does not want any further contact with her, going so far as to forbid her to visit her mother-in-law. Julia attends a prisoner's wives organisation where she can talk about her problems. They help her by giving the children clothes and presents at Christmas.

At the time of the second interview, Julia says that she does not now interact with her friends as they are "shocked" that she could stop drinking. They did not think that she had the strength to abstain for so long. Julia is proud of her will power, for she has proved to them all that she could do it.

Child's perception of parents

Tanya says that she gets on "all right" with her mother as she rarely "tells me off", and chooses her as her favourite adult with whom to confide. Tanya believes that her mother understands her, and only she should tell her what to do "because she is right most of the time" and "she won't shout". She would only change her mother's belly "because it's too fat and horrible" (Tanya's mother is pregnant).

Tanya believes that she takes after her father as she is shy like him and likes to tell jokes like he does. Telling jokes is what Tanya most likes about her father, as long as the jokes and laughs are directed at someone else and not at her. However, Tanya feels that she cannot tell her father any of her problems as he does not understand her. He does not listen to her or take her seriously and always laughs at what she has to say. For example, if someone beats her and she tells her father, he would say that she is weak, tell her to hit the person back, and then laugh at her. Tanya believes that he listens only to "the boys", but not "the girls". However, she thinks that her father should tell her what to do, and his imprisonment has not made any difference to the way she feels about him. The best aspect about her father is when he sings and tells jokes to her, and the worst is that he does not take her out very

frequently. He also hits her, but she does not know why. Tanya thinks that her father takes her brother out more often because he is a boy.

At the time of the second interview, Tanya still chooses her mother as her favourite adult with whom to confide as she believes that she understands her, listens to her and gives her good advice. If she had problems at school, Tanya would talk to her teacher as she would understand and help her like her mother.

Both, mother and father only keep their promises sometimes; her father never keeps his promise of taking her out, and her mother changes her mind frequently about allowing her to play out.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Tanya knows that her father is in prison for stabbing a man. Her mother told her about the event but she cannot remember what kind of explanation she gave her. She only remembers that she felt very sad and frightened and could not believe that this had happened. Tanya heard her mother and father shouting from the bedroom and thought that he was killing her mother. She was very frightened and did not move until everything went quiet, then she went down the stairs and saw the man lying on the floor. Her mother and father were not there and she felt scared that the police would take her away.

Tanya blames her mother's boy friend for the event because "this man shouldn't be in the flat". She thinks that her father should not have committed the offence as it is not "right". She also thinks that her father should be punished, but the judge should have given him "only a very small sentence". At the time of the second interview, Tanya says that she does not think about the matter anymore and tries to forget the event.

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Tanya says that she misses her father's presence even though when he was at home he talked to her brother most of the time. Tanya also misses not being able to go out with him to interesting places such as "truck racing", when he would buy her crisps, coke and lots of rides. Another change for Tanya, is that since her father's imprisonment, she is allowed to touch the television and make a noise in her room, whereas before this was forbidden. She also now has to clean her room and look after her baby brother; she hates cleaning the room, but likes looking after her baby brother.

Tanya says that during the weekend her father was at home

on leave she felt very happy, but she is worried about when he returns permanently because of the restrictions he imposes, which she is not used to anymore.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Tanya visits her father twice a month. She feels very happy when she is with him, but during the visit she does not say anything as her "mother does all the talking" and there is no time left for her.

Interaction with friends

Tanya has many friends. The quality she most likes about in friends is kindness, because if they are kind they do not run away from her. She believes that her friends do not know about her father's imprisonment. If someone wants to beat her up she would threaten to get her father and they would be scared.

Moral Development Interview

Time 1: Tanya thinks that people in general should obey the law, although she does not know why, and they should be punished because they have done "something wrong".
Moral stage: 1/2

Time 2: Tanya thinks that people in general should obey the law because "it's the law", and they should be punished, "otherwise they might do the same thing again".
Moral stage: 2(3)

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Tanya in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	11	13
Social self-peer	6	4
Home-parents	5	4
School-academic	3	2
General self score	50	46

Child's impression of the interview

Initially Tanya felt very shy to answer the questions, but now she feels happy to be able to talk about her father. She thinks the questions are easy.

Child's perception of parents

Larry says that in general he gets on "all right" with his mother. He likes her the most when she buys him things such as sweets, but he does not like her when she "smacks him".

Larry thinks he takes after his mother because "she advises me and I do shout a lot also". However, he says he would like to be like the "Wonder Cat because he's big and strong". Larry chooses his mother as his favourite adult in whom to confide as she understands him. If in trouble he would also go to his mother, and if she is not available he would go to his father, as he understands him as well. He adds that when his father returns home he will talk to him about his problems because "I like my dad a lot". Larry enjoys the interaction he has with his father, particularly when he takes him out, picks him up and gives him swings, tells jokes and chases him around the house.

At the time of the second interview, Larry still feels he can confide in his mother as she "cuddles" him, but he thinks that she does not understand him when she makes him do household chores. such as washing the dishes or sweeping the stairs.

Larry thinks that he takes after his father as he looks like him and "says the same things" as he does. For example, like his father. Larry does not like people encouraging his mother to drink, such as when his mother's friend comes to the flat and "makes my mum drink when she's trying to stop it". Larry is not sure if he would talk to his father if he were in trouble, as he does not listen to what he has to say anymore. For example, on one occasion during the weekend he spent at home, Larry asked his father where he was going, but he did not answer and "just drove off". Larry thinks this is because he has other things on his mind or he just wants to be on his own. He felt very disappointed with his father's attitude for he expected him to say: "do you want to come"?

Larry also complains that his father now shouts at him, even if he just knocks at the door, and reprimands him for little things, such as when he was washing the window and his father told him angrily that he dropped too much water on the floor. He feels that he does not "deserve" to be "told off all the time" by his father.

For Larry the best thing about his father is when he takes him out, particularly to visit his friends, even though he has not done so from sometime. Larry quickly adds that his father loves him "the same because sometime he takes me out". Larry thinks that his father keeps his promises sometimes, but he could not elaborate as he has not been at home for a long time.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Larry says that his father is in prison for fighting a man. He (father) was angry because he was away working and when he returned home "he killed this man". His mother told him about the event but Larry cannot remember what she said to him as it happened a "long time ago". He only remembers that he felt very scared when he heard his mother and father screaming. He thought that his father was killing his mother and laid in bed as quiet as he could. When he did not hear any more "noises", he and his sister went down stairs and saw the man lying on the floor. He did not see his father or his mother and was very frightened that someone would take him away.

Larry blames his mother for the event. As he says: "because she goes off to the pub, pick up this man and brought him home". He thinks that his father should have committed the offence, because "he loves my mum and he did not want that man to love her, so he killed him". He thinks that his father should be free "because the man did not die.

At the time of the second interview, Larry still blames his mother for bringing the man back to the flat. He believes his father was right to "kill this man" as Larry did not like him because he had a "bald thing on his head like a patch". Larry thinks his father should not be punished as "it's not my dad's fault and the man did not die".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

When his father "left", Larry felt very sad because "there isn't a man in the house to talk to" and, although he likes to talk to his mother, it is not the same as "she's not a man". There is also no one to chase him round the house and he cannot go in the coach with his father anymore. Larry emphasises that he does not enjoy doing anything with his mother, and it is difficult for him to cope with not going "everywhere with my dad" and having to "sit indoors watching television all the time".

When his father was at home, Larry used to receive many presents at Christmas and on his birthday, but now he gets only a "few small presents". However, he is now allowed to touch the television, whereas before he had to ask his father's permission. He goes on to say that he still loves his father and felt happy when he spent the weekend with the family. Larry thinks that his father has "changed a bit" and does not understand him anymore; he now has a beard and long hair, which Larry does not like; his father now shouts at him and does not take him out as he used to before his imprisonment. Larry also says that his father looked scared as his face was "cramped up". He believes this was because the police wanted him to serve more years

in prison.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Larry visits his father fortnightly. Although he looks forward to the visits, he feels frustrated as he cannot talk with him as his mother is "always talking and doesn't give me a chance, so I give up". He would like it if his mother gave him more time to talk to his father. During the visits he feels sad, but does not know why.

Interaction with friends

Larry's friends know about his father's imprisonment as they heard their mothers talking about the subject. Although his mother told him not to say anything to anyone, she eventually told everyone the story of his father's arrest. However, no one is bullying him about his father's imprisonment. Larry never talks about his father with his friends because he feels embarrassed and believes that they may laugh at him. If they ask about his father, he tells them he is on holiday.

Moral development interview

Time 1: Larry thinks that people in general should obey the law, because "if they don't they get arrested", and they should be punished "because they've been "naughty".

Moral stage: 2(1)

Time 2: Larry thinks that people in general should obey the law otherwise they "go to prison"; and should be punished because they should not have committed the offence as it is against the law.

Moral stage: 2

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Larry in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	18	15
Social self-peer	5	7
Home-parents	5	5
School-Academic	5	3
General self score	66	60

Child's impression of the interview

When Larry's mother told him about the interview he felt scared as he thought that he was going to be forced to answer the questions, even if he did not know the answers. But during the interview he did not feel scared, he just felt "a bit shy" and proud of his performance. He says that the questions are difficult.

FAMILY J

Mother: Doreen, 36 years old

Father: John, 39 years old

Children: Robert and Dennis, 19 and 14 years old respectively.

Demographic data

Family J live in a two-bedroom flat on a council estate in East London. It is a run down inner city estate, lacking greenery and a play area for children. Although the flat is kept fairly tidy, it has not been cleaned for a long time.

Doreen attended school until the age of 15 and married her husband when she was 16 years old, already pregnant with her eldest son. She returned to college when she was 28 years old to study short-hand and typing and worked as a secretary until the time of her husband's first conviction. Before his arrest, her husband had his own building maintenance business. Due to the pressure of work they both started to take heroin "to relax". Eventually John's business went into decline and he began to deal in drugs and receive social security benefits.

Doreen is a pleasant and friendly woman, although she has an apathetic attitude towards life, and expresses feelings of hopelessness for the future.

Husband's criminal data

John was arrested for conspiracy to supply and sell drugs. He has a previous conviction for a similar offence, for which he received a prison sentence of 18 months, three years ago John has a history of "being in trouble" with the police between the age of 10 and 16 years of age. During this period he engaged in petty crime such as "pinching cars" or "taking things from people's shops and houses". John's mother was a "fence" (one who buys and sells stolen goods), therefore, he had an early introduction to crime. By the time of the second interview, Doreen's husband had been sentenced to four years imprisonment.

Mother's perception of the event

Doreen says that her husband's arrest was not totally unexpected as he was dealing in drugs from their own flat, and about five weeks before his arrest, two policemen warned him that they had received a complaint from a neighbour about his drug dealing. He did not take any notice of the warning and carried on dealing.

When her husband was arrested, Doreen had "mixed feelings": on the one hand, she felt very lonely, depressed and desperate to talk to someone, but on the other hand, she

felt relieved because now she could "sort myself out" by trying to stop taking drugs, and decide whether or not she wanted to divorce. She feels that if she is going to "stay sane, carry on working and bring up the children" she has to stay off of drugs. According to Doreen, "the only way of staying away from drugs is to separate from my husband". This is because she feels that when her husband returns home she will not have the strength to stay off of heroin as he would provide the drug free. Doreen believes that she is able to stop taking drugs, unlike her husband, who needs "a crutch to live".

At the second interview, Doreen says she felt relieved when her husband was sentenced to four-years imprisonment. She says that now she has time to organise her life without his influence and a free supply of drugs.

Feelings towards the husband

Doreen feelings toward her husband have changed since his imprisonment. She says that they are still friends, but she does not "fancy him anymore sexually". She also does not now consider him to be part of the family. He does not contribute as a father or as a husband as he is now totally "obsessed" with taking and dealing in drugs. She goes on to say that he is "very weak, don't seem to try, he gives in too easily and don't seem to aim to anything. He's quite happy to plod along". Although she feels very bitter and hopeless about her future, she still tries to fight "to get somewhere".

At the time of the second interview, Doreen still feels very angry with her husband, particularly in regard to his weakness to deal with his drug addiction. She thinks that if he really loved her and the children, as he repeatedly tells them, he would have the strength to stop the habit. Doreen knows, by being an addict herself, how difficult it is to give up drugs as it becomes a "way of life". However, if her husband agreed to do something about his addiction, she would not have decided to separate from him. What made her decide finally to separate was his admission, whilst in prison, that he had no intention of trying to stop his habit. In fact, he is still taking drugs in the prison, smuggled in by his family during visits.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

The main difficulty for Doreen to cope with is being alone in the flat. Despite her two sons being at home, she feels very lonely and insecure about her ability to handle the situation. Doreen has also experienced "weird" feelings of helplessness; she would wander around the flat not knowing what to do, or would "just sit down with a blank mind". She longs to have someone to talk to, but her family live far away and she cannot count on her friends as they are not in

the "drug scene". She has had treatment for drug abuse during the last year.

Financially, Doreen's life has changed drastically. Until his arrest, her husband provided for all their financial needs. In addition, due to her depression, she lost her job as a secretary, therefore now she experiences extreme hardship having to manage on social security. For example, the telephone was disconnected as she could not afford to pay the bill. Two days prior to the interview, she began a part-time job in a local pub to supplement her social security benefits.

According to Doreen, Dennis has become very sad and quiet, since his father's imprisonment whereas before, he was always "hyperactive". He frequently "sits down and looks into the air" and he does not sleep enough. Recently, Dennis seems to have lost concentration at school and thinks that everything he does is not good enough. She says he lacks confidence and is always putting himself down. Apart from the suffering and insecurity that his father's imprisonment brought to Dennis, Doreen thinks that the area where they live does not help. Dennis has seen too much crime and drug taking; drug dealers sell heroin openly on the estate. The police try to do something, but as fast as they arrest them, "they crop up" again.

Doreen adds that Dennis keeps things to himself, therefore, it is difficult to assess how bad he feels. At the moment he just seems to want a lot of affection rather than talk, so she just cuddles him. But she goes on to say that Dennis has become pessimistic about his future and "worries sick" about his father's well being in the prison. He told Doreen a few days ago, that he is not "going to be able to make anything with his life", and he is worried where he is going to live, or what course he should take when he leaves school.

According to Doreen, Dennis never imagined that his father would be in prison for a second time, and now he is less hopeful that she and his father will ever live together again. When Doreen informed Dennis about her intentions to divorce his father, he was very upset and could not understand why she had to separate from him. Doreen thinks that Dennis sees her as the dominant person in the relationship and "strong enough" to give up drugs and help his father to do the same. She blames herself for this, as she always made excuses for her husband's lack of involvement in the family and lied about his drug dealing. Doreen is surprised and "amazed" by how strongly Dennis is attached to his father, as he has never concerned himself with matters related to bringing up children, and he rarely played games with Dennis or took him out. For Doreen, her husband is not a "family man" as he would not stimulate the children, he would "just sit around or watch the tele".

She repeats that they would rarely go out as a family and that her husband would never "join in"; he either worked or went out alone to the pub. When Dennis asked her where his father was during the evenings, she would tell him that he was working overtime. Dennis and his father rarely had any kind of conversation. Until Dennis was 10 years of age, only Doreen and her mother took him on holiday. She now deeply regrets lying to Dennis for he does not apportion any blame to his father for their separation.

At the time of the second interview, Doreen was still struggling with her financial situation and her feelings of loneliness. Although working four days a week in the local pub gives her motivation to leave the flat, she still feels hopeless and depressed for not being able to find a full-time job with sufficient money which would enable her to pay all the bills and have some left over to enjoy herself. So far, all the full-time jobs Doreen has seen advertised would only enable her to pay the housekeeping. To indicate her frustration Doreen states: "I'm not getting up seven in the morning, getting home seven in the evening, worrying about the kids, worrying what is going on round here and not been able to go out for a drink at the end of the week. I'd rather go and rob first". She goes on to say that during the last few months, and for the first time in her life, she has been shoplifting. As nobody helps her, she "helps herself". She says that she even enjoys it as she feels she is "getting a bit of the cake for a change".

Doreen also feels very lonely, and questions bitterly why only "drifts and walleys" ask her out. Doreen is still not using heroin, but says that most probably she would be taking it if her husband was at home. She adds that she does not blame her husband for her addiction, but only the fact that he makes the drug freely available to her, "that's something I can't resist".

Doreen says that Dennis is still very upset and miserable; he loves his father and forgives him for everything he has done. In addition, he is taking their divorce badly and although he does not talk about it, she knows that he still hopes that they will get together again. Dennis is always insisting that she visits her husband in prison in the belief that they will eventually "sort things out" between them. Her husband does not help the situation by saying to Dennis that he still wants to live with Doreen, thereby building up his hopes. Doreen adds angrily that she is tired of being the strong one, and suggests that she may be rebelling to all these expectations by showing to them that she cannot cope. She used to be "house proud", but now the flat is "filthy" and needs decorating.

Explanation of the event to the child

The first time Doreen's husband was imprisoned she told Dennis half of the truth. That is, she only mentioned about the cannabis but not the heroin. This time, however, she told Dennis the whole truth. Her husband was arrested while Dennis was on holiday and when he returned Doreen told him what had happened. She says that she did not have to explain anything to Dennis as he followed all the process of the trial, she just informed him of the length of the sentence.

Dennis became very upset and often cried. She emphasises that Dennis cried so much that it was painful for her to witness his distress, but she tried to comfort him by "cuddling him". Dennis appears to understand why his father had to go to prison, but "what kept Dennis going" is that he firmly believes that his father "will be home eventually and everything will be okay again", even though Doreen has made it clear to him that this is not going to happen.

Support System

Doreen has become close to her next-door neighbour, but she does not speak with the others. She has discovered that their offer to help was only a way of getting information about her life and then "gossip about it".

Although Doreen's family is very upset about the event, they like her husband very much as he "has an appealing nature". However, they live far from London and therefore cannot help her. Furthermore, it is very difficult for her to talk about her problems with her mother as she always made her feel inadequate. Doreen recognises that her mother has had a very "tough" life, but she does not realise that Doreen is different from her and needs help.

Doreen has no contact with her husband's family. They have "different ways of doing things", and she believes that they "hate her" for being an addict and for not helping her husband to stop taking drugs.

Doreen does not receive any help from the social services, but if anyone offered her help she would be happy to receive it. The type of help she would most appreciate, would be counselling with someone understanding. She has had therapeutic treatment in the past, but for a reason she has forgotten, she left.

Child's perception of parents

Dennis believes that he gets on "well" with his mother when she is happy, but not when "she has the hump and mucks around". She does not give him the attention he needs and is not interested in what is going on around her. When his

mother becomes upset, Dennis goes to bed and cries. He thinks that his mother gets upset when she thinks about his father. However, Dennis feels much better now that his mother has arranged a part-time job in a pub for he believes this will take her out of her depression.

Dennis says that, unlike his mother, his father does not keep his promises. He "lets me down" frequently. Many Saturdays he promised Dennis to go with him and play snooker but he never did. Dennis thinks he takes after his father. He says his father is a "bit of an idiot", and not as clever as his mother, but he cannot elaborate further.

Dennis chooses his cousin as his favourite adult with whom to confide. He feels that he can talk to his cousin as he understands him and he "keeps things to himself". However, if he had a problem at school he would go to his mother as "she is quite clever and would do something about it". Dennis says that he would not talk about his problems with his father as he does not understand him like his mother. He also believes that his father is not interested in giving him advice and he would not take any action unless the problem was "very, very serious". When asked why he thought his father would not give him advice, Dennis began to stammer. He explains that his father has never "sat down" with him and asked about his problems as his mother does. However, Dennis emphasises that he loves his father and still wants him home as soon as possible. He says the flat is not the same without him, and he feels happy just having his father there. He believes that he gets on "great with his father, particularly when they go out together and "have a laugh". Having "a laugh" is the best aspect of both his father and mother, and the worse is their drug-taking. He knew that his father was taking drugs but he did not know about his mother. Dennis explains that his father has changed completeley (he stopped talking to him and taking him out, he would only give him "a lot of money" and tell him to go out and spend it), but his mother has not, therefore he did not suspect that she was addicted to drugs as well. He discovered about his mother's habit when he caught her taking heroin. She told Dennis that she was only smoking cannabis but Dennis did not believe her as "the stuff crinkled up like tin foil".

At the time of the second interview, Dennis thinks that he gets on "brilliant" with his mother. He cannot think of an example when he does not get on well with her, and emphasises that he can talk with her about any serious issues. She helps him to resolve his problems and makes him feel better. Dennis repeats again and again that his mother is "just brilliant" as she really understands him. He used to confide in his cousin, but as he is taking drugs again, he cannot talk to him anymore.

Although Dennis loves his father and would be very happy if

he returned home, he does not want to be like him and would rather take after his mother. His father has no willpower to stop taking drugs, whereas his mother is "cleverer" than his father because "she knows what she is doing". Dennis believes that he gets on "great" with his father, particularly when they play football or go to snooker clubs together. He is also very happy just to be in his father's company as he makes Dennis laugh by fantasising about the future, even though they both know it will never happen. However, if in trouble, Dennis still does not feel he can talk to his father as he does not listen unless he stops taking drugs. But he adds that, really, he would not talk to his father about his problems even if he did not take drugs. Dennis has always confided in his mother and he thinks that his father does not understand him like she does. If he were ever in trouble and told his father, he would just laugh and say: "I used to do the same when I was little, just enjoy yourself when you can". Dennis feels that his father is not really interested in solving his problems, and sometimes he hits him if he misbehaves, such as when he answers back. Another aspect of his father which deeply upsets Dennis is his failure to keep his promises, especially the promise of not taking drugs anymore. Even now, after letting him down so many times, he told Dennis during his last visit to the prison: "I promise you son that I won't touch drugs anymore". Dennis hopes that this time he will keep his promise. The best aspect of his father is his ability to tell jokes and "to mess about" with Dennis, and the worst is his addiction to drugs. He goes on to say that they were a "good family once" but now everyone is "apart" due to this habit.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Dennis learned about his father's imprisonment from his mother when he returned from holiday. She just told him that his father had been arrested. Dennis was looking forward to giving his father a present he had bought for him whilst he was on holiday, and was very disappointed that he could not see him immediately. He felt "very bad" and started crying as he couldn't believe that his father had offended again. He adds that it was "bad enough waiting for him to come out of prison last time, but this time it's much worse" as he hoped this would never happen again.

Although Dennis tries not to think who is responsible for his father's imprisonment, he says that his father, being a weak person, has not the strength to stop taking drugs and as a consequence he commits the crime. However, he emphasises that his uncle "has a stake in that", as he supplies drugs to his father. Dennis recognises that his father "was in the wrong" and he should not sell drugs to "other kids", therefore he should receive some sentence as "he's making other people worse, making them ill".

