2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents in Ohio Prisons

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

Gary Mohr, Director

Cynthia Mausser, Interim Managing Director of Court and Community

By:

Kathleen A. Lamb

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

Social Science Research Specialist, Bureau of Research and Evaluation

Rona Dorsey

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

Southwest Region Reentry Programs Administrator

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents is based on a random sample of 1505 inmates from all institutions across the Ohio prison system (1149 males and 356 females), excluding the male reception centers and FMC for females , with inmates selected proportional to their representation in the