At the time of the second interview, Dennis still believes that his uncle has some responsibility as his father sells drugs for him. He thinks that his father should not sell drugs as "he's hurting people and making them worse". However, Dennis thinks that he should be let free, "just giving him a warning", but then he adds, "well, he should be punished because drugs are illegal and it's harming everyone else". Dennis still thinks that his father is a weak person and not a criminal. He believes that his mother could help him to stop the habit.

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Initially, Dennis could not "believe" that his father was in prison, but after some time he had to accept the reality and he felt "really bad". Before his father's imprisonment, Dennis was happy and they used to go out and have holidays together. But now, the flat seems empty and "everybody is sad". In addition he does not receive any pocket money, which is a great change, considering that his father would give him "a lot of money", before his imprisonment.

Dennis is not "doing well" at school. When he feels bored he thinks of his father and this makes him very unhappy and disinterested in the lessons. He thinks that his teachers "might have an idea" about his father's imprisonment as the science teacher asked him if he had any problems at home, which Dennis denied. He also complains that his mother is not helping him with his school work as she used to. Dennis was very frightened of what people would ask him about his father and what answer he should give them.

At the time of the second interview, Dennis tries to get on with his life and is not crying so much. He likes school more now and pays more attention to the lessons, rather than thinking constantly about his father as he did before. Dennis says that he still feels very sad because his "family is not a family anymore". However, now he has a girl friend who understands him and listens to his problems. Recently, Dennis has been thinking about his future. He says: "in most stories, kids like me end up like their dads but I won't, I'll be different".

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Dennis visits his father every Saturday. He looks forward to seeing his father and feels happy in his company. However, he also feels frustrated as his father only asks him "how are you going?" and talks "all the time" with Dennis' cousin about what it is going on in the drug scene. After his father conviction, Dennis visits him once a month for two hours. He asks Dennis how he and his mother are doing. He then talks with Dennis' aunt about family

business (Dennis' uncle drug business). While his father and his aunt are talking, Dennis looks around or listens to the conversation. Dennis feels happy to see his father getting better and putting on weight.

Interaction with friends

Dennis has many friends, whom he likes because "they are funny and always tell jokes", but he does not have one best friend as he prefers to have different friends. However, Dennis admits that he would like to have a friend with whom he could talk to, particularly when he feels upset about his father.

Initially, Dennis felt extremely anxious at the thought of what his friends would say about his father. Some of his friends know about his father's imprisonment, but would not comment on the matter, they just ask: "how's your dad and that" and "where is he now and leave it like that". Dennis does not like to talk about his father as he would beat anyone who makes "bad" remarks about him. The older boys who live on the estate would not bully him as his older brother used to "hang around with them". Many of these older boys used to buy drugs from his father.

Moral Judgment Interview

Time 1: Dennis thinks that, in general, people should try to obey the law, "just because it's the law", and they should be punished "because they broke the law."
Moral stage: 1

Time 2: Dennis thinks that, in general, "people shouldn't break the law, but depends what they do; selling drugs to other people is wrong". People should be punished but it "depends what for (they broke the law); if it's for a good reason no, but for money yes".
Moral stage: 3(2)

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The score attained by Dennis in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	14	19
Social self-peer	6	7
Home-parents	8	8
School -academic	3	2
Total self score	62	74

Child's perception of the interview

Initially, Dennis felt nervous at the prospect of being interviewed, but after a while he relaxed as he realised that he "really" had to give his opinions and feelings about the event and not "the right answer". Dennis found the questions "a bit difficult but interesting".

FAMILY K

Mother: Joan, 33 years old

Father: Frank, 33 years old

Children: Donald and Jaber, 14 years old twins; Ernest, 12 years old; Barry, 8 years old and Gary, 2 years old.

Demographic data

Family K live in a three-bedroom council maisonette in South East London. The interior of the maisonette is very small and sparsely furnished, but it is kept clean and tidy. To the front of the building there is a green area with trees.

Joan attended school until the age of 15, after which she worked in various shops and as cleaner. She has not worked since the twins were born. Joan left home when she was 16 years old and married her first husband soon after already pregnant. Two children were born from her first marriage: Donald and Jaber. After three years, Joan divorced her first husband and lived for "about 7 months" with another man with whom she had her third son, Barry. Immediately after this relationship ended, Joan met Frank, who became her second husband. Her fourth son, Gary was born from this relationship. Ernest is not Joan's son, but she is bringing him up for a friend who could not cope with the responsibility of having a child. Frank, therefore, has been stepfather to Donald and Jaber since they were about four years old.

Joan has a history of drug abuse and depression. Four years ago she was admitted to hospital suffering from depression where she remained for a period of two years. During this time Frank looked after the four children. When Joan came out of hospital, on the advice of a friend, she had her fourth child. Her friend told her that this would help her to overcome her depression and drug addiction. However, after the birth of Gary, Joan and Frank argued frequently mainly due to Frank's "compulsive lying". According to Joan, he would say that he was "a black belt in judo"; that his mother "bought him out of the army" or that he had a rich uncle. This lying annoyed Joan very much and she could never understand why he used to do it.

Before his imprisonment, Frank was unemployed and receiving social benefits, but did all the domestic chores in the home and looked after the children. This suited Joan as she needs to have someone with her all the time. On each visit made to Joan, she looked emaciated and tired, but during the interview she was talkative. She appears to be emotionally unstable and has a fatalistic outlook on life.

At the time of the second interview, the interior of the maisonette was very dirty and the front garden was littered

with rubbish. Joan is now living with the man she says is the father of her third son, who she lived with for seven months before marrying Frank. During the past year, all of her five children have been taken into care as a consequence of her hospitalisation. Joan decided to allow the three younger children to be taken in to care, while she was receiving treatment for her drinking problems. The two eldest sons have been placed in boarding school, where they will stay until they are 18 years old. Currently, she is fighting a court case against the social services for the return of her two younger children.

Husband's criminal data

Frank was arrested for murder after stabbing a man during a fight in a pub. This is Frank first offence. At the time of the second interview, Frank had been sentenced to five years imprisonment.

Mother's perception of the event

Joan was shocked when the police telephoned to tell her that her husband had been arrested for murder. She just "slammed" the phone down and everything "went blank". She explains that Frank did not know the person he stabbed, who apparently had already had a "barny" in another pub preceding the fight with Frank. Frank had also had "a good drink" and reacted to the man's provocation by stabbing him "only once". Unfortunately, the knife "caught the heart instead of the arm" as Frank had intended.

At the time of the second interview, Joan says that Frank was lucky to receive a five year sentence, although she firmly believes he does not deserve to go to prison at all. She feels partly responsible for her husband's offence as she was not "nice" to him, and did not give him sufficient love. They used to have many arguments, and the day before the incident they had a "big row" and she told him to leave the maisonette.

Feelings toward the husband

Although Joan feels very angry with Frank, she also feels guilty about the event and believes that her husband's violent reaction was due to his frustration resulting from his failure to understand her general dissatisfaction with life. Currently, Joan feels very hurt and upset because her husband has changed his attitude towards her. Every time she visits him, he repeats over and over again what happened and does not want to kiss her or even hold her hand (the day contact was made with Joan she was crying as her husband had "wiped off" her kiss). She even threatened not to visit him anymore as she believes he is "pushing" her away. She insists that, even though it is very hard to accept his offence, at least he did not mean to kill the

man; it could have happened the other way around and her husband could have been killed. But what she cannot accept is that after all these years of being dedicated to her, he has changed to the point of not wanting to see her. However, Joan still considers Frank to be part of the family, and believes that, in the near future, he will change his rejecting attitude towards her and return to his "old ways". She emphasises that they have five children to bring up and she needs him. Currently, Frank writes letters to the children, and he is particularly concerned about his two-year old son, who has had an operation "in his kidneys and bowels" for they "were not quite right".

At the time of the second interview, Joan is certain that she does not love her husband anymore and has decided to divorce him. She says that the main reason for her decision is that he is a compulsive liar, and that this behaviour is being imitated by Donald and Jaber. However, she recognises that he has been very good and caring towards her and the children and she still wants to be his friend. She has not seen Frank for almost seven months.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

After her husband's arrest, Joan lost his part of the social security money, which has made her life more "unbearable", even though it was not a "great amount of money". She now has to be extra careful with the food and restricts the children to the bare minimum. For Joan, however, the major difficulty has been to take over the responsibility of running a house and looking after the children alone. In the past she relied greatly on her husband to help her with the daily routine of the family and her drug problems and depression, even though he never really understood her "mind". She feels ashamed of not being able to cope alone and often cries over her impotence to do something about the matter. Recently, she has become "obsessed" with cleaning the flat and feels a compulsion to buy cleaning materials (Joan pointed to 17 bottles of cleaning fluid in the cupboard). After cleaning all the maisonette, she will sit on the settee for just a few minutes to relax, and then suddenly begin to clean the whole place again, even if it is midnight. Joan is receiving psychiatric treatment, which includes tranquillizers prescribed by the psychiatrist.

Joan says that Donald misses his father "badly" and is always writing letters to him. However, Jaber is not very upset with his father's imprisonment, as he "don't worry about nothing". Soon after her husband's imprisonment, Joan noticed that Donald became very quiet, whereas Jaber became very "flash". Before their father's imprisonment, Donald was the one who talked "a lot" and Jaber was the quiet one. She also says that Donald has become very insecure and sentimental, while Jaber has become street-wise, hard and

confident, and does not fear anything.

Donald and Jaber were placed in a boarding school soon after their father's imprisonment, but they spend every weekend at home. They have become "naughtier" since their father's imprisonment, and although they have always been active, they are now out of control. Jaber shot a person in the neck with a borrowed air gun, and has been caught in a stolen car. He was charged by the police with actual bodily harm. Donald has been getting into many fights with other children and the teachers at school. Both, Jaber and Donald, often run away from the boarding school and return home. They say that the staff at the school hit them.

At the time of the second interview, Joan feels that she does not have the energy to take care of her maisonette, and she is very concerned that her flat is "filthy". She recalls how she used to be "obsessed" about cleaning it many times a day, but now she cannot understand how she could do all that work. During the month before her hospitalisation, Joan sold almost everything, even her washing machine, to buy drink. Now she does not have any money to buy these things again.

Currently, Joan is living with the father of her third son. He visited her one day unexpectedly and, after few meetings, they decided to stay together. She feels sorry for Donald as he is very close to her husband Frank. He gave the children much attention and used to take them to the park as she could never go out due to her "illness". However, she adds that both, Donald and Jaber do not mind about her separation and do not mention the matter.

Since the last interview, Donald and Jaber have been moved to a new boarding school as they could not remain at the previous one during weekends whilst Joan was in hospital. Joan says that Donald and Jaber are now totally out of control. Jaber's behaviour has become worse. The charge of the shooting pellets was dismissed, but he has become involved in "all kinds of trouble" during the last nine months. For example, he broke into a doctor's surgery and stole his bag "full of pills and seringes", and brought it back home. She telephoned the police but they did not charge him with this offence. Currently, Jaber is on bail for "mugging".

Joan believes that Donald is taking drugs, and that although he and his brother are in care, they still become involved with the police. Both Donald and Jaber have many court cases to attend for burglary, taking cars and stealing from shops. She insists that the staff of the boarding school are "too easy going" as they allow the boys to stay out as long as they want, and if they telephone informing them that they are going to stay at a friend's house, "they even let them stay out all night". Joan adds

angrily that her children have found a way to break into houses or steal cars during the night, but they are not allowed to see her as she is supposed to be a "bad influence". Joan goes on to say that Donald "threw himself under a car" and was badly injured. Before the incident he went to see her and she noticed that he was very depressed. He told her that he did not have anything to live for in life. Joan asked the school principle to send Donald to a psychiatrist but they do not think that he needs any treatment.

Explanation of the event to the child

Joan told the children that her husband was "drawn into a fight" and that "unfortunately the other person died". Initially they became very quiet, but now they are behaving as if nothing had happened. Joan thinks that they still do not believe that their father really killed a person.

At the time of the second interview, Joan says that Donald and Jaber have accepted their father's offence. They followed everything that was going on, particularly the trial proceedings. One of them (Joan does not remember which one) even bought a knife similar to the one that her husband used in the fight, in order that she could describe it during her husband's trial. She told the police that she gave the knife to her husband to cut meat for the dog, to demonstrate that her husband's offence was not premeditated.

Support System

Since her husband's imprisonment the neighbours have stopped talking to Joan and have forbidden their children to play with her children. She also says that they are bullying the children about their father's imprisonment and that they gossip about her. On one occasion Joan was at the window and overheard a neighbour derogating her husband. She "picked up a bunch of tools" and threw them on their heads.

Joan's family has been very supportive, and although they do not live nearby, her father takes her to the hospital to be "detoxed" from tablets and drink and gives her money. Joan does not have any contact with her husband's family as they have "disowned" him. Recently, her husband's parents tried to visit him, but Frank refused to talk to them.

Although a social worker has been visiting Joan, she feels very disappointed with the social services in general. She complains that all they want to know about is her past: "they ask and ask and keep asking questions". She thinks this is because they believe that the past is going to happen again. However, what Joan wanted was that they "sort out things" when she could feel herself getting more and

more depressed and was drinking all day long. They told her that they could only help her when she had gone "to the very end". She says that one has to be half dead for them to do something, and this was what happened to her. She had to drink a bottle of vodka a day, and sell everything, even her washing machine, before they arranged a place in a hospital for her.

Child's perception of parents

Donald says that he gets on "all right" with his mother. He likes her as she gives him money when she can, but does not like it when she slaps him. He adds that some time ago he had the same bad temper as his mother, but now he is more calm like his father.

The English teacher is Donald's favourite adult with whom he can talk to as he listens to what he has to say and always helps him when he needs some advice. However, if he were in trouble he would go to his mother because she would "sort it out". Donald goes on to say that he does not consider fighting a trouble, but just "something he has to do sometimes", therefore he would fight and "leave it at that". If there were bad consequences from a fight, such as someone getting hurt, he would go to his mother because she understands him: "she knows why you are bad as she brought you up". But he emphasises that, in general, he does not tell anyone when he is in trouble.

Although Donald thinks that his father has the right to tell him what to do as he has to look after him, he does not feel he can tell him his problems. He believes that his father does not understand him as does his mother, because when he tries to explain or wants to know something, his father does not take any notice of him. However, Donald says that he gets on well with him, particularly when they "muck about fighting". He also likes his father's company as he is "kind of happy to be with". He does not like it when his father "slaps him" for things such as answering back or not saying where he goes, as he has a "strong hand". If he could change anything about his father, it would be his hair as it "hangs over his shoulder". Donald would also change his mother's drinking habit, which "gets him down". He says that she does not keep her promises and cannot "be bothered" to understand him when she is under the influence of alcohol.

In general, Donald says that neither his father nor his mother keep their promises. For example, his father used to promise to play football with him, but he rarely did. Donald used to feel let down, but now he is used to it as his father lies without any reason. He could not think of an example when his mother did not keep her promise.

At the time of the second interview, Donald chooses his

mother as his favourite adult with whom to confide. She brought him up, therefore she knows him very well. However, if in trouble, Donald would go to his friends as they are "faithful" and help each other. He would never talk to the teachers at his new school, they do not know what "is going through my life". If his father was at home, he would talk to him about his problems and would accept his advice on the condition that he thought that "the advice is all right". His father's imprisonment has made no difference to the way he sees his role as a disciplinarian. Donald believes that he gets on "excellent" with his father, and that he understands him most of the time, particularly when Donald explains his problems to him and he tries to "sort them out". Donald also believes that his father cares for him, and although he "hates" it when his father uses "his back hand", he realises that his father has good reasons for doing so, such as when he gets in trouble with the police or when he gives him "back chat". Donald says that his father does not understand him when he thinks that everything Donald is saying is a "pack of lies" and refuses to help him. However, he believes that his father would help him once he discovered that he had given a truthful account of the situation. He emphasises that his father used to be a "bit of a liar" himself and would rarely keep a promise, and although this behaviour did not "bother" him, it hurts his mother. For example, if his father smashed something in the house he would not say anything and would let the children be blamed for it.

If he could change anything in the situation he would not have his father committed for "what he's supposed to have done" and return to the days before his imprisonment when the family was together.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Donald was informed by his mother that his father stabbed a person. Initially he could not believe that his father could be involved in such an incident, but when he realised what his mother told him was true, he tried to understand why his father had committed this offence. Donald believes that it is not his father's fault. He explains that the person "jumped" on his father and he must have felt his knife in his pocket, pulled it out and stabbed the man as a reaction to the attack. He thinks that his father should be free "because he's done it in self protection, but thinking about his wife (victim wife), he should get about six months or a year.

At the time of the second interview, Donald says that his father committed the offence in "self-protection", that it "was just an accident", and that his father telephoned the police soon afterwards and told them what happened. He should not be punished, but let free: "because the reason; he's got a good reason, he done it in self protection, he's

not a criminal".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Donald greatly misses playing football with his father and "have a laugh", even though it did not happen often. He also misses to "muck about" (fighting) with him. He says that he does "muck about" with other people, but it is not the same as it was with his father.

After his father's imprisonment, Donald was moved to a boarding school due to his behaviour. At his previous school he would fight with the teachers frequently, or play truant. In this new school he is constantly in fear that his friends may ask questions about his father, such as: "what has he done?"; "how long is he going to stay in the asylum?" as they have done many times. He feels "uptight" and as soon as they begin the questions he'll "put up a fight". Donald "hates" this school; the boys there demand money from him to buy "ciggies" and sweets, and the staff do not take any action to stop it happening.

Since the last interview, Donald has been moved to another boarding school. His mother was drinking heavily, therefore he could neither go home nor remain at the school at weekends. Donald is content to be in this new school, and says that no one steals his clothes or videos as they did in the old school. However, he also says that his friends at the school commit burglaries almost every night. According to Donald, the staff at the school are "thick", and although they may suspect something, they do not care. If one of them is caught by the police, they "bail him out".

Donald feels that the house without his father is not a home anymore, and everything seems to have "crumbled down". He is very worried about his mother's drinking problem and would like that she could settle down with someone. Although she has now left the hospital and seems to feel better, and assures Donald that she is not drinking anymore, he cannot trust her completely. Donald has been told by the doctors that his mother may not be telling the truth when she insists that she is not drinking, as she still has hallucinations. As the boarding school is near his home and he is allowed to go out in the evenings, he either visits his mother or she meets him when he is playing in the street with his friends.

Donald says that despite everything his father has done, he still loves him, and adds resolutely that he will interact with him when he leaves the prison, even though he might not come back to the house. However, he still has some hopes that his mother and father may be together in the future. As he says: "My dad might end up here again, it

depends what happens in the future". He adds sadly that he was happy before his father's imprisonment and now he misses the "whole happy family". He never realised that his father and mother had problems. Donald says that he does not "mind" about his mother's relationship with her new boy-friend, he thinks that "he's alright".

Donald currently attends a Youth Centre as the activities carried out there are "supposed to keep me out of trouble with the law". But he believes that it does not help, and if he wants to steal cars or "mug" someone he would do so anyway. Since the last interview, Donald has been charged with stealing a car, carrying a knife, and two burglaries. In the case of the knife, Donald insists that the police "set him up" as they are "pigs" and "want to be sergeants and earn high wages", therefore they do everything they can to arrest people. At the moment, he is adamant that he is not going to get involved with the police anymore and is very worried about his future. Next year he will be leaving school but he is sure that nothing is going to happen as he does not have a trade. The teachers do not teach him anything and do not give him any work to do. They just make him "run about the woods looking for a little treasure". He would like to do "some exam and learn a trade", but he does not have the address of the Educational Authority in order that he can write to them" and explain his situation.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Donald visits his father once a week. He looks forward to seeing him and wants to know what happens in the prison. They also talk about the family. When he is with his father he feels "kind of sad" and sorry for him because he has to stay locked in the prison.

At the time of the second interview, Donald says that, although he would like to see his father and feels very happy to be with him, he is not visiting him, he only writes letters to him. As he is under 18 years old he has to wait for someone from the school to take him to the prison, which Donald thinks they are not too interested in doing. However, he is now waiting for his father to send a V.O. (visiting order) in order to visit him. Donald says that he has many things to talk about with his father, such as what he is going to do in the future and what has happened recently in his life. His only frustration is that the two hours he is allowed to stay with his father are not sufficient to talk about everything he wants.

Interaction with friends

Donald has many friends where he lives but not at school as the children there are always asking for money to buy cigarettes or "take the mick" of people. Everyone at the school knows about his father's imprisonment it was

publicised in the newspapers. Everytime Donald visits his father, the boys from the school bully him. They ask Donald if he is going to the asylum and laugh. Donald feels very angry towards them and also towards the school staff as they do not help him.

At the time of the second interview, Donald says that he has many friends at the new school, but he would not call them "good friends". He likes the friends who live near his house as he knows them very well and they "act properly", which means that they do not carry knives and are "just normal"; they do not go out on burglaries like his friends at the boarding school. None of his friends at the boarding school bully him as many of their fathers are also in prison. As for his friends who live near his house, they are not interested in his father.

Moral Judgment Interview

Time 1: Donald thinks that, in general, people should obey the law, "because it's the law", and they should be punished, but "only if they did it in the first place because they should learn not to do it.

Moral stage: 2/3

Time 2 : Donald thinks that the law should be obeyed, but he also thinks that the police do not care and have no respect for people like him. As he says: They don't care, all they care about is themselves and their families and their things, they don't care about us. They wouldn't care, right, if my mum died right, my dad got sentence to life right, and I got sentenced, they don't care. If they knew that my mum died right, and my dad died right, they would still try to put me down. The court might care, but the police wouldn't.

He thinks that people who break the law should be punished, but it "depends on the reason; for mugging and rape they should , but silly things like taking something from a shop, no".

Moral stage: 3

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The score attained by Donald in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	20	21
Social self-peer	5	6
Home-parents	7	8
School-academic	0	3
General self score	64	76

Child's perception of the interview

Donald felt a "bit bored" during the interview but did not mind answering the questions. He says that he does not want anyone to feel sorry for him, but "if people knew what I've been going through they might treat me with a bit of respect". He goes on to say that if he is not very bright at school it is because of the "things" that have happened in his life.

Child's perception of parents

Jaber believes that he gets on "just normal" with his mother and father, but adds that he gets on better with his mother as she knows how he is and "takes things more easy". She also understands him "now and again", particularly when he does "bad things" and she tries to "sort them out". He could not think about anything that he did not like about his mother, except her obsession with cleaning the flat.

He chooses his mother as his favourite adult with whom to confide as she brought him up, knows everything about him and she is nice to him. For example, she helped him with the police when a neighbour accused him of shooting a man in the neck with a pellet gun. If in trouble, Jaber would never go to his father as he would make "too much fuss about it" (hit him). If in trouble at school he would talk to his mother as she "is good to sort out this problem", but if he was in trouble because of a fight he would go to his friend John as he could stay the night at his flat and think about what to do the next day.

Jaber does not have "a clue" if his father understands the way he feels about things. He only knows that his father tries to "sort things out" when he is in trouble, but then he beats him. He also says that his father does not keep his promises. For example, he promised to write a song for him, but he never did. However, if he could, he would make

his father leave the prison.

At the time of the second interview, Jaber still believes he gets on "well" with his mother and maintains that she understands him. He says that he does not remember much about his father as he has been away for a long time, but he does not think he gets on with him very well. He recalls clearly, however, how annoyed he used to feel when his father lied constantly, and emphasises that if he was at home now that is older, he would probably hit him. This is mainly because he made his mother unhappy with this behaviour. He also feels angry with his father as he did not keep his promises for many times he promised to take him out and failed to do so. Nevertheless, Jaber believes that his father understands the way he feels because he went through the same problems when he was young. But he did not understand him when he "lied" about buying him a "brand new bicycle" and then gave him an old one. He goes on to say that he feels sorry for his father as he has never been in this situation before, but he tries not to think about this matter, adding "I must get on with my life".

Child's attribution of responsibility

Jaber's mother informed him of his father's arrest. Initially, he could not believe it and felt "very bad". He thinks that his father stabbed the victim in self-defence, and adds that if someone attacked him to "rob" him or to "beat" him up, he would do just the same, but he would aim to the throat not to the arm like his father did, as one cannot know if the person has a knife or a gun and would kill him. Therefore he says: "my dad had to defend himself, right or wrong it's his life before the other". However, Jaber then states that his father "should've only scared the man so he wouldn't be in trouble now". Even so he thinks that his father should be set free, "because it's not his fault, because the other man jumped on him".

At the time of the second interview, Jaber says that his father should not have committed the offence, "but it's done and in the situation I would do it. He didn't want to kill but the man jumped on him so he had to". Concerning his punishment, Jaber says that: "it's hard to say if he should be punished, it's how they (police and judges) see it. They probably see in a different way than me. The way I see it he should be let free, or only given a small sentence; he has a good reason".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

The main change perceived by Jaber is that his father is not there to "have a laugh" and "muck around the house". He also enjoyed playing football and going out with him,

particularly on "bus rides". He is very worried about his mother's obsession with cleaning the house.

Since the last interview, Jaber has been moved to a boarding school near his home. He feels happier in this new school as the staff try to help him and give him more attention. There are less children in the classroom and more teachers, therefore there is always someone at hand if he needs anything. He explains that in the other school he had to wait "about 20 minutes" until the teacher went round the class to see everyone's work before he received any attention. He says that the children in the old school used to "beat up" the staff (laughs).

During the past year, Jaber has become heavily involved in petty crime. This includes breaking into a doctor's surgery and stealing drugs, shoplifting and stealing radios from cars. Jaber says that most of the trouble he gets into with the police is caused by someone "winding me up", or when "things get me down". As an example of the first case Jaber explains that, if a person "pushes him about" and he does not want to hurt him for fear of being charged for assault, he will "knick" something from this person. This only happens when he becomes angry, because that is "just the way" he is. In the second case, he commits some offence "to alive myself up" when something depresses him, such as the "bad things" his mother does like drinking too much, going to hospital or arguing with him, or when something bad happens to his brothers. Jaber goes on to say that he does not feel frightened to break into people's houses and if he finds someone in there he has to hit the person. He does not feel scared or even worried when the police arrest him and take him to court as he is sure that they will not beat him unless he hits them first. He thinks that the police are "muffy", they believe they are "hard" and that they can do what they want just because they wear uniforms. He concludes defiantly: "they only can lock me up".

Jaber is not upset with his mother's divorce and says that it is her life and if she feels happy "that's okay". He goes on to say that he is getting older and soon he is going to "get a flat" and then he will not be around to "bare all the hassle".

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Jaber has seen his father "a couple of times" since he has been in prison. He explains that he cannot visit his father on his own and his mother does not go to the prison very often because his father "don't want her there". Jaber would like to see his father more often, although when he does go to the prison he never has a chance to talk to him as his mother and father argue constantly. During visits, Jaber says he feels "just normal".

At the time of the second interview, Jaber says that he has not seen his father during the past year, but he thinks that he might visit him sometime "to cheer him up".

Interaction with friends

Jaber did not elaborate on what he likes about his friends, he simply states that "they are my mates, they are there and I play with them". He never talks about his father to anyone as "it's not their business", and no one would "dare" to pick on him about his father as he would beat them up very badly.

At the time of the second interview, Jaber has a best "mate" because "he is a proper mate", which means they go out together and Jaber is able to sleep in his house. His friend also helps him when he is in trouble and does not "grass" him. Jaber still believes that none of his friends know about his father's imprisonment.

Moral Judgment Interview

Time 1: Jaber thinks that, in general, people should obey the law in order to avoid trouble, and they should be punished, depending on the offence committed. In the case of rape or other serious offence they should, but in the case of "stealing something from a shop and drinking and driving", they should not.

Moral stage: 2

Time 2: Jaber thinks that everyone feels different about obeying the law or not, and it depends if the person thinks that the reason for disobeying the law is worthwhile to "get nicked for it". He also thinks that people should be punished depending on the reason they have for committing the offence. If they have a good reason, they should not be punished, only for a bad reason, like stealing something for themselves, should they be punished.

Moral stage: 3

Coopersmith SelfEsteem Inventory

The scores attained by Jaber in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	14	15
Social self-peer	5	6
Home-parents	6	4
School-academic	3	4
General self score	56	58

Child's perception of the Interview

Jaber felt nervous before the interview as he thought he may not know the answers, but as the interview progressed he became more relaxed and did not worry anymore. He does not mind to answer all the questions if that is going to help the researcher.

FAMILY L

Mother: Sandra, 55 years old

Father: Neil, 59 years old

Children: Ruth, Emily, Kate and Tom, 24, 23, 19 and 15 years old respectively.

Demographic data

Family L live in a three-bedroom semi-detached house, located in a suburban area of a town in Bedfordshire. The house is well maintained, adequately furnished and kept clean and tidy. The eldest daughter currently lives abroad, the younger is married and lives nearby and the middle daughter still lives at home.

Sandra left school at 16 years of age to work as an assembler for a television company and married Neil at the age of 28. Sandra has not worked since the birth of her first daughter, 24 years ago. Neil used to work as a telephone engineer, but for the past eight years has been unemployed due to ill-health. The family live on a pension from Neil's former employers plus social benefits. At the time of the second interview, Tom had moved to another town to live with his uncle.

Husband's criminal data

Neil was arrested for a drug dealing. He has no previous convictions. At the time of the second interview, Neil had been convicted and sentenced to four-years imprisonment.

Mother's perception of the event

Sandra never imagined that her husband could ever be involved with the police, let alone be arrested. When he was taken to the police station, she thought it was only for routine questioning and that he would return the same day. She even prepared a dinner for him, but he never returned. Sandra did not sleep all night worried about a family party, which had been arranged for the following day. She felt deeply ashamed when, later in the evening, she had to explain the situation to the family. However she still had hopes that he would come home in a few days, but the police kept postponing his release "week after week" saying that they needed to ask more questions.

According to Sandra, her husband went to the local shop to buy food for a family party, which had been arranged for the following day, where he met a friend, who, unknown to them was dealing in drugs. He gave a lift to this friend, at his request, and on the way to his friend's house the police stopped them and found drugs in the car. When the police arrived at her house with her husband, she was so shocked by their "invasion", that she "lost" her voice. It

seems to Sandra "unbelievable" that her husband could be involved with drugs and that it is a nightmare from which she will awake soon. After the initial shock, Sandra felt very scared as she did not understand what was going on, or why the police arrested her husband. She now feels frightened about the family's future, and at the thought of dealing alone with the routine of everyday life. Sandra insists that the police acted on the wrong information, as they did not believe her when she told them that her husband went out to the shops to buy food for the party and met this friend by chance. She feels very bitter with the police because they did not believe her husband, who has never been involved in crime, but believed his friend, who has many convictions. She goes on to say that they treated her very badly during their search of her house, and as a consequence she does not trust them anymore.

Feelings towards the husband

Sandra firmly believes that her husband's friend is to blame for the event and that her husband is totally innocent. Sandra's feelings towards her husband have changed since his arrest. She still has the same "respect" for him as before and considers him part of the family, but now she feels very sorry for him and realises that he is essentially a weak person who has great difficulty facing the situation. This has come as a total surprise to Sandra as he always adopted an authoritarian approach to the family; he was extremely strict and inflexible with the children and demanded total obedience from everyone. Even now, during the visits, he tells her what she should do and expects his orders to be obeyed. However, Sandra says that he is a caring father, who always gives the children "good advice" and tries to understand their problems. He has also insisted that the children receive a very good education, although he was not very close to them and did not show them much affection.

Sandra has no intention of separating from her husband as her children need a father and she believes that a marriage should not be broken. However, she has decided to be "stricter" with her husband when he returns home, and to "enforce" her views, particularly about the "right way" to discipline her son. She feels that too many restrictions are not good, as is too much freedom. Sandra goes on to say that, after his imprisonment, her husband has shown more affection towards her and the children, and he even listens to their opinions.

At the time of the second interview, Sandra still believes that her husband is innocent of the crime, but he cannot prove it. She does not know who to blame for the event, but says that her husband should not have trusted his friend. He should have followed her advice and terminated their friendship. She is very worried about her husband's health

as two months ago he had a heart attack and "looks ill and depressed".

Changes after husband's imprisonment

According to Sandra, everything has changed since her husband's imprisonment. He decided absolutely everything about the family and also dealt with the financial and social security problems. As he was always at home due to ill health, he used to do the weekly shopping, decorate the house and mend things that were broken.

Sandra lives in "panic" because now she has to decide everything alone, such as, family matters and problems related to his imprisonment. She finds her involvement with the police, solicitors, lawyers and courts a terrible nightmare as she is unable to understand the explanations and advice they give. She therefore feels impotent to give her husband effective help.

Sandra also feels very lonely as her children are grown up and she needs someone of her own age that she can talk to, and "share things" with. She is also very frightened of losing her house as the police has frozen all her husband's accounts and she has been told by friends that even her house is at risk. But the major difficulty for Sandra is the social stigma associated with her husband's offence. She "dreads" to explain to relatives and friends about the event because she thinks they will not believe that her husband is innocent. Initially, she just said that he was on holiday as she thought the matter would be solved soon, but now she avoids going out and talking to people.

After her husband's arrest, Sandra observed that Tom became very "silent" and would not leave the house; "he just lay around and cried frequently". He does not trust anyone now and is even suspicious of people who knock on the door to sell things. He could never believe that his father could do such a thing, and it was "too much a change from his father being almost perfect" to this new image of "a total wicked man".

By the time of the second interview, Sandra had managed to organise her financial affairs, even though it has been most difficult for her as she has never had to deal with money throughout her marriage. She now receives £68 instead of £50 per week as she is entitled to extra social benefits due to her asthma. Her difficulty in dealing with the financial problems of the family is compounded by the necessity to deal with matters related to her husband's trial, such as banks, police, solicitors and barristers. However, she has found the strength and patience to cope with the "complicated and confusing" law system. Sandra adds that the prison environment is depressing, and is too crowded and noisy to enable a fulfilling conversation. She

finds it difficult to discuss legal matters in such an environment.

Her son, Tom, has left home to live with her husband's brother in another town to get away from all the problems (in order that he can concentrate on his studies). At home he was involved in perennial discussions about solicitors, barristers and laws. Sandra points out that the only positive outcome from her husband's imprisonment is that he has become "incredibly" close to his son.

Sandra says that Tom has also changed "completely". He has become more mature and worries about everything. For example he worries about where they are going to live in the future, about his father's health and his education. Sometimes "he goes very sentimental" and "cries and cries". He has also become more impatient, shouts more frequently at his sisters and does not trust anyone, apart from the immediate family.

Sandra still does not go out because she fears being asked questions about her husband and because she believes that everybody gives her "dirty looks". This makes her feel miserable and lonely.

Mother's explanation to the child

Sandra did not have to explain to Tom about his father's arrest as he was at home studying for his exams when the police arrived with his father to search the house. And since his father's arrest, Tom has been informed about everything that has happened concerning the event, including the daily problems of family life and matters related to the development of the legal process.

Support system

Sandra only receives support from her husband's brother and some friends. Her friends visit her frequently, and one visits her husband in prison. Sandra is thankful to them as they never show disbelief about her husband's innocence. Other members of her husband's family, however, are not very concerned with the situation and do not believe in her husband's innocence. Her family cannot help her as they are living abroad.

Sandra did not ask for, or was offered any help from the social services or prisoners' wives organisations. She visited the social services when she was worried that the "government" could take her house as a payment for "drugs", and they told her that they could not do anything.

Child's perception of parents

Tom gets on very well with his mother, as he says: "she's great, she's the best thing in the world", and she only makes a promise when she can keep it. The only aspect he dislikes about his mother is that she does not share her problems with anyone in order to avoid hurting them. His mother is also his favourite adult with whom to confide. They communicate with each other very well and she really understands and listens to him. Tom finds it easy to express his feelings to his mother. As he states: "I can even cry as much as I want in front of her and she is never going to say boys shouldn't cry". Tom feels "totally free" with his mother and she has helped him enormously to cope with what has been a most difficult time.

If in trouble, Tom would go to his sisters. He says that although they may "tell him off", if it was his fault, but they would help him to get through the situation or to "break the news easily" to his mother. Tom would "never dream" of talking to his father about his problems as he is very strict. He says he was extremely frightened of his father, therefore, he could never communicate with him. However, he is sure that his father cared for him, although he never showed it. Tom would prefer his father to be more friendly, less "authoritative", and take some notice of what the members of the family have to say. He explains that as his father has gone through "a lot of suffering", he has discovered how important the family is to him and as a consequence, he has changed his attitude completely towards them. He now asks Tom his opinion about important issues and he is also more sensitive to his feelings.

Tom believes that when his father returns home, he will be able to talk to him and find the courage to put forward his own views, and obey his father only if he agrees with his demands. This change in perception of his father's image, from a strong powerful man to a helpless suffering person, who has weakness just like everyone else, has made Tom feel closer toward him. However, he adds that it is "very strange" for him to see his father in that way, for before his imprisonment, he had "to accept" that he was "right all the time".

For Tom, his relationship with his father, prior to his imprisonment was very stressful, and that his father was "slowly drifting away" from all the members of the family. He explains that his father never spent any time with him as he remained in his room for most of the day, which he suggests may have been due to his illness.

Tom's angry feelings towards his father were particularly strong just before his arrest as he was under pressure studying for his exams, and he could not talk to him about his doubts and anxieties for fear of provoking his

father's "bad temper". For example, on one occasion he "dared" to say to his father that he preferred to study law rather than medicine as his father wanted. Tom will never forget "this big explosion in the house" when his father shouted and threatened him with "dreadful things" if he did not study medicine.

At the time of the second interview, Tom's mother is still his favourite adult with whom to confide. He affirms that she is a mother and a friend who cares for him, is always there to listen to his problems and who "gives me her shoulder to cry anytime I need". Tom also admires his mother's new discovered strength and the support she gives to everyone, including his father. In the present situation, she has demonstrated that she is stronger than his father, who is now weak and does not know what to do. His mother, who has never dealt with the "outside world", faces everything with courage and never complains, even though many times she becomes depressed and desperate. Tom adds, emphatically: "I really respect my mother and would like to be like her". He goes on to say that during the visits to the prison, his father cries in front of him, which he finds strange and extremely difficult to accept as he still has not fully assimilated his father's transformation from a person who knew what to do in any situation, to a helpless and tormented man. He is also deeply concerned as he believes that his father "has basically given up hope". Tom says that his father's imprisonment has made a great difference to their relationship, particularly during the last year. As he states: "we've been torn apart and yet we've gone so much closer". He finds "fantastic" how well he gets on with his father and "almost cannot believe it". Tom repeats that his father never understood the way he feels and believes that he was not interested in knowing. He says that his father never kept his promises to him, his sisters or his mother because, for his father, they were "there to be used" and he never thought he owed them anything.

The only aspect of his father that Tom admired before his imprisonment was that he did everything for the family, therefore they did not have "to trouble about anything". But now, if there is a telephone call to be made, a letter to be written or a complaint to be made, they have to take the initiative.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Tom recalls with "horror" the day his father was brought back to their house by the police after he was arrested, and they informed him about his father's offence and asked him if he had seen any drugs around the house. He was so astonished that he could only mumble: "What?" "Suddenly" the house was full of policemen and policewoman in plain clothes searching for drugs everywhere, even in the garden.

Tom felt so scared that he could barely answer the many questions the police asked him. When they left, the house was in a total "mess". The police had thrown his revision notes, books, folders, pens and pencils on the floor. Tom tried to control his anger and reorganised his school material as he had to study for his exams.

Tom felt totally confused, and thought he was dreaming as nothing seemed real. He only realised that his father had gone when two policemen returned late that night and told him that his father would remain in the police station for questioning. He cried for a long time and will never forget the "horrible feelings that lasted for days". He had expected that his father would return home the following day and clarify the situation, but "days went by, then weeks, then months", and his father never returned. Tom felt very worried about his father's health as he has a heart condition, and the day he was arrested he seemed ill.

Tom firmly believes that his father is innocent and thinks that the police distorted the evidence in court. He finds it extremely disturbing how the police treated the whole family during their investigation as they behaved as if the family were a gang of drug dealers, and showed no respect or restraint when they searched the house.

Tom thinks that his father should be free, as he did not commit the offence; "he was just giving a lift to a friend, and it's just unfair that he was arrested".

At the time of the second interview, Tom was still very angry with the police. They did not consider any evidence in his father's favour, such as Bank loans he had, which, for Tom, show that he was not getting any money from drug dealing. Neither did the police take seriously his father's allegation that he was just giving a lift to his friend, nor his mother's evidence that he remained indoors most of the time. Tom still believes that his father is totally innocent of the charges and feels "sick" about the whole situation. He thinks the family has been punished more than his father as everyone, particularly his mother, has had to cope with great changes and "enormous" problems. For Tom the proceedings have been dealt very "callously" by all concerned; no-one really listened to his father, and the jury was very biased against him.

Tom still thinks that his father should be free because "he didn't do it, drugs kill and they are all murders" and "because there's so much proof he's done nothing wrong".

Child's perception of changes after father's imprisonment

Since his father's imprisonment, Tom feels that he has "really broken down". He cannot "take things" as he used to and cries frequently. He says he has become "emotionally

soft", "touchy" and feels "all the time on the edge" as he cannot trust anyone, except his parents and sisters. Tom explains that if someone talks about his/her father, he immediately suspects that the person is trying to tell him something about his own father. He also feels "empty" and insecure as his father had an "enormous influence" on him; he always told him what to do, but now he has no one to ask.

The "atmosphere" in the house has also changed completely as everyone is sad and scared, and the conversation centres on legal matters and prisons. Tom, as the rest of the family, has to deal with barristers, solicitors and laws, which is "horrendous" as he does not understand anything, and feels totally useless and powerless. However, as a result of the family's shared suffering, they have become much closer to each other, which has given them more strength to cope with the "terrible" consequences of his father's imprisonment.

Tom used to respect the police and thought that they were "brilliant", but after being subjected to "their abuse" and "insensitive and rude" treatment, he has lost all respect for them. For example, when the police returned to his house, after having taken his father to the police station, they insisted in telling him that his father was a drug dealer and "other bad things", as if he had already been found guilty.

Tom has become aware of the existence of prisons. When the police told him that his father had been sent to prison he had "a shock" as he never imagined he would ever visit a prison. He thought that prisons were far away from city centres, surrounded by empty land or on distant islands. He found it "unimaginable" that while he was queuing to enter the prison, cars could be passing by and people could be looking at him. He was also surprised with the architecture of the prison as it did not look like a prison and he would have passed by without noticing anything "strange". But for Tom, the biggest surprise was to discover that the people that were in the waiting room with him were "just normal people", like "ladies with babies", brothers, sisters and wives of the prisoners.

At the time of the second interview, Tom says that he has become a very serious person and finds difficult to laugh about anything. He has also grown to hate some friends of the family as they made his father's "life a hell" by gossiping instead of helping him effectively. Tom has discovered that his mother is a "very strong" person and says that he has developed a great admiration for her. While everything was going well she would "step back", but in this difficult situation she has shown her strength of character. One day she was happy and on the next day, she was plunged into one of the most "horrific" situations, and

she has coped "marvellously". His feelings towards his father have also changed. Just before his imprisonment, Tom began to "really hate" and rebel against his father's authoritarian attitude. Now he feels very sorry for him as he thinks that when one reaches old age, it should be a time to relax and have the children looking after you, and not be "locked away" from one's family. He is also "amazed" at how close his relationship with his father has developed.

Tom still does not trust anyone, particularly the police, and feels permanently tense. He feels that if such a thing can happen to his father, it can happen to him as well. Before his father's imprisonment, he used to make plans for the future, but now the only thing for him to do is "get on with life and die". Tom feels that there is nothing to hope for, or look forward to until his father leaves the prison. He says that one does not realise what life really is until one "gets trapped" in a situation like the one he is experiencing. He is also frightened of losing the family house. Financially, they "went down to the poverty line".

Since the last interview, Tom has moved to his uncle's house in the north of England as he was unable to study at home, or even do the normal things young people are supposed to do, such as interact with friends or listen to music. Everyone in his family is experiencing "conflict" and is "frustrated" with the slow progress of the case. The conversation between them revolves around solicitors, barristers, laws and what will happen to them, therefore he could not relax.

Interaction between father and child

Tom visits his father once a month. When they meet, Tom asks him about his health and his father inquires about Tom's education, like "a time table", then they talk about general issues. Tom has mixed feelings when he is with his father: on the one hand he feels happy because he can communicate with him, but on the other, he feels sad because "it hurts to see my father in that horrible place".

At the time of the second interview, Tom does not visit his father as often as he did before he moved, but he still looks forward to seeing him when he can. He says that, "strangely enough", everytime his father sees him, he seems surprised that he still wants to visit him. They also talk more now than ever before, even though they only stay together for very short time. Sometimes they even have a laugh. When his father becomes tearful Tom feels very upset and would like to be able to do something, but he just sits quiet in front of him.

Interaction with friends

Tom believes that almost everyone knows about his father's imprisonment, and that his friends now avoid to interact with him. They only talk to him when they have to. According to Tom, they feel embarrassed, or they think he is "bad" like his father and is also involved in drugs. He feels that he cannot communicate with his friends now, and fears that they may "turn their faces" and talk behind his back.

As a result of Tom's constant demands for emotional support, the relationship with his best friend has ended, and now his friend tries to avoid any contact with Tom. Tom feels particularly upset because they were close friends for many years and they used to study together. Tom goes on to say that he has many friends, but when his father was at home he was not allowed to go out with them in the evenings, therefore his relationship with them was limited to the school. Now that he is able to meet them in the evenings he does not wish to leave the house. He thinks that he has become used to staying at home during the evenings, or that he has lost the motivation to interact with his friends.

At the time of the second interview, Tom says that he likes his new school and he has many friends there. Initially, he felt very scared to make new friends, but gradually he relaxed and now he is enjoying his new life. However, he misses his mother and sisters and finds it difficult to adapt to the routine of his uncle's house as he never left home before.

Moral Judgement Interview

Time 1: Tom thinks that, in general, people should obey the law, otherwise "there would be chaos", and they should be punished if the crime has been committed for "the wrong reason", that is, for their own benefit.

Moral stage: 3

Time 2: Tom thinks that people in general should obey the law otherwise there would be an "unbelievable amount of rapes, murders and burglaries" and he would not like to live in "that sort of society". People should be punished if they have committed an offence for their own benefit, but not if they are offending "out of their conscience to help someone".

Moral stage: 3(4)

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The score attained by Tom in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	16	14
Social self-peer	6	5
Home-parents	7	3
School-academic	4	2
Total self score	66	48

Child's perception of the interview

Tom felt excited to be able to talk and share his problems with someone outside his family. He thought: "God I can actually talk to someone outside the family". It has also been a great help to "let it all out" and be able to talk to someone who can understand him and the situation. The questions made him "think".

FAMILY M

Mother: Frances, 39 years old
Father: Noel, 44 years old
Children: Ronald, 15 years old

Demographic data

Family M live in a two-bedroom converted flat in South London. The interior of the flat is well furnished and is kept exceptionally clean and tidy.

Frances left comprehensive school when she was sixteen years old and worked in various jobs, such as packing for a mail order company, in a pet shop and in the office of a laundry. She has not worked for the last 11 years. Ronald was born when she was 20 years old, but never knew his natural father. Frances met Noel when she worked at the laundry and has lived with him for 12 years. Ronald considers Noel to be his father. Frances is outgoing, very friendly and spoke openly about her problems.

Before his arrest, Noel worked as a metalurgic engineer at a local College. Since Noel's imprisonment, Frances has been receiving social security benefits.

Husband's criminal data

Noel was arrested for murder. He had been celebrating with friends after receiving an unexpected back payment from his employers, which happened to coincide with the Christmas festivities. During the party, Noel drank too much (he is an alcoholic) and became involved in an argument with his best friend, and in the heat of the moment, he hit him on the head with a source pan. Noel has one previous custodial sentence for a drinking and driving offence he committed 20 years ago.

By the time of the second interview, Noel had been sentenced to 6 years imprisonment, and they have decided to get married whilst he is in prison.

Mother's perception of the event

When Frances' husband was arrested it came as a great shock to her. She did not go to the party where the incident happened due to an operation she had had on her foot and had no knowledge of the offence. When the police came to her flat to arrest her husband, Ronald was alone as Frances and her husband were attending the hospital. According to Frances, the police "burst" into the flat and searched everywhere. Ronald did not move, "completely astonished". When she and Noel returned from the hospital the police were waiting for them. They told her that there

had been an incident in which a man had died, and they were taking Noel to the police station for questioning. Initially she thought there had been a misunderstanding, but later she had to accept that the incident had happened and that her husband was involved in it.

Frances cries "endlessly" and just sits down with a "blank mind", without the energy to do anything. What made matters worse for Frances was that the incident happened two days before Christmas, considering all the preparations and expectations that surrounds this time of year.

At the time of the second interview, Frances's husband had been sentenced to six years imprisonment. Frances did not expect that her husband would receive such sentence, and when she heard the judge pronounce it she "went numb, cold", and felt like a "piece of stone". She just could not move from her place in the court. The solicitor and barrister told her that her husband would probably be sentenced to 3 year imprisonment. She thinks that they were "useless" as they advised her husband to plead guilty to murder. Frances had insisted categorically, that if he was going to plead guilty, he should plead guilty to manslaughter, which she says they should have advised him to do in the first place. Frances finds it very frustrating having to deal with a legal system which provides inadequate information. She gives the examples of not being informed when her husband was moved to another prison, and the lack of communication between prison staff.

Feelings towards the husband

Frances does not blame anyone for the event. She believes that a series of unfortunate events led to the incident. First, Noel received extra money from work at Christmas, which led him to drink more than normal. Second, she had just had an operation on her foot and could not walk, therefore she could not attend the party and control Noel's reaction to the drinking.

Frances' feelings toward her husband have not changed, in fact his imprisonment has given her cause for hope that their relationship will be "a lot better" when he returns home. She says that Noel is a very generous and responsible person, and has a caring attitude towards her and Ronald. He has provided the family with a good standard of living and took Ronald everywhere with him, even to his work. He also used to help Ronald with his school work. Frances adds that now he is more affectionate towards her and Ronald than before his imprisonment. According to Frances, Noel's "basic problem" is drinking, but now due to his offence being related to drink, he has firmly decided to give up the habit. Although he has tried many times before unsuccessfully to stop drinking, Frances is convinced that this time he really means what he says as they can now

discuss the problem together. She has therefore decided to wait for his return and endure all the difficulties for the sake of their future relationship.

At the time of the second interview, Francis still does not blame anyone for the event, just the "drink", and thinks that her husband's imprisonment has brought them closer together. She emphasises that, although she would not like to go through this experience again, it has helped Noel to realise the extent of his drinking problem and how much he loves her. Frances says that Noel is still determined to stop drinking and reorganise their lives, and she is convinced of his sincerity and feels very hopeful about their future. He is receiving therapeutic treatment in the prison.

Noel's relationship with Ronald has also become closer, and now they talk about Ronald's problems in more depth. Before his father's imprisonment, Ronald took him for granted but now he has become aware of the importance of his father's advice, particularly about his professional future.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Noel used to "earn quite well", but now Frances is living on the £45 per week she receives from the social security. This is the first time she has received social security benefits and it constitutes a "big drop" in the family's income. She feels ashamed to be "begging for money" and cannot go anywhere, even to visit friends or buy the things she was used to, such as clothes for Ronald and herself. At the moment she can only afford "basic things" like food, rent, electricity and gas. Frances feels very lonely and depressed as her friends have "left her alone", and the only persons she talks to, are the women she meets in the queue at the Prison Visitor's Centre. Frances also finds it extremely difficult to visit Noel every day, as a result of the operation she had had on her foot. She has tried various sources of help to take her to the prison, such as ambulances and Dial a Ride, but apart from the vicar of the local church and occasionally her sister, no one helps her. When the vicar cannot manage to take her to the prison, she has to hire a mini cab which costs her £5 a day. Although the time allowed for visiting is only 15 minutes, she cannot not miss a day of seeing Noel. Frances feels that this period of waiting for the trial is so uncertain that she cannot make any plans for the future.

The most difficult change for Frances is having to adjust to Noel's physical absence and the emptiness of the house. Initially, she could not sleep or eat on her own, and she lost two stone in weight. She felt so sad and vulnerable that when people spoke to her she would just cry. What has helped Frances to cope with her feelings of isolation are her son's company and the daily demands of looking after

him. She says that, apart from Ronald being very worried about his father's condition and angry with the police and solicitors, she did not notice any great changes in him. Soon after his father's arrest he became very quiet, but as the days passed he became used to the situation, mainly because Noel's attitude towards him changed for the better.

Since the last interview, Ronald has become more mature and responsible. Due to the financial situation, Ronald decided to seek part-time employment, and therefore does not now rely on his mother to buy the things he needs. He has been promised a job at a local estate agent as soon as he leaves school.

Frances' financial situation has not changed since the last interview. However, despite her limited economic resources she manages to keep herself busy by attending keep fit classes, gardening talks, visiting her sister and friends, and helping to organise jumble sales at the local church. But she cannot find the motivation to cook, particularly Sunday dinners. Since her husband's imprisonment she has not cooked a "single Sunday dinner". During the week she eats "tins of soup" as her son does not normally eat at home, and when he does, she boils some eggs or buys fish and chips. She still cannot sleep well as her "mind" is thinking of Noel and the situation.

Frances feels more lonely than she did last year. Since Noel's conviction she is allowed only one visit fortnightly compared to everyday when he was on remand. Although the visits now last for two hours, as against 15 minutes when he was on remand, she misses the daily contact she used to have with him. She adds that she feels as "if he is a dead-alive" person. In addition, the prison is located very far from London and the bus service which is laid on for prisoner's wives is not reliable. This service is supposed to run every Sunday, but it is often cancelled at short notice if there are not sufficient people who have booked seats. On these occasions Frances experiences great financial hardship and strong feelings of frustration.

Explanation of the event to the child

Frances says that she did not have to explain anything to Ronald as the police informed him about the event when they came to the flat to arrest Noel. They even questioned Ronald about his father's whereabouts and character, and he had to sign a statement about his father's movements on the day the offence was committed. Ronald has followed every step of the legal process since the day his father was arrested, and he also attended the trial.

Support system

Frances' parents are deceased but her sister has been extremely helpful. Sometimes she takes Frances to the prison, and also on holiday. Frances does not receive any help from Noel's family; he has not seen his mother for 20 years and does not wish to see her. He is frightened of her "causing a scene" and shouting things like "lock him up and through the key away".

Frances has not sought help from any organisation as she feels she can manage on her own and does not like strangers interfering in her life.

Child's perception of parents

Ronald says that he gets on "well" with his mother as she is very kind and cares for him. He feels that she understands him most of the time. For example, she allows him to go out and stay up "until late". She also keeps her promises most of the time. He only does not like his mother's "temper" (shouting). However, he would not change anything about her character, and he believes that he takes after her. Ronald says that he is like his mother to the extent that he is tidy, does his homework and "sticks to things". However, when he becomes angry he is more like his father after he has been drinking. That is, he throws and kicks things, fights and gets into a "real bad temper".

Ronald chooses his father as his favourite adult with whom to confide. He believes that he is generous and is prepared to help him in anything he can, such as his homework, explain general things to him and listen to his problems. He also says that when his father promises anything he means it, otherwise he would not promise in the first place. However, if he is in trouble at school he would go to his mother as she knows how to deal with this situation better than his father. Ronald says that when his father returns home he will follow his advice. In fact he is now following the advice his father has given since he has been in prison concerning what College he should attend and his future career. But he adds that no one should tell him what to do as he can make a choice, "I'm not a baby anymore".

Ronald says that his father understands him most of the times, like when he allows him to watch a television program which is shown at the same time as one his father would like to watch. But he does not understand Ronald when he "looses his temper" or when he tries to be funny, which for Ronald is not "funny at all". For example, on one occasion, when his mother returned from shopping and knocked on the door, his father answered: "there's nobody in", just to be funny. When Ronald went to open the door, his father grabbed his T-shirt which made Ronald loose his

temper and it lead to a fight between him and his father. In fact Ronald told the police about this incident when they asked him if he had any arguments with his father. The police distorted Ronald's account and wrote in his statement that his father used to beat him and he was, therefore, a violent person.

At the time of the second interview, Ronald still says that he gets on "well" with his mother, except when she "nags" at him for wasting his money on clothes and records. He likes her most when she is quiet and does not speak. Although he cannot express his feelings "in words", his mother knows him very well, therefore there is no need for him to explain how he feels about things to her.

His father continues to be Ronald's favourite adult with whom to confide. Now that he is in prison, he "saves" everything he wants to tell him until the next visit. Ronald thinks that his father understands the problems of young people and knows what to "talk about" (before his imprisonment, Noel used to work with adolescents).

If in trouble, Ronald would try to sort out his problems" on his own. If he needed help, he would talk to his teacher whom he trusts and has known for the past four years. However, he misses his father's help, particularly when he does not understand maths.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Ronald says that he knows everything about his father's imprisonment. The police told him when they first came to the house to arrest his father. Ronald was at home alone at the time, and when he opened the door they "rushed" in asking where his father was. Ronald asked them why they were looking for his father and if they had a warrant to search the house. They answered that they did not need a warrant for a murder investigation, and that his father was a very "bad" man who had done very terrible things and that Ronald should not "associate" with him. Ronald just listened and could not think or move. He felt very bad and would have liked to have told the police to go away immediately, but he did not "utter a word". He did not believe what they were saying and thought that it was all a mistake. He knew his father very well and he did not believe that he could have done such a thing.

Ronald blames his father's drunkenness for the offence and thinks that he should not be punished. As he states: "he should get off because he was drunk, so he didn't really know what he was doing because he doesn't know what he does when he's drunk. He's never done anything, my dad's not a criminal. Ronald just feels angry that his father has put himself in such a position.

At the time of the second interview, Ronald does not blame anyone for the event. He thinks that the circumstances led to his father getting drunk and committing the offence. Initially, he could not believe that his father could have done such a thing, but now he thinks that he is "doing his time" and when he returns home everything will be better than before as he is not drinking anymore.

However, Ronald goes on to say that his father should be free "because there's no proof that he did or that he didn't, and anyway if he did, he just went to help his friend and got drunk; it was just the circumstances".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Ronald only understood the full extent of his father's imprisonment three weeks after his arrest, when he visited him and saw him locked up all day with "hardly anything to do ". He felt very sorry for his father. However his feelings towards him have not changed, and he looks forward to having his father back home, but "cured of his drinking" habit.

Since his father's imprisonment, Ronald says that his mother cannot afford to buy him clothes or give him any money to go out, and his father cannot give him presents as he often used to before his arrest. But what Ronald misses the most is going out with his father, particularly to his work where they made models of oil rigs and petrol stations, and then had lunch together. He "really loved" these occasions as he learned many interesting things. He feels very sad as he believes that when his father returns home he will be working and not be able to do all these things he used to do with him.

At the time of the second interview, Ronald says that he has become more confident since his father's imprisonment. When his father was at home he used to give him money to buy records, clothes and books, but now he has to work to buy these things. However, he complains that he does not earn sufficient money to save for holidays or to go to restaurants as he used to do. He also misses his father's help and feels frustrated at having to cope alone with his school work.

Ronald feels "very, very angry" towards the police and stresses that he is never going to trust them again. He believes that on the day of his father's arrest they tried to "trick" him to give evidence against his father. He also feels deeply upset, for while he was giving the statement the police took his father away and he was not given the opportunity to say goodbye to him.

Ronald feelings towards his father have not changed. In fact, Ronald states that he now knows that he took his father for granted, but since his imprisonment, Ronald has realised how important his father is for him.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Ronald visits his father two or three times a week. He looks forward to seeing him, but "hates going down the prison". He can "stand the queue", but he "can't stand being in the waiting room full of people smoking". The smoke gets into his eyes and he can barely cope with it until the end of the visit. Ronald says that he feels sad seeing his father locked up all day.

Since his father's conviction, Ronald visits him once or twice a month. He looks forward to talking with him about his school work, what he has been doing and about what he is going to do in the future. When he is with his father he says: "I feel just kind of sad".

Interaction with friends

Ronald has many friends and likes them to have a "good personality", which means being cheerful and not mean. None of his friends know about his father's imprisonment. He would not tell anyone "because it's a family problem" and they would not understand why his father "did what he did".

At the time of the second interview, Ronald says that all his friends know about his father's imprisonment, but no one says anything to him about the subject. Ronald is absolutely sure that none of his friends would bully him about his father's imprisonment, but, he emphasises, if they did, they would "regret it" as he "would kill them".

Moral Judgment Interview

Time 1: Ronald thinks that, in general people should do everything to obey the law, otherwise "they can get in trouble", and they should be punished depending on the offence committed. According to Ronald, it is pointless putting someone in jail for "speeding down the motor way"; but if they have killed someone they should be punished.
Moral stage: 2

Time 2: Ronald thinks that is up to the people to obey the law or not. As far as he is concerned, after his father imprisonment, he does not trust the police or the law anymore. People who break the law should be punished depending on the offence they have committed. If one punishes everyone who has broken the law "there's going to be so many people in prison it's unbelievable".
Moral stage: 3(2)

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Ronald in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	19	21
Social self-peer	6	7
Home-parents	7	6
School-academic	8	5
General self score	80	78

Child's perception of the interview

Ronald says that he cannot express what he feels about the interview. He agreed to be interviewed as he believes it may help people to understand the situation he is in a "bit better". He finds the questions too long and a "bit personal", but as he has a choice of answering them or not, he does not mind.

FAMILY N

Mother: Pamela, 36 years old

Father: Ben, 45 years old

Children: Bill and Mara, 17 and 9 years old.

Demographic data

Family N live in a three-bedroom council flat in South London. Although it is a typical inner city Council Estate and is situated in front of a factory, the blocks are relatively small with grass areas between them for children to play. The internal corridors are dirty with the walls covered with grafitti. The interior of the flat is clean and fairly tidy.

Pamela attended a secondary modern school until the age of 15, after which she worked part-time in various jobs such as cleaning and in pubs. She married at the age of 18 already pregnant with her first son Bill. According to Pamela, her first husband carried out a robbery from a hotel but put the blame on his brother Ben, who was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment. She became very angry with her husband and told the truth to the police, "even Scotland Yard", but they did not take any notice of her information, "they had the man and that's it". Soon after this event she separated from her husband and began to receive social security. However, she continued to work part-time in casual jobs such as cleaning and on a market stall.

Pamela had a new relationship, with the father of her daughter Mara. Mara, however, never knew her father as the relationship ended soon after her birth.

When Pamela's ex-brother in law, Ben, was released from prison, he went to see Pamela to thank her for the support she gave him and that was the beginning of a new relationship between them. Mara was almost two years old at that time and has always thought that Ben was her real father.

Ben also has a son, who he did not know "existed" until three years ago, when "someone" told him that he had heard on a CB radio, that a young boy (Ralph) was claiming to be his son and was looking for him. Initially, Ben said to Pamela that he did not have any children, however, he decided to meet the young man and discovered that he was his son. Pamela did not like this new situation as she felt that Ralph was a threat to the close relationship she had with Ben, Mara and Bill. She also thought that Ralph was making too many demands on his father, both financially and emotionally, as his family was very poor.

Before his arrest, Ben had a fruit barrow and also sold souvenir hats. He also received social security. Pamela

used to help him in the business. She is very active and determined to achieve her goals. Generally, she does not like to talk about her private life, unless to a very close friend.

Husband's criminal data

Ben was arrested on arrival at Heathrow Airport from a holiday "abroad" with his son Ralph, for illegally importing drugs, for which he received a nine-year custodial sentence. At the time of the first interview, Ben had served two years of his sentence. Fourteen years ago, Ben received a ten-year prison sentence for robbery, of which he served six years.

Mother's perception of the event

For Pamela, Ben's arrest was a total surprise, she felt "shocked, stunned and terrified". She did not know what could happen and felt like a "robot". Pamela went to the airport with her son Bill to meet her husband and they were also arrested. The customs officers detained them at the airport for 10 hours before releasing them. Pamela could not speak and when she asked for a glass of water they (customs) would not give it to her. She also "begged" them to let her telephone to her daughter Mara, who had been waiting for them since 1 p.m. She was only allowed to telephone at 6 p.m.

Pamela thought that the situation would be resolved as drugs were not found in Ben's possession, but rather on his son Ralph. But when she realised that this was not to be the case, she felt really angry. She believes that if the police "want you, they'll get you". Pamela goes on to say that she always taught her children to respect the police, but now her attitude towards them has totally changed. She cannot identify the police with law and order and does not believe that their job is to protect people, but rather just to convict them. She repeats: "I hate them, I hate them, they're just pigs".

Pamela has become increasingly resentful towards authority (police, prison officers, solicitors and judges), and says that they are "picking on her husband and son". Both of them have been treated "very bad"; they did not allow her son Bill to visit Ben, and they have not kept the promise they made of providing therapy for him when he was sentenced.

When Ben was sentenced to nine years imprisonment she "just couldn't believe it", she thought "no, no, just can't be, can't be". She ran out of the court and does not remember how she drove home. She only recalls stopping the car many times to cry. Fortunately, her son Bill was with her and helped her to avoid an accident. When she arrived home she

"just cried and cried and cried", as did her son Bill and daughter Mara. Pamela was not expecting such a sentence as the barrister led her to believe that she had nothing to worry about as the prosecution could not prove anything. She believes that the barrister was completely inefficient just for the fact that he did not allow Ben to tell the court that Ralph was his son. For Pamela, the trial was also unfair as "it was put in the jury's mind that Ben was a minder". She is also very angry as Ben's appeal did not proceed. This was because Ben reported his barrister to the bar during his appeal on the grounds that he did not act on his behalf. As a consequence, the barrister was "thrown out", and when the appeal was to be heard the court would not supply a new barrister (it seems that by law Ben had to use the same barrister who worked on his trial). In addition, at that time the judicial system "were coming heavy" on drug offences.

Feelings towards the husband

Pamela firmly believes that Ben is innocent and blames Ralph for the event as the drugs were found in his possession, and he accused his father of smuggling in the drugs. She also blames the custom officers for Ben's imprisonment, as she thinks that they should not have taken him to court since he did not have the drugs on him.

Sometimes Pamela directs her feelings of frustration and resentment at her husband, for when something "wrong happens in the family" she blames him, as she thinks he should have "stood up and done something more through the courts", although "deep down" she knows he did what he could. More usually her frustration is directed towards her daughter Mara. For example, on one occasion Mara fell over and "split all her chin" and "all she wanted was daddy, daddy, daddy". Pamela shouted at her angrily: "your bloody daddy is not here, what do you want me to do about it?".

Pamela says that her feelings towards her husband have changed due to the lack of physical contact. Although she still loves him she has "built up a barrier" to any sexual desire, which adds to her feelings of frustration. However, Pamela still considers Ben to be part of the family and says that Mara is very close to him. Even in prison he contributes as a father by listening and participating in the problems that appear between Pamela and Mara. She has decided to wait for him and believes that when he returns home he will assume all his former responsibilities again. Pamela believes that she will have to wait the full nine years as she thinks we live in an unfair system.

At the time of the second interview, Pamela says that she still loves Ben and is sure that the "emotional side will never go", but she is worried about the "physical side".

She explains that she tries to remain as detached as possible from this aspect of their relationship, and to achieve this she goes as far as avoiding any cuddling during visits to prevent any fantasies developing. Currently, Pamela is extremely worried at the prospect of Ben receiving home leave, for although she is happy for both Ben and Mara, she is very apprehensive about what her sexual response toward Ben will be like after three years separation. Nevertheless, Pamela looks forward to having him back home as soon as possible. She admits that they have changed in "their own ways", but at the same time they have kept the necessary contact to keep the "emotional side alive". She says that Ben is still very close to Mara: "she's still his baby".

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Since Ben's imprisonment, Pamela's life has changed drastically. Financially, she has had to adapt from being quite "well off" to living "on peanuts". She cannot go out as before or buy all the things necessary for Mara's dancing lessons. She now only receives £45 a week from social security, whereas before Ben used to work and provide for everything. She also used to work with Ben, but when he went to prison she could not cope with the work alone as previously he decided everything about the business. Before, she was totally dependent on him and now she feels "completely useless" and has found it very difficult to deal alone with all the problems related to running a house. Sometimes she feels so angry about her situation that she "slams doors, throws plates and kicks things". Pamela also relies on her daughter for support and talks about her problems and frustrations with her. But she knows that Mara cannot do anything, and sometimes she does not even understand what Pamela is talking about.

Soon after Ben's imprisonment, Pamela's son Bill was arrested for being "carried by a stolen vehicle", but he received a conditional discharge. After that offence he "started knocking around with a guy of 32" who "was like a father figure" to him. They "got in trouble"; Bill was accused of stabbing a man and sentenced to three year's imprisonment.

Pamela has found it most difficult to cope with Mara's reaction to her father's absence. She started wetting the bed, having nightmares and demanding her father whenever something unpleasant happened to her. She would also cry and scream every time she saw a car similar to her father's, or saw something on the television which reminded her of her father: "one minute she could be happy, and in the next she could be in a fit of tears", which makes Pamela very upset. Mara has also become "clinging" and follows her mother everywhere for fear of losing her as well; she is very frightened that her mother can also be

arrested, and she might be put in a home. At school, Mara "answers back" to the teachers.

At the time of the second interview, Pamela still considers Bill part of the family. He cared for them and was always there if the children had problems. Even now, "after all these years in prison", if Mara is in trouble she will tell her mother, but as soon as she visits her father she tells him everything.

During the past year, Pamela has become more independent, and can cope better with her daily life. Many things cannot wait for a discussion with Ben, therefore she "gets on with it". However, she finds it difficult to cope with the loneliness and apart from visiting a friend, she does not go anywhere. During Ben's absence she has only been out to enjoy herself three times, and on each occasion she asked Ben's permission beforehand, as she does when she wants to go on holiday. As she states: "he ain't gone, he still rules the roost".

Pamela feels hurt by the fact that Ben is missing Mara's "growing up". During the visits, Ben tells her how sad he feels by observing the changes that Mara is undergoing, and not being able to take part in her development. She also finds it very painful to see her husband always miserable and continually protesting his innocence. He is "obsessed" with this matter and is unable to enjoy the brief time they have together. She recalls sadly how "easy going" he was at home, and she now feels like being "pulled from all the angles", as she has to play a supporting role to both, her husband's and her daughter's suffering. She complains that the prison's environment is not suitable to talk about family matters.

Three months ago, Pamela told Mara that Ben is not her natural father. Mara was very upset and shocked, but once she "calmed down" she accepted the situation and as far as Mara is concerned "that's the end of the story". What "calmed her down" was a conversation she had with Ben, when he told her that he will be always her father and that she will be always his daughter.

Although Mara is a "bit better", since the last interview, Pamela has been worried about her sadness and insecurity. She still "clings on" to her, and wants to know where she goes, what she is doing and to whom she is talking to. Pamela tries to reassure her by saying that she has not done anything wrong, therefore no one is taking her anywhere. But this fails to console Mara as she believes her father did nothing wrong and he is in prison. Currently, Mara is sleeping with her mother, and she says that when her father comes home Pamela has to leave the bed and let her sleep with him. When Pamela tells her that this is not possible, she replies that she will then bring the

quilt and sleep on the floor of her mother's bedroom.

Mara has had to be moved to another school as she has had problems with some children and the headmistress. Pamela says that the headmistress could not "stand Mara and picked on her". Once she "poked her shoes in Mara's stomach". However, Pamela is not happy with the new school as it has lower standards than the previous one and Mara's education has gone "right down". She adds that if her husband was at home this would never have happened.

Explanation of the event to the child

Mara knew what was happening from the beginning. Pamela says that she was too distressed to tell Mara a lie and continues to act in a "normal" manner. She also "honestly" believed that nothing was going to happen to Ben and that he would be home soon.

As the case progressed, Mara followed all the procedures. The legal problems were discussed in front of her and nothing was "covered up". Everytime Pamela went to see Ben or the solicitor, Mara would accompany her and hear what was said. Pamela says that this interaction has provided the opportunity to give mutual support to each other, and to help Mara absorb gradually the unfolding of events.

Support system

Pamela does not interact with her neighbours as she thinks they "should mind their own business and she'll mind her's". Only the next door neighbour knows about Ben's imprisonment, but she does not make any comment or give Pamela any support. Pamela does not tell anybody about her husband's imprisonment as she feels that people would make sarcastic remarks about her belief in his innocence. She has not even told her own family about the event. Her mother lives in the North of England, therefore she can manage to "keep the secret". She has no contact with Ben's family, apart from the occasional visit from one of his brothers. The only support she receives is the emotional support of close friends who really understand her situation.

Child's perception of parents

Mara says that she gets on "well" with her mother, and chooses her as her favourite adult with whom to confide. Mara believes that her mother understands the way she feels as she does not ignore her problems or "moan" when she cries, particularly when she feels sad about her father's absence. In times of trouble, Mara would go to either her father or mother as both would listen and try to help her. However, she thinks that her father "listens more" to her than her mother. This is because he allows her to talk

first before taking any action, whereas her mother has "a fit" as soon as she tells her a problem.

Mara could not think of any negative aspects about her father; he is joyful, keeps his promises most of the time and cares "a lot" about her. She is very attached to her father, and even now that he is in prison she tells him everything that happens to her. Mara thinks that she is not restrained like her mother, but is "more open" and "speaks her mind" like her father.

At the time of the second interview, Mara still thinks that her mother understands and cares for her. However, she would like to change her mother's "bad temper" and make her "more calm". When Mara told her mother that the headmistress was bullying her, she went "storming" to the school and started "bawling her head off" to the headmistress. Mara would have preferred that her mother had first discussed the matter, and then if it was necessary, "shout her head off". Mara also complains that, currently, her mother threatens to stop her dancing lessons just because she does not practice as much as she used to.

Mara says that she confides in her mother, but feels more affectionate towards her father as he is suffering for being away from them. She used to tell her problems to her father when he was at home, but now she is not so sure as he has been away for a long time. However, she still believes that he would help her more than anyone else, although he might get upset and "tell her off". She adds that her father's imprisonment did not change her feelings towards him; she still trusts and loves him "just as much if not more" than before. For Mara, the best aspect about her father is still his ability to listen to her "side first without having a fit" when she has a problem, and then work out what to do. She says that this attitude gives her confidence to disclose her problems to him without fear of getting into trouble.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Mara knows that her father is in prison for drug smuggling but she is convinced of his innocence and that he should not have been arrested. For Mara, his arrest was a mistake and she blames her father's son Ralph for the event, as he was in possession of the heroin but did not take responsibility for it. She also thinks that everyone linked with the case the police, barristers and judges are wrong as they did not have any evidence to accuse and sentence her father.

Initially, her mother told her that her father had been arrested without going into details. She felt very upset but thought that the customs were just doing their job and eventually they would discover that it was all a mistake.

But when her father had to go to court and received a nine-year sentence, she did not understand "anything anymore". She felt like "going up there" and "ripping and smashing the place up" as she was sure he was not guilty. Mara says that her father could not commit such an offence and he should not be punished; he "never did nothing wrong", but they put him in prison. They shouldn't have put him in prison because they didn't find any drugs on him".

At the time of the second interview, Mara is still absolutely sure that her father is innocent of the crime, and feels very angry towards "all this people" who have convicted her father and cannot "be bothered" to review his case, let alone take an interest to understand his family. If they did so, she believes it would show them how her father cares about everyone. She continues to believe that Ralph is responsible for her father's imprisonment, as he accused him of smuggling the drug in order to avoid being sentenced himself. She cannot understand why "all them people" believed Ralph's account as the drug was found in his possession and not in her father's. To indicate how angry her father feels about the issue, she goes on to say that Ralph and her father were placed in the same prison, but Ralph had to be moved to another prison for fear that his father would attack him. She says that he (Ralph) "will suffer" for "his lies", if her father "gets his hands on him".

Child's perception of changes after father's imprisonment

Mara says that she misses her father's presence in general and his "cuddles" in particular. She feels frustrated as she cannot go to places she used to before his imprisonment, such as Margate, restaurants or fan fairs. Her father also used to take her to dance classes and dance competitions. She felt very proud to have her father watching her dancing and winning competitions. Mara says that her's "is not a family anymore".

Before her father's imprisonment, Mara used to "run" to her father everytime her mother "told her off", but now she has lost his support. Soon after he went to prison, she could still telephone him when she felt very upset and receive some comfort, but after a while her mother stopped her as she said that he could not do anything about the matter and it would only add to his feelings of helplessness and frustration.

Mara has had most difficulty coping with her feelings of angeriness and insecurity related to the injustice committed by the police. She cannot understand how, being innocent, one can be put in prison, and as a result she does not trust the police anymore. She feels that anyone can be arrested guilty or innocent and setenced arbitrarily. She is also frightened that her mother could be arrested,

leaving nobody to take care of her.

At the time of the second interview, Mara says that her mother takes her to the dancing lessons, but she cannot take her on holiday, to the park or give her pocket money as her father did when he was at home.

Mara feels more frustrated than at the time of the last interview for not having her father's support in times of trouble. She is convinced that only he can "see her side" and then tell her what to do if she "gets in trouble", particularly with her friends. Now she even has to avoid telling him any problems during the visit for fear of upsetting him, as he is becoming "more and more sad as the time passes".

Mara has now moved to another school due to the hostile attitude of the headmistress towards her. She does not like the new school and feels extremely angry at this move, but she has no other choice.

Mara has never become used to her father's absence; she still misses her father's cuddles and the flat seems "bare" without his presence.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Mara visits her father once a week. She looks forward to the visits and tells him what she has been doing at home, at school and with friends since the last visit. She feels very happy to be with him, but she also feels sad when she has to leave him there.

At the time of the second interview, Mara still looks forward to visiting her father, however, she feels very annoyed as her father wastes most of the visiting time repeating that he is innocent and "going over and over again his court case". As a consequence, he is always sad and she would like to see him happy. When Mara is with her father she feels both happy and upset; happy because she is with him, and upset because she has to leave him and wait for another two weeks to talk to him again (Ben was moved to a prison where visiting is allowed twice a month).

Interaction with friends

Mara does not talk about her father with any of her friends and they do not ask about him as she only interacts with them at school. She returns home from school alone and her mother does not allow any of the children who live on the estate to play with her; her mother thinks that most of the children who live on the estate "swear and have bad manners". Mara worries about "keeping the secret" about the event from her friends as they would not understand the

situation and would not believe that her father is innocent.

At the time of the second interview, Mara still takes great care to ensure that her friends do not discover her "secret" as she believes that they would immediately think that her father is a "crook" and "take the Mick" out of her, when she knows her father is innocent of the charges.

She still cannot talk about her father with her friends, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to avoid conversations which may lead to a disclosure about her father's situation. She feels "very bad" when her friends tell her about the "nice places" they have been with their fathers. She has to make a great effort not to cry, and to think before mentioning anything about her father. She really would like to talk about her father's situation and be able to defend him, but she knows that no one would understand or believe in his innocence: "they would only laugh at her".

Moral development interview

Time 1: Mara thinks that people should obey the law "because most law are right, some are not, but most of them are". People should be punished depending on the reasons why they break the law. "What matters is the reason why they broke the law".

Moral stage: 3(2)

Time 2: Mara thinks that people should obey the law "because the law is very important. You can destroy people's life because you've done something wrong towards the law". People who break the law should be punished "because they should be taught a lesson, unless there's a reason for it".

Moral stage: 3

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Mara in the four sub-scales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	18	20
Social self-peer	6	7
Home-parents	7	7
School-academic	6	6
General self score	74	80

Child's impression of the interview

Mara says that talking about her father's imprisonment has helped to "get it a little bit out of my system". Although Mara feels bored to answer the questions, she does not mind because she is helping other people. She finds the questions difficult and boring.

FAMILY Q

Mother: Constance, 27 years old

Father: Mark, 28 years old

Children: Jennifer and Tania, 8 and 4 years old.

Demographic data

Family Q live in a two-bedroom ground floor council flat. The flat is located in a row of terraced houses and has a small rear garden. The property appears to be quite old and run down. Rubbish is left in front of the property, and what space is available for plants is overgrown with weeds. The interior is untidy and in need of repair. At the time of the first interview Constance was attempting to re-decorate the flat herself.

Constance attended a special school for "fragile children" until the age of 16. She had a difficult childhood as she suffers from diabetes and had to remain inside the house most of the time. Until she was six years old she had to be "carried up and down the stairs" by her sister. Her mother was overprotective towards her and did not think she could ever cope with a family on her own. However, Constance left home when she was 19 years old, after a row with her mother over the time to arrive home at night when she was pregnant with Jennifer. Soon after she married Jennifer's father Glen, and they went to live with his parents. They separated after about one year and Constance went to live with Mark. Jennifer was two years old at the time. Glen has agreed to let Jennifer think that Mark is her real father, and Glen her uncle until she is of a sufficient age to understand. However, since Mark's imprisonment, Constance's mother has frequently reminded Jennifer that Mark is not her real father. Constance has a second daughter, Tania, by Mark. Before his imprisonment, Mark worked in the "building trade".

Husband's criminal data

Mark was arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment for murder, which means fourteen-year sentence with the possibility of release after 10 years for good behaviour. He killed his sister's lover with a scaffolding pole after a row in a pub involving his sister's husband. At the time of the first interview, Mark had served three years of his sentence. He has no previous convictions.

Mother's perception of the event

Constance did not expect that Mark would be arrested, but when he was, she did not think it was serious and thought he would be released soon. She thinks that he was "just in the wrong place at the wrong time". During the trial, Constance prepared herself for a sentence of five years,

even though she believed he would be released. When he was sentenced to life she felt "horrible" and "totally devastated". She felt helpless, angry and totally lost dealing with the judicial system. She did not understand the trial and cannot say if it was fair or not, especially the forensic reports; she is surprised "how much they can tell from silly things". Constance blames herself for contributing to the police's suspicion of Mark as she washed his jacket at "the wrong time". She also felt very hurt by the statement given in the court about the state of her flat. The "CID men" said that her place was filthy, when she did not have time to clean it after all the confusion. She believes the police gave this information as "a lot of things depend on the surroundings". However, Constance does not blame the jury for the sentence as they have "a big decision to make", even though she thinks 14 years is a long time, particularly when compared to the ten-year sentence given to her brother-in-law for killing Constance's sister. Even so, she believes that the jury was biased against Mark as he is Irish. She also thinks that, as no one spoke on Mark's behalf, not even his sister, who went back to Ireland with her husband instead of staying in London to give evidence, it did not help his case.

Feelings towards the husband

After Mark's conviction, Constance kept asking herself all kinds of questions concerning her relationship with her husband, the problems of coping alone with the children, their futures, and managing the family's finances. However, she still considers Mark to be part of the family and she is determined to wait for his return for "as long as it takes" so they can "begin a new life". Constance says that Mark is a very good husband and he loves the children. Even now, he never forgets their birthdays and follows their development with interest. He was "very thrilled" when Tania put on her first nickers without nappies and when she started to talk. She adds that she could ask him for anything and he would try to provide it. But most important is Mark's relationship with Jennifer. Since they met "they took to each other like a duck takes to water". Even though Tania is his natural daughter, Jennifer is his favourite and she is closer to Mark than to her. Constance recalls the first time Jennifer saw Mark. She told Jennifer to say "hello" to him, but she said: "hello daddy" and sat on his lap immediately. The first Christmas Mark spent with them he bought a pink dress for Jennifer which made her feel very happy and proud. Currently, he saves money he receives in prison to buy "furry material" to make animals, such as panthers and teddy bears for Jennifer.

Constance believes that Mark is innocent of the crime, even though he participated in the fight. Constance insists that she would not be waiting for him if she knew he was guilty as she would feel scared of living with him. She agrees

that Mark can be aggressive, particularly when drunk, but "he would never look around to pick up something to hit anyone. If he feels like beating up someone, it would be with his hands". Constance blames Mark's sister for his imprisonment: if she had not had an affair with the victim "behind her husband's back", nothing would have happened.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Before his imprisonment, Mark received his wages "cash in hand", which, added to Constance's social security benefits, allowed the family to have a reasonable standard of living. Now Constance has enormous difficulties trying to manage with the £36 she receives in benefits. She has to rely on charity for the children's clothes, which makes her feel very depressed.

After Mark's imprisonment, Constance had to wait a month for an appointment with the social services to sort out her benefits. During this period she had to borrow money to survive. However, the most difficult thing for Constance to cope with at that time was her health. Mark used to give her the daily injections of insulin she needs to control her sugar level, therefore she was very frightened to be alone, as "anything could happen to her", and consequently to the children, during periods of low sugar level. She was too "terrified" to inject the insulin herself and a nurse was called, but after a while the nurse taught her how to inject herself. During this time she felt disoriented like a "robot going about", and would direct her frustration at Jennifer.

Although Constance feels very lonely and misses "silly things like ironing Mark's shirts", she is more confident in herself as she has learned to inject the insulin and knows what to do when her sugar level drops. She also does many things that previously she relied on Mark to do, such as the decorating, and has adopted a firm approach with the children. Constance perceives the development of her independence to be a positive outcome of Mark's absence.

Constance says that she has not noticed any changes in Jennifer's behaviour since Mark's imprisonment. She explains that Jennifer has always wetted the bed, therefore she cannot say that this behaviour is a consequence of Mark's absence. However, during the interview she says that when Mark first went to prison, Jennifer became very quiet, did not play out as much as she used to, and tended to stare at the television no matter what program was on. She also says that, after Mark's imprisonment, Jennifer kept asking about him "on, and on, and on", and that she was "pining for him". But once Constance told her that he would be away for a long time, she never asked for any further explanation. According to Constance, Jennifer "pretends

most of the time", therefore she has to ignore her otherwise she would rely on her to do things that she could easily do herself, such as her school work. When Jennifer visits Mark, she demands his attention throughout the whole visit, much to the annoyance of Constance and Mark as they cannot talk. Jennifer is very interested in knowing what kind of wall paper Mark has in his cell.

Constance feels that Jennifer "improved enormously" after the first prison visit. She thinks "it was for Jennifer's peace of mind to know that her father was still about, rather than just disappear like her first father", for Jennifer may believe that it is her fault that "all her fathers disappear". However, Constance says that it is very difficult for her to take the children to the prison as frequently as she would like, as she cannot afford the journey. In addition, the children do not allow her to talk with her husband as they interrupt their conversation "all the time". She emphasises that there should be some attraction for children in prisons so they could "talk together, at least for half an hour in piece".

At the time of the second interview, Constance is still struggling to manage the family finances with the money she receives from the social security, and finds it most difficult having the sole responsibility of the children. Although she feels very lonely, she is resigned to living alone. She says that she has "no choice" but to bring up her two daughters the best she can, adding "but it is very hard with so little money".

The major difficulty with which Constance has had to cope since the first interview has been the deterioration in Jennifer's behaviour. According to Constance, she has become much worse; she seems to be living in the "clouds" and does not react to anything. For example, Jennifer gets up at 5 a.m., puts all her toy cups and saucers in a shampoo bubble bath and mixes them with water and toilet paper. Constance washes everything and reprimands her, but next day she repeats the same procedure. When Constance asks her to put the toys away she does not listen to her, and no matter how long Constance makes her stay in her bedroom as a punishment, she still will not put the toys away. Constance has decided to hide all her toys. On one occasion, Constance was so annoyed with her lack of response that she shook her and shouted: "for god's sake scream at me, will you, tell me to go away". Jennifer's response was to repeat "go away" very quietly.

Jennifer also lies frequently but insists that she is telling the truth, even when she is confronted with overwhelming evidence that she is lying. Jennifer will "answer blind" that she did not do what she is accused of. After a "wack" Jennifer might say half the truth. Constance loses her temper and shouts at her: "you hate

me, don't you, you really do, that's why you do that to me, don't you?". But Jennifer does not answer and just stares at her.

Jennifer likes to play with everything that belongs to her mother; she wants to read Constance's books and play with her perfume and powder. She also hides her dirty clothes under her mother's wardrobe, and when asked why she does this, she answers that she does not know or just shrugs her shoulders. Constance says that she cannot talk to Jennifer as her mother could not talk to her. She goes on to say that Jennifer often "mumbles" to herself and never tells Constance what she did at school. For example, a boy in the school "grabbed Jennifer by her hair and hit her head on a brick wall" and she did not tell anyone. Constance only found out because Jennifer told the story to a friend of Constance's brother when Constance was in the kitchen and Jennifer thought she could not hear her.

Recently, Jennifer has been stealing sweets from shops when accompanying Constance shopping. On one occasion, Jennifer took some sweets from the shop and hid the wrappings under the carpet in her bedroom. Two days later, Constance found them there and said to her: "Do you want to end up in prison like your dad, because that'll happen if you carry on and mummy will end up there too, so you'll have none of us". On another occasion when Jennifer stole sweets Constance threatened to call the police, and just by chance a police car stopped nearby and Jennifer pointed to the policemen. Constance had no choice but to tell the policeman about Jennifer's behaviour. The policeman reprimanded Jennifer, and until now, it seems to have had results.

Jennifer also does not sleep well. She goes to bed at 8 p.m. and when is 4 or 5 a.m. she is "wide awake and wants breakfast". Sometimes she picks up a pillow and a cover and sleeps on the floor next to her mother's bed. When she wets the bed, Constance feels that she wets it on purpose to upset her, as generally this happens when Jennifer wakes up and could avoid it. When Constance went to the social services to ask for new sheets to replace the old ones, they insisted that Jennifer be seen by a psychiatrist. Constance says that the therapy is having no effect on Jennifer.

Constance also says that Jennifer is always in trouble at school. Children throw ink and stones at her, and once during a school trip to the swimming pool a group of children from another school threw Jennifer's new shoes in the toilet full of faces. Constance believes that everyone "picks on Jennifer" because she does not stand up for herself and has no confidence or "personality, she just exists". However, Constance says that Jennifer is completely different when she is not present. While

Constance is near her, she is quiet, does not talk and does what she is told. Normally, Jennifer does all "the naughty things" when Constance is not present. She then becomes lively, talks and sings, but when Constance arrives she stops immediately. According to Constance, Jennifer would talk to anyone but her and she does not know what to do. She does not understand why Jennifer behaves in this way. Constance says that she prefers Tania (Jennifer's younger sister) because "I know where I stand with her". Last week Constance was so angry with Jennifer that she told her to pack her bag and get out of the house as she did not want her anymore. Jennifer did not move, she just "stood there and looked at me". What brought Constance to such an extreme state of desperation, was an accumulation of things such as Jennifer's lying, taking things from the cupboard and eating the whole tub of ice cream at 6 a.m.

Mark and Constance have had many arguments about Jennifer during visits as he thinks Constance is too strict with her. For example, when Constance and Mark are talking and Jennifer demands attention, Constance becomes very annoyed and tells her to go and play. Mark complains that she is "picking on the child". However, on the last visit Jennifer was so disruptive that even Mark "had a go at her".

Explanation of the event to the child

Constance has never explained to Jennifer why Mark is in prison and tries not to talk about him with her. At the time of his arrest, Jennifer assumed that Mark was in hospital (Constance does not know how she arrived to that conclusion) and asked her mother what was wrong with him. Constance replied that he had "a bad back". Recently, Constance overheard Jennifer telling her cousin that her father was in prison, and that it was not a hospital. However, they still do not mention this subject, although Jennifer visits her father in prison. On one occasion Jennifer asked her mother what he had done to be in prison, to which Constance answered "he was a naughty boy and the police took him away". Jennifer appeared to be satisfied with this answer.

Support system

Constance thinks she is lucky as most of her friends and neighbours gave her support by listening to her problems and helping her to look after the children. Her mother has also given her some help, although Constance thinks she tries to control her too much and does not like this attitude. Mark's family live in Ireland and are therefore unable to help her.

At the time of the second interview, Constance does not receive any support from her family, his family or her friends, although her mother looks after the children

sometimes. Constance has not asked for any help from the social services, as she is worried that "they may say she's a bad mother". She was contacted by a Catholic organisation, who has taken her on holiday, given the children clothes and organised a Christmas party where the children received presents.

Child's perception of parents

Jennifer thinks she gets on "okay" with her mother as she allows her to colour pictures and see her friends. Jennifer likes very much to awake her mother in the mornings as she wants to have her breakfast. She also likes playing with puzzles and cards with her. However, she would change her mother's "mind" into her grandmother's "mind", but does not know why. Jennifer goes on to say that she does not like her mother shouting at her or hitting her, and would like it if she could give her more attention. Jennifer says that she used to get on "fine" with her father and felt happy when he told her stories or sang songs for her. She adds that her sister, her mother and herself want him to return home as "all of us like him". If Jennifer could change her father, it would be into a "flying fish", as she likes flying fish; or into a toy dragon, but does not know why.

Jennifer says that her grandmother is her favourite adult with whom to talk, but if she is in trouble she would go to her mother as she would "tell off" anyone who kicks, beats, punches or pulls her. Jennifer would also talk to her teacher as she is "nice and likes people". This teacher also likes the work Jennifer does at home and she tells her how to make things and how to do maths. She says that her father is not at home as he works in a hospital as he suffers from a "bad back".

At the time of the second interview, Jennifer says that she does not get on well with her mother as: "I can't tell her what happens to me", but does not know why she feels that way. Jennifer says that she no longer knows in whom to confide as her father has been away for a long time.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Jennifer says that she does not know what really happened but tries to think that her father is not in prison. She goes on to say that she does not know the place where he is, but whenever she visits him he looks very sad and has "different hair"; "once it was curly, then it was short and now it is different". Therefore Jennifer thought that "it weren't my daddy, he didn't look like my daddy, but he was".

Although, Jennifer does not really know why her father is in prison, she says that if he "stays there for a long,

long, long time until I grow up, then I'll miss him very much. She says that he should not be punished because "is my best dad. I don't want him punished, I cry because I hate my dad being punished".

At the time of the second interview, Jennifer says that she tried hard to think that her father was not in prison but in a hospital. Then she heard her mother telling her friends that her father was in prison, but she still tried to keep thinking that he was in hospital. When she could not "think hard anymore", she felt very sad because he was in prison and no one had told her. She wishes he "wasn't in hosp.... I mean prison".

Jennifer believes that someone must have hit her father "first on the back", and then her father "hit the person back". She is sure that her father did not start the fight, but she does not know how the fight ended. Jennifer blames "somebody else who must've done it", but does not know who. Jennifer still thinks that her father should not be punished as "I don't want him punished", although she now thinks that he did "something naughty, but he's still my best dad".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Jennifer says that when her father left home she felt scared, but when asked what she was scared about, she replied: "he was gone, he makes me scared". Jennifer then changed the subject, but when probed further she revealed that she feared that her mother could go away like her father, and she would have to remain alone with her sister.

Jennifer looks forward to having her father at home again because he is "nice" and gives her attention. Before her father's imprisonment, she felt happy playing hide and seek and going to the shops and parks with him. She recalls sadly, that she loved the time he used to take her to the swings, but now she does not go anywhere. Jennifer feels both sad and angry because she would like to see her father everyday, so that he could read books to her, cuddle her, and fix her bicycle. She emphasises that she loves her father the same as before and that it is very difficult "not to have my daddy".

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Jennifer visits her father "lots of times" and she likes to see him, particularly when he buys sweets for her. She tells him how she is doing at school and everything that has happened at home between visits. She feels very happy to be with him as he makes her laugh by telling "funny jokes". But what makes Jennifer really happy is when he cuddles her, although she also says that sometimes he sends

her away in order that he can talk to her mother, and then she feels "really sad".

Interaction with friends

Children often bully Jennifer, but not about her father's imprisonment; they throw earth at her, kick and punch her, and pull her hair, but she does not know why: "It's too much, I don't know really, I don't know what to do". She feels very angry and wishes "I was a baddest, horrible, yaki, maddest, very mad dog, and when they bully me I'll au, au, au". Jennifer never mentions her father to anyone as she is frightened of being bullied.

Moral Development interview

Time 1: Jennifer thinks that people in general should obey the law "because it's right to obey the law, and they should be punished "because they steal, kill people, hit them on the head, bang dead".

Motal stage: 1/2

Time 2: Jennifer thinks that people should obey the law "because if I don't obey the law I'll be killed. God, when God had killed me I go up into heaven and I'll be an angel and I do what God says. I'll be arrested and stay in prison long time. They should be punished "because they've stolen, that's it".

Moral stage: 1

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Jennifer in the four sub-scales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	10	10
Social self-peer	5	4
Home-parents	4	5
School-academic	4	4
General self score	46	46

Child's impression of the interview

Initially, Jennifer felt frightened that she would not be able to answer the questions, but by the end of the interview she felt more relaxed and happy. However she thinks that there are too many questions and that they are difficult. She feels sad to talk about her father, but does not mind to talk to the researcher.

FAMILY P

Mother: Susan, 28 years

Father: Jack, 29 years

Child : Natalya, 9 years and 1 month

Demographic data

Family P live in a two-bedroom flat in a relatively modern council estate in Surrey. The interior of the flat is adequately furnished, clean and tidy. Susan attended school until the age of 15, after which she worked in an office. Since her daughter Natalya was born she has been receiving social security and working part time in a fish and chip shop and cleaning houses.

Susan met Jack, her current common law husband, when she was 18 years old, and after three months she became pregnant with Natalya. Jack has an institutional background: care, borstal and prison. He is a compulsive thief, drinks heavily, gambles and for the past four years he has been taking drugs. Jack has been unemployed (in receipt of social security) for the majority of the time that he and Susan have been together. According to Susan, he is very unreliable, he often leaves the flat saying that he will return home for dinner and then disappears for four or five days. Susan admits that since the beginning she was the one who kept the relationship going as she believed people could change and Jack would "grow to love me". But his addiction and consequent "nastiness" and "viciousness" ruined their relationship.

At the time of the second interview, Susan had separated from her husband and had three part-time jobs: serving in a fish and chip shop, cleaning and participating in group research.

Husband's criminal data

Jack was arrested and remanded in custody for shoplifting, burglary and failing to surrender to bail. At the second interview he had been sentenced to 12 month imprisonment and released, but did not return to the family home as Susan decided they should separate.

Mother's perception of the event

Susan believes that Jack is totally responsible for his imprisonment. She thinks that he is stupid, and contrary to previous occasions, she hopes that he will receive a long sentence in order that she may have the opportunity to reorganise her life. Susan explains that her attitude to her husband's imprisonment has changed over the years from "utter devastation" to "utter relief". Initially she

believed he could change and felt sorry for him. Whenever he was arrested she felt as though he had died as many times she was not even given the opportunity to saying good-bye. She used to be very supportive to him and thought of herself as "great" by helping him. But now she realises that it is unlikely that Jack will ever change. However, Susan is visiting Jack regularly for the sake of Natalya, and because she feels sorry for him: "If I don't take him some cigarettes or a meal now and again nobody would".

At the time of the second interview, Susan reiterates that only Jack is to blame for his imprisonment. She even goes as far as to say that his 12 month sentence was too lenient as he has no respect for the law.

Feelings towards the husband

Susan loved Jack very much and thought he would settle down especially after they moved into their present home. However, his perennial drug problem has undermined any hope of her ever having a stable and loving relationship with him. Susan emphasises that "I would stand by him being in prison, but I cannot come to terms with this horrible, disgusting, filthy habit of injecting himself, and his shifting moods and sickness". She goes on to say that she could not cope with her husband's activities to finance his addiction: "he sold his daughter's television, jewellery, broke into the electric meter and even took articles from my dad's flat". As a consequence Susan underwent a period of severe depression, and has now given up any hope of a future with her husband.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Susan says that nothing has changed since her husband has been in prison, as he is totally unreliable and has never contributed financially, or to general decision making within the family. In fact she feels more secure when he is not at home as she can plan and organise her life more effectively. When he is at home everything is chaotic. She recalls the previous time when she felt completely lost and confused about laws and courts and could not make any plans as her only thought was how to get him out of prison.

Susan says that it is difficult for her to link any changes in her daughter's behaviour to her father's imprisonment as he has been in prison so many times. She has not noticed any changes in her behaviour or school work and attributes this to the lack of details given to Natalya about her father's imprisonment. However, she has observed that Natalya has problems with relationships. It is very difficult for her to keep a friend no matter how much effort she puts into it. According to Susan, Natalya does not like to hurt anyone, therefore her friends bully her.

Susan also says that Natalya feels that her father is incapable of taking care of himself, and consoles herself by believing that he is safer in the prison as "he can't get into trouble in there". Natalya also shows concern about her father's cell conditions and repeatedly asks her father what colour are the carpets and the wall paper in there.

Since the last interview, Susan and Jack have decided to separate, therefore she does not now consider him to be part of the family. In fact Susan admits that he never contributed as a father or as a husband. They never went out together and he only gave money to her when he felt like it. She does not consider that by Jack taking Natalya out or giving her some attention when he feels like it, is sufficient criteria to be considered a participant father. She would have terminated the relationship before if it were not for her daughter's strong attachment to her father. According to Susan, Natalya and her father are very close, she loves him dearly and accepts the way he is, although she does not know about his drug problem (Natalya believes that her father suffers from frequent "colds" and is not well). Natalya knows that her friends' fathers are different from her's but she cannot elaborate on this subject. To indicate the extent to which Natalya is prepared to make excuses for her father's unreliability, Susan recalls an event which happened last year, before Christmas. Natalya made a bet with her friends that her father was not in prison, and would attend the Christmas Concert that was held at her school. She was "worried sick" that her father might not be released as expected, before the Concert, but when he was eventually released on time she was "over the moon". However, Natalya's happiness was to be short lived as her father did not attend the Concert as he was under the influence of drugs. At first she "slammed herself in the settee" and shouted that she did not want to see her father ever again and "sobbed, sobbed and sobbed", while repeating: "how can I face the girls and how are they going to believe me now?". But as soon as her mother told her that her father telephoned saying that he had to go to the social security at 7 p.m. to get money, she "swallowed it straight away" and calmed down, even though it was a blatant lie.

It was soon after the saga of the Christmas Concert that Susan decided to move Natalya to a new school, although this event was not the main reason for her decision. Susan had been aware for some time that Natalya had been involved in a gang of children who were stealing. She explains that Natalya had been bullied frequently by two girls at the previous school and they were forcing her to do what they wanted, and the situation became worse once they learned that her father was in prison.

Currently, Susan both despises and fears Jack. When he

comes to see Natalya and they are together he abuses her and treats her like "dirt" and she has to make an effort to avoid arguments. She is particularly worried when her husband takes Natalya out in his car, but she does not dare to say anything as he has threatened to "scar" Susan's face if she stops him taking Natalya out. However, it is becoming easier for her to cope with the situation; she does not get hurt anymore, and it does not "destroy part of me" to see Jack "stoned". Susan adds that she cannot forgive him for letting Natalya down and does not understand how he can hurt someone who loves him so much. Susan is concerned that Natalya still accepts all the "muck" her father "throws at her", which she says is her fault because during all these years she hid from her daughter her father's doings and her own suffering, therefore, Natalya tends not to worry about her. She recalls that at Christmas she used to put all the presents in a sack and say that were from "mum and dad", when "he couldn't even be bothered to give Natalya a present, even a sweet or some food".

Explanation of the event to the child

Until Natalya was five years old, Susan used to tell her that her father was working away, although on one occasion when Natalya was about three years old she witnessed her father being arrested when he arrived home handcuffed with four or five policemen. He was shouting at the police as he did not want Natalya to see him in that condition. Natalya, who was leaning against the wall of the flat, became very white, "all her blood drained from her face" and she slid down the wall. However, Susan believes that Natalya does not remember this incident, and adds that whenever the police have carried out a search of the flat, she takes Natalya to her mother's, therefore she only witnesses the police arrival. When Natalya was about five years old, and could read the word prison on the gate, Susan told her that her father was working in the prison. Although Susan believes that Natalya accepted this explanation, Natalya herself questioned her father on why he did not come home at weekends. His response to this question was that he wanted to finish the work as soon as possible. Susan finally told Natalya that her father was in prison when she was six years old. She took the opportunity when her husband was convicted for a less "serious" offence: drinking and driving. Therefore Natalya still does not know the full extent of her father's criminal activities.

According to Susan, Natalya felt "very, very angry" toward the police, her father and everybody involved, although recently she does not show any reaction and appears to have become used to it. Susan adds however, that she does not know how Natalya really feels "inside her".

Support system

Susan's mother has been a major support to her by listening to her problems, looking after Natalya and taking her on holidays, unlike Jack's family, who have never shown any interest or concern with Susan or Natalya. Susan feels very fortunate in having good neighbours that helped her with the bail for her husband. Her friends have also given her enormous support and she marvels at their patience; they have listened to her problems being expressed "over and over again, day after day".

Susan has never received any help from social services, not even money towards the transport to the prison. She tried once to claim travelling expenses, but the "hours" she lost waiting and the telephone calls she had to make cost her more than she would have received. The only person who went to see her was the probation officer as he had to make a report about Jack. Susan adds that she does not want social workers round her flat "preaching" to her, and she does not believe they can give her the help she requires.

Child's perception of the parents

Natalya believes she has the same sense of humour as her father, and like him, she does not take things very seriously and makes jokes out of everything. However, she would like to be like her grandmother, her mother, or her aunt as they have "a lot of energy". Because they keep busy doing many things they have not "grown up to be nasty" and they are very kind to people. Natalya feels that her mother provides her with security; she sees her as being kind and reliable, as "always being there". When her mother makes a promise she keeps it, unless she "really has to break it". Natalya chooses her mother or grandmother as her favourite adults with whom to confide. Both take her seriously and try hard to do something about her problems. Although Natalya likes to talk to her father, she would not tell him her problems, only "laughable things", as he does not take her seriously and would make jokes and laugh at what she tells him. She likes her father's jokes but not when she is talking about her problems or asking for advice. Sometimes, however, he may take her "too seriously", as when she had problems with her friends and he wanted to go to the school "to sort out things the wrong way" (shouting and screaming) without even knowing what was really happening. Natalya adds that her father tells her all his secrets, but she would only tell her secrets to her mother as she understands her.

Natalya does not mind who tells her what to do, although she believes she can get round her father as "he's more of a softy". She believes that she gets on "well" with her father most of the time. Natalya "loves" when they go

together across the meadows and fields looking for "nature things", such as conkers and leaves. His ability to paint and his love of excitement are what Natalya most admires in her father. She emphasises that her father is not like an ordinary person, he "has to be different". He is not frightened of anything, he would take her by different routes across the fields where the horses are running wild, and be adventurous by walking long distances instead of calling for a taxi, whereas her mother would go by car everywhere.

What she most "hates" is when her father goes to prison as they are not able to see each other and enjoy "lovely weekends". If she could change anything about her father it would be "his ways" so that he would not have to go to prison. Natalya goes on to say that he does not understand what she feels when he makes a promise without having any intention of keeping it, particularly the promise of not returning to prison. Everytime she visits him, he promises her that she will never have to go to the prison again, but she does not take any notice of what he says anymore, as he never keeps any promise. However, she says that he does understand her need to see her best friend on Saturdays and miss some visits to the prison. Natalya can only see her best friend on Saturday which coincides with the time she visits her father. To decide on whether to see her father or her friend she plays "little match", thus, it is her little finger who makes the final decision. However, she still feels very guilty at not seeing her father more often as it appears that, lately, her "little finger" chooses to see her friend more frequently than her father.

At the second interview, and after her father had been released from prison, Natalya says that "in a way I prefer it more when he is in prison because I know exactly where he is", for now that her father and mother have separated, Natalya does not know where he lives; "he stays everywhere". She also feels let down when her father goes to the pub saying to her that he will be back soon and can be hours before he comes back. This normally happens on Sundays, the only day she sees him and which is supposed to be "our Sunday". She explains that, although her father "sleeps a lot", she just likes him to be at her flat on that particular day, especially when it is raining and she sits near her father on the settee.

Natalya also recalls the disappointment she felt at Christmas when her father failed to attend the school Concert, as he knew how important it was for him to go. She had made a bet with her friends that she had a father and he was not in prison. Natalya kept looking to her watch "all the time" and felt "really bad" when her friends said: "I told you, you haven't got a father, he's in prison, I don't believe you anymore". Natalya states that she felt very angry with her father, but she still loves him the

same and adds that what would make her feel "really happy" would be her father staying at home with her, for him to stop having arguments with her mother, and make him find a job, so that they could be a family again.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Natalya says that her father has been in prison "a few times" for drinking and driving, breaking into video shops, stealing a "real tea set" from a shop, which she adds was not her father's fault as he was with a friend, but only he was blamed for the offence.

When her mother explained about her father's imprisonment for the first time, Natalya felt "pretty horrible" and became "very, very, very upset" as no one that she knew had a father who went to prison, but she believed that he would never do it again. Now she is used to it and does not feel so bad anymore, she just says: "Oh no, not again". She explains that "normally" the telephone would ring from some police station and the person would ask to speak to her mother. After the telephone conversation her mother would say to her: "Do you know what happened?" and Natalya would say: "I think so", and her mother would answer: "What?" then Natalya would tell her mother what she thought and her mother would say: "yes" and tell her what happened in more detail. Natalya emphasises that, although she is not proud of him, she cannot do anything about it. She accepts that he is "stupid to follow his friends and do silly things". She knows he is not going to change, but she still likes him very much, even though she does not know why.

Natalya thinks that her father should not have broken the law as "it is naughty". However, she thinks that he should be let free because "it was only a little one, it was only drinking and driving and not killing or things like that". At the time of the second interview she still thinks that her father should not have broken the law, and he should only have "just a small sentence because is not very serious like killing or rape, and his friend S. should also be blamed because he was with my dad". Natalya explains that her father commits all these offences because "all his friends do and he does not want to be the odd one out". They have all been in prison, except for their "mothers and ladies". She does not understand why her father does not find other friends, and she compares him to herself saying that when she was at the old school, her friends "got her into stealing and swearing" otherwise she could be the "odd one out". However, now that she is with different friends she does not steal or swear anymore.

Child's perception of changes after father's imprisonment

Since her father has been away, Natalya misses "seeing him all the time" and going out weekends to the fields, horse

riding and to a "nice pub", where Natalya could play in the "animals playground" nearby and have crisps. She also loved to help her father with his paintings, although she adds that when her father was at home he used to disappear for days, so she did not really have a routine life with him. For Natalya, the most difficult thing to cope with is her father letting her down "all the time", and afterwards making it sound quite legitimate that he should behave in that way. As she says: "I end up going along with his excuses, but I feel very angry inside".

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Natalya used to visit her father every Saturday. However, at the time of the first interview the visits have become less frequent, but she could not say precisely how often she visits him. Natalya has mixed feelings about the visit; whilst she likes to see her father, she also feels annoyed that he has offended again and she has to go to the prison to see him, when he should be at home. During the visits she talks to her father about horse riding, her relationship with her best friend and what she is doing at school, but she complains that she cannot really tell him everything as there is not enough time. She also asks her father about the colour of the carpet and the wall paper he has in his cell.

At the time of the second interview, Natalya was seeing her father "most" Sundays as he had been released. She says that she feels good to be with him as he is always doing interesting things, even though some Sundays he does not appear, and then she feels deeply disappointed.

Interaction with friends

At the time of the first interview, Natalya has one best friend with whom she is so concerned about maintaining a friendship with, that she makes a conscious effort not to argue, and proudly says that she had a "record of not breaking up with R. for six weeks and one day". Natalya has been having many problems with her friends at school, particularly with a girl called S. This girl is very "nasty" as she makes Natalya do "horrible things" such as steal things from other children. S. used to "whisper" to the other children about Natalya's father being in prison, but Natalya says she never took "much notice". She also told them that Natalya's father was "nasty" to her mother, which, according to Natalya, was true but "none of their business". Natalya believes that the "majority of the children do not like her but she does not have "a clue" why. However, the children at the new school are nice and kind, and she has a new friend who likes her. But Natalya does not tell anybody about their relationship because she wants to be liked for herself by the other children, and not because she is a friend of a popular child.

Moral Development Interview

Time 1: Natalya thinks that in general people should obey the law because "the law is the law and they shouldn't do wrong things anyway. People who break the law should be punished because "they broke the law, for doing something wrong".

Moral stage: 2/3

Time 2: In general people should try to obey the law because "if wasn't the law people would go around stealing and killing people for no reason and nothing could be done about it as they couldn't say it was a rule". People who break the law should be punished because "otherwise they'll keep doing it if they're not punished and just let off".

Moral stage: 3

Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Natalya in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
General self	15	17
Social self-peer	7	6
Home-parents	8	8
School-academic	4	5
General selfscore	68	72

Child's perception of the interview

Natalya was "happy" and "excited" to talk about her father as she likes to talk about him. She also says that she likes to be interviewed because she can help with the research to understand what children feel when their fathers go to prison. She finds some questions easy, some difficult and some interesting.

FAMILY Q

Mother: Kay, 39 years

Father: Arthur, 40 years

Children: Jane, Helen, Julia, Louise and Ian. Ages 20, 18, 14, 11 and 10 respectively.

Demographic data

Faily Q live in a five-bedroom flat on a council estate in North London. The estate is run down and lacks greenery and facilities for children to play. The only space where children could play is reserved for cars. The entrance and the landings are dirty with grafitti on the walls. The flat is in need of repair and there is a serious problem of dampness. The glass of the front door is held together with adhesive tape and the interior of the flat is untidy, dirty and sparcelly furnished.

Kay attended a "boarding school" due to her inability to learn to read and write, which, according to her, is a result of an operation to remove a brain tumor when she was 18 months old. At that time she also had to have two opertions on her ears. The total time she spent in hospital was about 34 months. She left school when she was 15 years old still illiterate, and at 17 she left home as she had disagreements with her mother concerning her step-father. Her natural father died when she was 13 years old. When Kay was 18 years old she gave birth to her first daughter, and two years later she had another daughter. However, their father left Kay and has never kept contact with them. Kay married her current husband at the age of 23 and has had three children by him, two daughters and a son. Kay has never worked and her husband was unemployed and on social security before his imprisonment. He used to work as a "machine mechanic", but he was sacked and now he cannot find another job as he has not "the papers, the qualifying things".

Kay is cheerful, pleasant and talks openly about her life. However, she is very conscious of her inability to read and write and often feels "degraded", particularly when she is asked to fill in forms. For routine events such as shopping, she has managed to overcome her disability by memorising particular products and their prices. Kay is proud of the fact that she has brought up five children, contrary to her family's expectations and their advice not to do so.

At the time of the second interview, Kay's two eldest daughters had left home to live on their own, and she was working, encasing records.

Husband's criminal data

Kay's husband, Arthur, was arrested for theft and resisting arrest. He has a previous conviction for attempted robbery, three years ago, for which he received 15 months in prison, but only served six months.

At the time of the second interview, he had been convicted to 18 months, and released after serving 7 months.

Mother's perception of the event

Kay was very surprised at her husband's offence. When the police knocked on the door to inform her that her husband was in the police station, she said to them: "you found him, you keep him then", and "shut the door in their face". When they knocked on the door again she apologised and let them in. They were laughing. Kay was very angry and did not go to see her husband for eight weeks, until she received a letter from him pleading for her to visit the prison. Kay decided to visit her husband and tell him that she had decided to get a divorce as he was "getting into my nerves" by "going in and out like a bloody yo yo". The first time he became involved with the police she "half understood it", as he could not find a job that would pay enough money to keep the family and she was "nagging him to death" to get some money to buy food for the five children. But this second time Kay became aware that she could organise her life better alone. However, at the time of the first interview, she had decided against divorcing him.

At the time of the second interview, Kay says that her husband did not deserve 18 months sentence for stealing a "bloody radio". In addition, the police did not find the man who he was supposed to have beaten up, so this offence should not have been considered.

Feelings towards the husband

After knowing all the story, Kay deduced that her husband did not have any intention to steal, he just took advantage of the opportunity presented to him. He convinced her that his involvement in the offence was not his fault and that he would stop drinking and compensate her for all the aggravation he caused her.

Although Kay admits that she misses her husband, she feels very bitter and annoyed towards him for getting into trouble with the police again, and thinks that he is irresponsible and immature. However, she still considers him to be part of the family. She believes that he loves all the children equally, and he is very good to her, therefore, she has decided to wait for him in order to start a new life. She also wants to prove to her family that her marriage is lasting, contrary to their expectations.

At the time of the second interview, Kay has divorced her husband. After his sentence, she realised that she had to make some changes in her life. It was "too hard" for her to keep saying no to everything the children wanted. They both agreed to the divorce; he wanted his freedom, and for Kay the marriage was "getting on top of me" as her husband would not "fight" for her and the children and get a job. According to Kay, the children are enjoying themselves much more now than when their father was at home. They do not have "any restriction about eating". She feels sorry for her husband as he is alone, whereas she has the company of her children. Kay adds that she misses him "in a way"; she misses "nagging" at somebody. She emphasises that she is not angry with him anymore, even though he offended again when he promised her that he would never get involved with the police again. However, she adds that she really does not know the truth. She has heard two stories: one from the police and one from her husband, and she does not really believe either. She goes on to say that she feels somewhat responsible for her husband's offence as the day before the event, they had a "big row" when he walked out and she told him not to bother to return. She really did not mean it, she was just very angry, but this might have influenced her husband to commit the crime.

According to Kay, Louise has accepted her divorce well. She says that she never talks about her husband to the children, but they know that they separated in a friendly way and he can come to see them any time. She believes that Louise misses her father, but hardly mentions him. Sometimes she says: "I wish dad could come round to see us", to which Kay replies: "give him time and he'll come some day", and "that's the end of the conversation".

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Kay finds it most difficult to cope with the financial situation. She has to control very strictly everything the children eat, and never knows "where the next meal is going to come from". She says it is also very difficult to tell the children that they cannot have "absolutely anything". She has lost her husband's social security money and now only receives £52 per week, which barely pays the "electric and food". She also finds it very stressful to deal with the council, particularly getting them to undertake essential repairs in her flat. She would like her two eldest daughters to be re-housed, which would leave her free to move out of London with the three younger children. She also complains bitterly about the cost of the journey to visit her husband and the location of the prison, which is very far and involves travelling all day just for a one hour visit. The social security paid for the first visit, but the "hassle" was too much for Kay, therefore now she only goes when she can afford to and takes the children in

turn.

Since her husband's imprisonment, Kay finds it very difficult to control the children as they do not take any notice of her demands, and she is too tired to enforce discipline. However, she also says that the children should have freedom to come and go as they want. Kay did not notice any changes in Louise, although initially she says Louise was very angry with her father, so angry that she only went to see him two months after he had been arrested to "make him suffer". Since this period Louise has not demonstrated any other reaction.

At the time of the second interview, Kay's husband had been released, but she and the children have no contact with him. He said that he wants to get a job, earn some money and have a place, before he will come to see them. Kay concludes that all this may take two years and they may even "get back together again". Kay no longer considers her husband to be part of the family.

Kay has now started work, and is very excited that after all these years she finally earns "a wage" and does not need the social security anymore. She feels very pleased "how things have turned out". As the two eldest daughter have left home, she finds it easier to cope with the work and the three children. She now earns, with overtime, £100 "every single week", whilst before she never knew when or where she was getting money for the next meal. If her husband was at home she probably would not have got the job and he would still be "sitting on his back side doing nothing".

Since last year, Kay has noticed that Louise has become more quiet and sensitive. She says that Louise always cries when she tells her off as she hates it when she shouts at her. Recently, Louise seems to "react stronger" (cry more than ever) to her mother's outbursts. She is also "a bit touchy", for whenever Kay tries to talk to her she "tries to bite your head off", particularly in the mornings when she is in a bad mood. Kay says that she was not like that before the separation.

Explanation of the event to the child

Kay did not say anything to Louise about her father's arrest, until she overheard her mother talking about the event with her eldest daughter. However, they never discuss the matter, they just exchange practical information such as the time of the visits. According to Kay, Louise has followed all the process of her father's trial, therefore she does not need an explanation.

Support System

Kay only receives support from her mother. She gives her some money when she desperately needs it and listens to her when she needs emotional support. Kay does not interact with her husband's family or neighbours, neither has she any friends. Lack of money and the demands of the family, make it difficult for Kay to develop friendships outside the home.

Kay was not offered or sought any help from the social services. She says she does not want any because: "once you get them on your back you can never get them off of you". Kay thinks that social workers are "bloody nosy buggers", who visit people just to find out what they do. However, based on her previous experience with social workers, Kay acknowledges that some have "nice ways" and some "are nosy and stupid", depends on what kind of person they are.

Child's perception of parents

Louise says that she gets on "fine" with her mother, particularly when she helps her with the house work, when they go out together shopping, or when her mother answers all her questions about her life. The only time she does not get on well with her mother is when she shouts at her. This happens when Louise annoys her mother by slamming the door, or "just lay about doing nothing", or by refusing to go to bed. She also does not like it when her mother deducts the money she borrows from her pocket money. Louise says that she would like her mother to listen to her explanations before shouting, as sometimes she shouts at her unreasonably.

In general, Louise believes that her mother understands the way she feels, although many times she is not prepared to listen as she is more interested talking to someone else and sends Louise away. On these occasions Louise goes to her father, who listens to her and understands the way she feels. As an example she mentions an occasion when her father left a telephone conversation in the middle and passed it to her mother, so that he could give her the attention she required. She also chooses her father to talk to when she has arguments and fights with her younger brother, which is quite frequent, as he takes action to stop him tormenting her. However, if Louise were in trouble, she would go to her best friend as she can trust her not to tell her secrets to anyone. If her best friend could not help her, she would go to her grandmother. When Louise has problems at school, she talks to her French teacher as she is "nice". For example, when a girl bullied Louise on the first day of school by demanding money from her otherwise she would be beaten up, the French teacher took action immediately.

Louise's criteria of getting on well or not with her father are limited to such factors as receiving money from him, which makes her happy, and being made to go to bed early during school time by him, which she most dislikes. For Louise, her father's best aspects are that he does not shout at her "too much", and he is always prepared to defend her from her brother's bullying. She also liked it very much when her father took her to the pub and they used to talk about different things. On these occasions Louise felt very happy. The worst aspect about her father is when he awakes her in the morning when she is half-asleep to make him a cup of tea. This is apparently because he has a "bad back" and finds it difficult to get out of bed himself. She also "hates" the length of her father's hair, as he does not look like her father, but a girl.

Generally, Louise says that her father keeps his promises as does her mother, although they may forget sometimes. For example, last year her father forgot her birthday and she "got the hump".

When her father returns home, Louise will still accept his advice and regulations. In fact, she thinks that he, rather than her mother, should tell her what to do as she knows that her mother insists less on being obeyed, therefore Louise tends to "forget" her orders.

At the time of the second interview, Louise feels that her mother does not understand her as she is too busy "going about and doing things", such as watching television, washing up, cooking the dinner or going to the shops. She also says that her mother does not listen to her in the first place, let alone keep a promise. Louise also says that she would not confide in her mother as she does not trust her to keep a secret. She believes that her mother would tell her grandmother, who in turn would tell someone else and then the secret would be "spread around". Louise emphasises that the only person who really understands her, and who she can trust to keep a secret, is her best friend.

When her father was at home, Louise used to talk to him as she trusted him to keep a secret. However, now she cannot remember any specific examples, either in relation to good or bad aspects of their relationship, as she has forgotten "that time". Louise only remembers that she did not like it when her father "told her off", and that on one particular occasion he did not keep the promise of not telling anybody about a private conversation they had, because he was drunk and told her mother. However, she recalls how happy she felt to go to the pub with him, even though now she would not like to go to the pub or anywhere with him anymore. She prefers to go out with her friends as she has "grown up". She concludes that if her father returned home she would accept his advice if she were in trouble; it makes no difference that he went to prison.

Child's attribution of responsibility

According to Louise, her mother told her about her father's arrest, although initially she told her that he went on holiday. It was only after few days that Louise heard a conversation between her mother and her older sister about her father, and later that day her mother told her that he "was nicked again" and had to go to prison. She felt very sad and angry and could not believe he had offended again. Her mother did not give her any explanation and her father just said to her that he was in prison "because I've been a naughty boy" (laughs).

Louise blames the police for her father's imprisonment. She says it is the "police's fault" as she does not believe that her father's offence was as serious as the police said it was. She insists that he did not do anything "that wrong", but even if he did, he should not be punished as it was not as "bad as the police is making it".

At the time of the second interview, Louise says that her father was arrested for "stealing something". She thinks that he should not have broken the law because "he would be here with me, wouldn't he?". She says that he should have been sentenced as "he did something wrong, but not that much, only a month".

However, she goes on to say that she tries hard not to think about this matter anymore and she has become used to it now. As she says: "I just wiped out from my head", and adds "it's just one of those things, it can't be helped".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Louise feels that her flat is quiet and empty since her father has been away. Before his arrest, the house was full of his friends who would be "having a laugh". She usually "joined in" and enjoyed to play and "muck around" with them. Now they have all disappeared and she misses their joyfulness and playing "fights" with them. Louise adds: "it's not a family anymore".

Louise complains bitterly that she does not go out anymore and feels very annoyed with the reduction in her pocket money, and not receiving the extra money her father used to give her. She also complains that her mother makes her clean the flat "all the time", and go to the shops, which she thinks is unfair. She also misses her father's presence, as he is not there to stop her younger brother bullying her. Louise emphasises that she still loves her father "the same" and looks forward to his return.

At the time of the second interview, Louise says that

although she tries not to think about her father, sometimes she feels very sad and depressed. If she had a "private thing" to tell her father, he would listen to her. Since the last interview her brother has stopped bullying her, so now she does not need her father to support her: "I just kick him back".

In regard to her mother's divorce Louise says: "That's life it's her life", therefore she has to decide what is best for her.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Louise could not be precise about how often she visits her father. She feels happy to see him, but does not like to go to the prison as the journey and the time she has to wait before she can see him makes it boring. Louise also complains that her mother talks with her father all the time and does not give her a chance to talk. Louise wants to know about the condition of her father's cell and if he has sufficient blankets on his bed, as she is very concerned about him being cold in the prison.

At the time of the second interview, Louise has not seen her father for about six months. As her mother has divorced him and stopped visiting him in prison, she could not see him. She goes on to say that since her father's release, she does not even know where he lives as he wants to reorganise his life before contacting her again. Louise adds that her mother does not tell her much about this matter, and if she told her mother what she felt about it, she "probably would get a slap round the head", therefore she keeps quiet.

Interaction with friends

Louise has a best friend who is kind and takes her seriously. They trust each other and talk about their problems when they are unhappy or in trouble. Louise has only told this friend about her father's imprisonment. However, another friend at school has been bullying her about her father's imprisonment, but Louise does not know how this girl discovered where her father was. She did not tell anyone for fear that the matter would "spread around the school", and what she would feel or do if any of the children said to her: "your dad's in jail and all that".

At the time of the second interview, Louise still has the same best friend she had last year. She can talk to her about "many things", but mainly she can tell her "things" about her father, such as "he's naive and kind". Her friend does not say anything, she just listens and would not "laugh or spread the secret".

Moral Judgement Interview

Time 1: Louise thinks that, in general, people should obey the law as it is "naughty not obey the law", and they should be punished because it is wrong to break the law.

Moral stage: 1(2)

Time 2: Louise thinks that, in general, people should obey the law because otherwise "you go to court". She does not know why they should be punished. The only thing she knows is that if they break the law, the police "catch them and put them in jail".

Moral stage: 1

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The score attained by Louise in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Subscales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	15	15
Social self-peer	6	6
Home-parents	3	3
School-academic	4	3
General self score	56	54

Child's impression of the interview

Louise felt "happy" to talk about her father, as nobody talks to her about this subject. She also says that she wants to help the researcher. She finds the questions too long and boring and she feels that she does not know how to answer them.

FAMILY R

Mother: Annabel, 34 years old

Father: Clive, 28 years old

Children: Lauren, Linda and Jim, 10, 6 and 5 years old.

Demographic Data

Family R live in a two-bedroom council flat on an estate in East London. The estate is deteriorating and has no green area or facilities for children to play. The stairs and balconies are dirty and smell of urine. The interior of the flat is also very dirty and the furniture old and worn.

Annabel attended a secondary modern school until the age of 15, after which she worked as machinist (making clothes). She met her first husband when she was 19 years old and lived with him for five years before getting married. They had been married for only two months when he was arrested for burglary. Lauren, her daughter, was born while he was in prison. Annabel's first husband was a violent man and he used to beat her frequently. He is currently serving a ten-year prison sentence for rape and burglary. It was after this offence (raping a 65-year-old woman) that Annabel decided to separate from him.

Seven years ago, Annabel met her present common-law husband and they decided to leave Scotland and live in London. Initially they squatted in their present flat until the council eventually allocated it to them. Before his imprisonment, Clive worked sporadically in the building trade, and received social benefits.

At the time of the second interview, Family R had moved to a new flat which is better situated than the previous one. The blocks are smaller and are surrounded by a green area. The flat is kept fairly clean and tidy, although it is sparsely furnished with no carpets on the floor.

Husband's criminal data

Clive was arrested for theft, which is his first conviction. At the time of the second interview, he had been sentenced to 18 months imprisonment, of which he only served 12 months and is now released.

Mother's perception of the event

Annabel felt "terrible" when Clive was arrested, as she believed she had "left all this trouble" behind her and would never have to live through this situation again. She finds the legal system confusing and feels frustrated with the visiting procedures of the prison; she does not like taking the children to the prison as "you have to wait for a long time and they get tired and drive you mad".

At the time of the second interview, Annabel complains that the sentence of 18 months Clive received for stealing £300 is extremely unjust, considering that this is his first offence. She emphasises that no one was interested in his life, his family, or the reasons why he stole the money. She compares the sentence Clive received with a two-year suspended sentence given to a man who recently assaulted her when she was returning from the local shops, and who had already spent five years in prison for rape and physically abusing his children.

Feelings towards the husband

Annabel blames Clive for the event. However, she adds that he had lost his job and they did not have any money; therefore, he stole the £ 300 to provide clothes for the children to go to school. She still considers Clive to be part of the family and emphasises that he cares for her and the children, is "harmless" and has a very "good nature". Unlike her first husband, who would beat her almost every day, even in front of the children, Clive never beats her or the children. Annabel thinks he has the "right ideas" on how to bring up children. For example, if Lauren does not want to do something he will explain to her why she should do it. He also tells her what time she has to go to bed and what time she should be in. Annabel is happy to have someone to control the children as she is "sort of soft"; she only shouts and does not insist on being obeyed.

At the time of the second interview Clive had been released, but their relationship is not as good as before his imprisonment. When she moved to the new flat she hoped that this would be a new start in their lives; instead, Clive seems to want to go out with his friends when he pleases, leaving Annabel at home. The main problem between her and Clive is that he wants the domestic life and the social life at the same time, and the two "clash" as she cannot accompany him because of the children. She is adamant that when he earns money he has to give a part of it to her and not spend it all with his friends. However, she is prepared to give him another chance to "sort things out". According to Annabel, Lauren does not realise what is going on.

Despite her problems with Clive, Annabel is happier in her new flat as the children have more space to play, the school is nearer and she does not feel frightened that someone is going to attack her.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Annabel says that she is having great difficulties coping with the financial changes. Before his imprisonment, Clive worked, even though sporadically, as a painter and

decorater and used to earn an average of £200 a week. Now Annabel receives £38 a week from social security and finds it practically impossible to manage the family budget on this money. She has accumulated many debts and finds it difficult to buy even essential things like food. When she was living in Scotland she had many friends and at times of economic difficulty she would borrow "potatoes from one person, sugar from another and make a meal". Here in London it is completely different: if she has sufficient to eat "okay", if not "too bad".

Annabel feels very frightened and insecure at being alone with three children in London, particularly in the environment in which she is now living. She recalls the experience she had since Clive has been in prison, when a neighbour attacked her and her sister when returning from shopping. The man assaulted her with a knife and tried to rape them. They ran away but he pursued them and smashed the windows of Annabel's flat. As a result of this event, Annabel lost the baby she was expecting. However, she is resigned to the fact that she has to be alone for the period Clive is in prison and is attempting to cope with her loneliness and fear by visiting her sister frequently.

Since Clive's imprisonment, Annabel has noticed many changes in Lauren's behaviour. She has become very "cheeky" and "hard to please". She does not help with the house work anymore and has become very argumentative. Annabel believes that Lauren is retaliating for not going out as she did when Clive was at home. She also thinks that Lauren has matured too quickly and has become too self-confident and does not see danger in anything. For example, Lauren often does not return home from school until seven or eight o'clock in the evening, as she visits her friend and does not recognise that the estate where this friend lives is very dangerous and that she is at risk of being attacked. Annabel blames herself for Lauren's attitude, as she has allowed her to stay up late to keep her company and she is not able to enforce the punishment she gives; therefore, Lauren takes advantages of her. Annabel also complains that Lauren helps everybody (her mother's friends and neighbours) with cleaning and babysitting, but she does not want to do the same for her.

At the time of the second interview, Annabel says that after the initial difficulties managing the financial budget, she can now cope with the lack of money as is was used to it. If she really needed money desperately, her sister would help her. Her sister has also helped Annabel cope with her loneliness by going out with her and listening to her worries.

Soon after his release from prison, Clive began work as a decorator with his brother. Currently however, he is unemployed.

Explanation of the event to the child

Annabel told Lauren about Clive's offence and arrest, but asked her not to tell her siblings as they are too young to understand. When Lauren learned of Clive's imprisonment, she was very upset and "cried and cried", but as "she keeps things to herself", it is difficult for Annabel to know just how upset Lauren really is.

Support system

Annabel does not interact with neighbours, and her immediate family consists only of her sister, who is very close to her and helps her with money and emotional support. Clive's mother also helps her by cooking the Sunday lunch for her and the children. Annabel did not ask for and was not offered any help from the social services. She does not want any "nosy" person telling her what to do.

Child's perception of parents

Lauren says that she does not get on very well with her mother, as she does not listen to her and is very upset and "takes it out on me". They have many arguments as her mother asks her to do things which she cannot be "bothered to do". Lauren feels that her mother is making a habit of sending her to the shops everyday, or making her clean the room. She also dislikes her mother's temper and "moaning" when she eats a sandwich or a biscuit without asking first. Currently, Lauren feels particularly upset towards her as she refused to buy a pair of jeans because of lack of money. She explains that all her friends have jeans. Lauren goes on to say that, even though she understands her mother's explanations (that the other children have fathers who give their wives money) she still feels that the situation is unfair. However, she loves her mother and says that her best aspects are that she is loving and caring.

Lauren thinks that her mother understands her sometimes, as when she lets her stay up until 10 p.m. Lauren also believes she looks like her mother as she is intelligent, nice and "half good looking". She also loses her temper like her mother, as when she shouts and hits her brother and sister when they do not obey her, particularly when she is baby sitting and they insist on not going to bed or "muck around".

Lauren chooses her aunt as her favourite adult in whom to confide as she knows how to talk and not upset her. According to Lauren, she is very understanding, listens to her, can be trusted and does not "get into a temper" like her mother. Lauren adds that when she is sad, her aunt says "the right thing". Lauren also goes to her aunt if she is in trouble, unless it is just a "silly thing" and not a

"deep thing", like the day she came home late after school and was frightened of being punished. For serious problems she would not know where to go for advice. She thinks that "probably" she would keep it to herself.

Lauren would talk to Clive as he is kind, but not about her problems as he would not understand women's problems. She only talks to him when he is in a good mood; she knows when he is in a good mood because he begins to talk about her education and looks at her "happily" and gives everybody money and tells them to go out and spend it. She loves it when he plays games with her or takes her out, but does not like it when he comes home in a bad mood and shouts or makes "stupid jokes, taking the rise of me". Lauren takes these jokes seriously; she loses her patience and "smash cups and things". On these occasions his face becomes red and he slams the doors and moves the armchair in front of the television so noone can see the programme. Lauren feels particularly angry and frustrated when Clive promises to take her out just to keep her quiet, only to deny the promise he made in the first place. She "begs him and begs him" until he says that he is not taking her out again. Lauren understands that it is against her interests to insist in this way, but she feels so annoyed that she cannot control herself. For Lauren, it is "just horrible" when people promise something to her and then do not keep it: "I just go mad".

Lauren feels very upset when her mother and Clive have arguments which, in general, are Clive's fault. He does not want her mother to go out but it is all right for him to do so. She adds angrily: "They (men) say: cook the dinner and then they go out". She adds that if she were a father, she would help the family more by giving more care and money and certainly would not "go to prison all the time".

At the time of the second interview, Lauren says that she obeys Clive if he tells her to be good at school or help her mother, but she does not like it when he tells her not to stay out too late at night because something may happen to her. She explains that she understand that he is worried about her, but she tells herself that nothing will happen so she stays out anyway.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Lauren says that her mother told her about her father's imprisonment. Initially, she could not believe it and felt very sad. Lauren does not blame anyone for her father's offence, she explains that Clive stole the money to buy clothes and food for her, her brother and sister.

Lauren thinks that her father should have stolen the money "because he did it for us" and he should not be punished because "it was stupid, because it was only little amount

of money and like other people get let free and he never did anything before"

At the time of the second interview, Lauren thinks that Clive should not have committed the offence because "I know we needed clothes but he could've waited and like don't steal, but she still thinks he should not be punished "because he's never been in prison before and it was only a little money, only £300. Like T. he did it to my mum (assaulted her with a knife and tried to rape her mother) and he never got nothing but my dad only got the money and T. did more then what my dad did and got nothing".

Child's perception of changes after the father's imprisonment

Lauren says that when her father went to prison "everything went quiet". Lauren was allowed to stay up until late and go out with her friends. Even though she likes to keep her mother company and go to bed or come home later, she misses "a man in the house" to protect them and would rather have her father at home than be alone with her mother. She felt very scared when her mother was attacked by a neighbour. Clive used to take her to his family or to the park, fun fair and bus rides. Since his imprisonment, her mother does not go out with her anymore. But for Lauren, the change she finds most difficult to cope with is her mother's mood. She is very upset, therefore she cannot be "bothered with us". Lauren feels that her mother does not know what to do and "just can't handle it". She tries to help her mother by avoiding arguments and doing "normal things" such as returning home early from school and not shouting at her sister or brother.

At the time of the second interview, Clive has been released from prison and Lauren has had to adapt to a new routine of going to bed earlier and coming home directly from school, which makes her feel very annoyed. When she learned that Clive was going to be released she felt happy, excited and counted the days until he returned home. Initially he was really nice to everyone, but soon after he "got used to it and got back to it all, going out with his friends and spending all his money with them".

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Lauren visits her father fortnightly. She likes to visit him but feels disappointed because he does not listen to her. He asks her: "How are you?" and she answers: "fine" and then he turns to her mother and only talks to her. Lauren believes that he may have too many things on his mind; therefore, she just sits down and "play about with the chair" feeling very bored. However, she looks forward to the visits mainly because it is a day out, and after seeing Clive, her mother used to go to the market. Lauren

enjoys walking through the metal detector in the prison. She keeps her keys, buttons and silver in her pockets just to make the detector ring.

Interaction with friends

None of Lauren's friends knows that her father is in prison, apart from her best friend and the teacher. Lauren believes that her friend would never hurt her and she trusts her to keep the secret. They exchange information about their fathers, as her best friend's father is also separated from her mother. When her mother and Clive have arguments she feels "ill" and has to talk to her best friend, which makes Lauren feel better. However, Lauren is "terrified" that one day other friends may find out.

Moral development interview

Time 1: Lauren thinks that, in general, people should try to obey the law "as best as you can, because otherwise everybody would steal". People who break the law should be punished if "they've done something bad. Some people will just do it again but most people think: "Oh, I've got caught one time so I'm not going to do it again".

Moral stage: 2

Time 2: Lauren thinks that people should not obey the law in some circumstances "if you are desperate and you need money for a good reason and your wife need it then you do it, you don't care about the law. People should be punished depending on "what they've done, if it was a silly thing like stealing a £ 100 no, but breaking into a shop probably.

Moral stage: 3

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Lauren in the four subscales of the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	20	23
Social self-peer	8	8
Home-parents	6	8
School-academic	6	8
Total self score	80	94

Child's impression of the interview

Lauren feels very pleased to be interviewed as nobody talks to her or is interested in what she feels about anything. She likes to talk about her father and found the questions interesting and easy to answer.

FAMILY S

Mother: Cristina, 32 years

Father: Glen, 33 years

Children: Sally and Edgar, 9 and 11 years old.

Demographic data

Family S live in a two-bedroom council house in west London. The interior of the house is clean and tidy.

Cristina was looked after by her grandmother when she was a child, and as her grandmother was not keen on her going to school, she received little education after she was 13 years old. She worked as a cashier in a shop before marrying her first husband when she was 19 years old, but has not worked since. She lived with her husband for five years, and soon after separating from him she met Glen, her current common-law husband. Sally was one year old at the time. Cristina's son now lives with his grandmother. Before his imprisonment, Glen was working in a warehouse and receiving social benefits at the same time.

Currently, Cristina is not working and receives social security benefits, complemented by financial support she receives from her brother. Cristina is gentle and kind-hearted. She seems very insecure and dreamy.

Husband's criminal data

Glen was arrested and remanded in custody for dealing in drugs. He has no previous convictions. At the time of the second interview, Glen had been sentenced to 15 years imprisonment.

Mother's perception of the event

Although Cristina was "suspicious" that her husband was doing "something bad", as someone told her about his involvement with "friends" who were dealing with drugs, she "really didn't believe it" and thought it was a mistake. She never imagined that he could ever be arrested.

When Cristina learned by a friend that her husband had been arrested, she felt shocked and angry with him because she was not given the opportunity to help him. As she says: "I may have talked some sense in him", if he had told her. Cristina feels very distressed that her husband never confided in her about what he was doing, but justifies his silence by saying that he never told her about his drug dealings as he wanted to protect her from the consequences of being involved in such "work".

Cristina did not attend the trial as her husband did not want her to be exposed to the suffering it could bring her.

His brother told her the result of the trial, and when she learned that he had been sentenced to 15 years imprisonment, she felt like "smashing everything in the house" and immediately thought: "fifteen years on my own". It seemed impossible that this was really happening and she felt like they were talking about another person, not her husband. Fortunately, her mother was in London on holiday at the time and she comforted her, otherwise she could have "committed suicide". Cristina does not understand why he was sentenced to 15 years as he was dealing in drugs "in a very small way". She believes that the barrister and the solicitor "muddled everything". Glen was very confused; first he pleaded not guilty and then he changed his mind and pleaded guilty. However, she still feels hopeful that "something will happen" and he might "get out in three or four years". He is going to appeal, therefore, he might have his sentence reduced, and he could also receive parole; but at the same time, Cristina says that the barrister told her that drug offenders are not granted parole.

Feelings towards the husband

Cristina believes that Glen's friends are to blame for her husband's imprisonment, as they convinced him to participate in their criminal activities by "false pretense". They only showed him the advantages and not the dangers he could face. She says her husband was too weak to resist his friends pressure. "Anyway", she concludes, "he didn't do anything bad, he was just involved with these people".

Cristina's feelings toward her husband have not changed. She still thinks he is "a very nice person", different from other men as he is "kind, understanding and loving". She believes he cares about her and Sally. Initially, she was so angry and frightened that she did not go to see him, but then he wrote a letter from the prison to her saying he was wrong and "against everything he had done"; he even started crying when he saw her on the first visit. It has been very difficult for Cristina to see her husband "breaking down", as before his imprisonment he was proud of himself and would never show his emotions. Cristina says that she forgives her husband for what he has done, and is adamant that she is going to wait for him.

At the time of the second interview, Cristina says that she is more worried for Glen than she is for herself as he never imagined he would receive such a long sentence. She felt "sick" with the thought of what he was going through and not being able to do anything to help him.

Cristina now, first blames the police who told the judge that he was guilty; second she blames his friends, particularly the one who had just been released from

prison and should have known that the police were watching him; and third, she blames her husband as he knew what he was doing, but wanted to make a lot of money in an easy way. She goes on to say that, despite what he did she loves him more than before his imprisonment, as now he shows his affection to her and writes long letters saying how much he loves her, whereas before, he took her for granted. However, Cristina is aware that his change of attitude may be due to his fear of losing her, but she is certain that she could not be happy with anyone else and finds some consolation in the fact that she still can see him regularly.

Changes after husband's imprisonment

Cristina says that "everything changed" after her husband's imprisonment. She says that the future is unbearable without Glen and has nothing to look forward to. He was the only man who really was interested in her as a person and made her feel like a real woman. Now she does not look after herself or go out anywhere. At night she misses him and has terrible nightmares. Two days before his arrest she learned that she was pregnant and felt really thrilled, but after Glen's arrest, she felt so confused and insecure that she followed the advice of some friends and had an abortion, which she deeply regrets. She now thinks that she may not have another chance to have a baby as she is already 32 years old, and Glen will probably receive a sentence of more than five years.

Financially, Cristina says she is "all right" as her brother "helps her a lot". He pays for holidays, clothes, telephone, gas and electric bills and "a little shopping". The major difficulties for Cristina have been coping with her lack of knowledge where her husband was being held, what was happening to him, and with the attitude of the police in general. She thought that the police were beating him to extract the names of the people involved, and that she might never see him again. She was "very, very frightened". The police told her not to get in touch with her husband and that he would receive more than 10 years, therefore it was better not to wait for him. She was also scared that the police would arrest her and she would lose her rights over her daughter, even though she did not know anything about her husband's activities. According to Cristina, the police behaved "a bit mad and aggressive" towards her. When they came to search the house for drugs and she opened the door "a bit", they pushed her away from the door and would not give her a chance to say anything. She felt that they treated her as a "prostitute", as they were asking why she did not work and how she was feeding her daughter. They also asked Sally many questions, such as what kind of presents her father gave her, where she went on holiday with him, and even what was her uncle's name.

Cristina has not noticed any major changes in Sally. She asks about her father frequently and is worried about what can happen to him, and sometimes she "panics". That is, suddenly she says with a sad voice that she might not see Glen anymore, or that when he returns home she will be "grown up". Cristina adds that Sally can cope better than her with the situation, as she is "much more clever and outspoken" than she is, or even her husband. According to Cristina, Sally seems to "know everything about life", while she is ignorant and naive.

At the time of the second interview, Cristina is thinking of getting a job. Although her brother provides everything she needs financially, she thinks it's not fair to depend on him and feels very distressed to be a burden on him. She also thinks that having a job may help her to take her "mind off" her husband's imprisonment.

Cristina recalls how content she felt with her life before her husband's imprisonment. She used to go out with him quite often to restaurants and parties. Now she does not want to go anywhere, talk to anyone or do anything. She feels sorry for herself and is "obsessed with the thought" that they are spending the best part of their lives apart.

She has also become more insecure than ever. When her husband does not write to her, she immediately thinks that he has forgotten her. Every afternoon her "eyes are always on the door", waiting for a letter from him.

Now her husband's has been convicted, Cristina is only allowed to visit him once a month. She felt happier when he was on remand as she could visit him every day. Although it was very tiring to take him food and clothes every day, she thought it was worth the trouble as after she had seen him she felt much better and believed she had done something to help him.

As in the last interview, Cristina emphasises that Sally misses her father as he used to give her "a lot of attention", but she is coping very well with his absence. She says that Sally even consoles her when she feels very upset, particularly when Glen does not write "at least one letter a week". On these occasions, when Cristina "worries sick" that he may have forgotten her, Sally tells her that she "is very silly and shouldn't worry".

Explanation of the event to the child

Cristina did not have to explain anything to Sally. She heard Cristina talking on the telephone with Glen's friends about his arrest, and she followed the process of the trial closely. According to Cristina, Sally was very worried about her own reaction to the event. She tried to comfort her mother by saying to her that nothing would

happen to her father, but at the same time Sally was asking her mother, while also crying, if they (police) would beat up her father.

Support system

Cristina's mother supports her by listening to her and giving her advice. However, her mother thinks that what Glen did was "horrible", that Cristina is doing too much for him, and wonders whether it is all worthwhile. Some of Cristina's friends have also been very supportive by offering her advice and giving her emotional support.

Cristina has no contact with Glen's family; they do not live in London, apart from a sister, who no longer wants to speak with him.

Cristina has not received help from the social services; they never offered and she never asked for any. Cristina believes that the social services can do nothing for her, for when the children were younger she asked them for assistance when she was ill and they said that they could not help. Cristina says that she would have appreciated someone with whom to discuss her problems, particularly someone who could explain the "court system".

Generally, Cristina does not interact with her neighbours and she believes that they do not know about Glen's imprisonment.

Child's perception of parents

Sally believes that she gets on "all right" with her mother. She loves when they both "sit down" to watch a funny programme and laugh together. Her mother also tells her stories which she says are true, but Sally thinks they are made up to make her laugh. However, now her mother is very angry; she hits her and pulls her hair and does not want to listen to her anymore. She "hates" when her mother behaves in this way and feels scared at her mother's "very loud shouts". Sally also says that her mother "forgets to keep her promises all the time". She even tried to remind her, unsuccessfully, by writing down what she had promised.

Sally chooses her mother as her favourite adult with whom to confide. She feels that her mother "always keeps the secret" and that she can tell her anything and she will not criticise her or tell her what she should or should not do. Sally goes on to say that she would like to be like her grandmother as she is a "really nice person". She is kind to everyone, gives presents to all the family and would never say "you owe me this or that". She would "just forget about it".

If in trouble, Sally would go to her mother. Although her

mother says that she will not help her as she should have thought about the consequences of her action before, in the end she tries to do everything she can to "sort out" the problem. However, if her grandmother lived near her, Sally would prefer to go to her because she is very "sensible" and would never say "I'll do in a minute or half an hour, she would just do it". Her grandmother also tells her how to behave, how to sit or eat, and if she did something "naughty" her grandmother would pull her ears, as she does with her brother, who "is gone nice" since he went to live with her, and has stopped to scream and shout when he cannot have his own way.

Sally will tell her father any of her problems when he returns home, as he is not a woman, although she would like him to give her some advice as he is "quite clever". When her father was at home she used to get on "all right" with him. She recalls how happy she felt when he used to buy her presents or give her money to stop crying and go to bed. Sally would like her father to talk with her "a bit more" and not to be "so shy". She feels that he does not understand her when she tries to talk to him and he does not say anything. If she could change anything about him she would make him "talk a lot". She says that she is waiting for him to leave the prison to have the birthday party he promised her.

At the time of the second interview, Sally complains that her mother "day dreams" and does not listen to her. She also swears at her just because she becomes "confused". On these occasions, Sally feels very "uncomfortable" and does not understand why her mother becomes so upset for the least little reason. For example, Sally demanded that her mother write a letter to the school apologising for Sally's behaviour, but instead of doing what Sally asked, her mother complained and swore at her. Sally says that her mother does not understand the way she feels because she does not take any interest in her school work anymore. On the few occasions Sally has asked her for help, she simply answers: "I can't do anything about it". If Sally insists her mother becomes angry with her and begins to swear. However, Sally still chooses her mother as her favourite adult with whom to confide. Being a woman she can understand better what she has to say. If in trouble she would go to different people depending on the nature of the trouble. If she is in trouble for answering back to her teacher, she would tell her mother as she knows what to say to the teacher and so take "the pressure" from her. If she had a fight and damaged something, she would go to her uncle as he would "certainly" apologise for her behaviour, and pay for any damage she may have caused, whereas her mother would just leave it up to her to resolve the situation. Sally goes on to say that she would not tell her father her problems for, although she feels she could trust him, she does not believe he would do anything about

them. He would just listen and tell her to ask her mother. However, he says that she would still take his advice, and insists that imprisonment has not changed him as a person.

Child's attribution of responsibility

Sally was near her mother when she telephoned a friend and heard that her father had been arrested, but she did not tell her why. Sally remembers very clearly the shock she and her mother felt when they learned about his arrest. She also remembers her mother's "mumbling", and her efforts to talk to her mother in an attempt to understand what was going on. She felt really worried about her mother's reaction on the telephone, and at the "horrible" face she pulled. She discovered all about drugs when she overheard her mother talking to "people". Now she knows that her father is in prison for dealing with drugs but her mother never explained the situation. However, she thinks that he was "forced to do it", as he "surely" did not want to get involved.

In Sally's account of the event, she says that police cars were following her father and mother; they would stay outside her house to know who was coming in and out, or they would "run through streets corners to keep an eye on them". Sally did not like the policeman who was asking her "all kind of stupid questions" such as with whom she went on holiday, and her uncle's and grandfather's names. She adds that they found "the proof against my dad" because he was driving when they found the drugs in the boot of the car. She explains that he was "just driving their car because his friends gave the keys to him". Sally goes on to say that, initially she thought that the police were "telling lies" about her father, or that they had mistaken him for someone else. Sally was also very worried that they were "hitting him" to make him tell who was involved in the drug dealing.

According to Sally, if her father did such thing, he shouldn't have done it; "but he didn't want to do it, I think he was forced to do it because his friends pushed him to do it. But if he tells the law, you know the judge, they won't dare to believe him. They'll say it's all nonsense". According to Sally, her father "shouldn't get a sentence, not because he's my dad, but because he's not guilty, he was sort of pushed into it".

At the time of the second interview, Sally believes that her father's friends put the blame on him to get away from the police themselves. She adds that he is not this "kind of person" and she feels very confused about the whole situation: "because if my dad didn't do it, like if he never had anything to do with this and he was put into it, then why is he getting punished for no reason?"

However, Sally still thinks that he should be free, or be sentenced to a month or two: "because he was guilty, but not really guilty, his friends put him into it and he never done anything like that before. My dad is kind and cares about us".

Child's perception of changes after father's imprisonment

Sally says that she misses her father taking her to school, and going out with him to places such as fun fairs and parks. She also misses playing games with him and the attention he used to give her. Since her father's imprisonment, she has not been anywhere as her mother does not have the time; she has to cook and go to the prison every day to see her father. She really "hates it" when her mother is late and she has to stay at a friend's house. She also dislikes having to do the shopping and cleaning her room.

According to Sally, her father is "quite clever", therefore she could trust him to "sort out things", but now she has to "get on" on her own. However, the most difficult change for Sally to cope with is her mother's distress. She believes that her mother is "taking on" her by beating her up or "stepping my head on the television". She really wishes that her mother could "calm down".

At the time of the second interview, Sally complains that she no longer receives pocket money; she now has to plead with her uncle to have "some money". When her father was at home, he would buy many clothes for Sally and her mother, and take them out to many places such as restaurants, parks and fun fairs. However, Sally continues to think that the most difficult thing with which to cope is her mother's unhappiness. She feels very sad and helpless as she cannot do anything about it. She adds that her mother "forgets to sort out my P.E. stuff", therefore she is often prevented from participating in games at school.

Interaction between father and child during imprisonment

Sally does not know how many times she visits her father, but says that it is not very often. She does not really like going to the prison as the journey is very long, and when she is with her father, she cannot talk. Her father only says: "hello", asks a few questions about her school work and then starts talking to her mother about "courts, solicitors and barristers". To pass the time, Sally looks around to other people talking, or just "muck around" until the officer comes and "hurry them to stop". She also does not like the electric doors, the policeman with the "blue bowl" (for metal objects) and the metal detector. Sally does not understand why she has to pass under this detector; she "hates it", thinks it is stupid and suspects it is just for spying on her.

At the time of the second interview, Sally still does not visit her father very frequently. The last time she felt sick. The coach takes too long and Sally feels very bored. She only likes the sea crossing. She also feels very bored in the visiting room; just sitting down listening to her mother and father talking for two hours, while she has nothing to do.

Interaction with friends

At the beginning of the interview, Sally said that neither her friends or her teacher knew about her father's imprisonment: she never talks about her father, and her friends do not ask about him. However, she later mentions that she can tell all her secrets to her best friend and that she told her about her father. This friend only listens to her and does not say anything. Sally says that her best friend is so kind that even if she hits her, she would not tell the secret to anyone. Sally told her friend about her father on an occasion when there was "white stuff" (chalk) in the playground and Sally said: "drugs, drugs" just as a joke.

Moral development interview

Time 1: Sally thinks that, in general, people should obey the law "because if the law was made, it was made to be obeyed otherwise it's not worth having a law". People shouldn't be punished "if it's to do with your relations, I don't think so, but if they're doing it for fun, then yes, but if they care about the person, no".

Moral stage: 3

Time 2: Sally thinks that, in general, people should obey the law, but if they care about the person, and if it's only once, they can break the law. She thinks that people should be punished "if they want to do it, but some persons should be let free if they have a reason to do it".

Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The scores attained by Sally in the four subscales for the above test are as follow:

<u>Sub-scales</u>	<u>Scores</u>	
	Time 1	Time 2
General self	22	21
Social self-peer	5	6
Home-parents	6	4
School-academic	6	8
General self score	76	78

Child's impression of the interview

Sally said that she was excited at the prospect of being interviewed. Initially, she thought that the researcher would not go to her house therefore, she tried not to expect the visit, but when the appointment was kept she felt good as she "likes to talk to people, but not everyone". She finds the questions interesting.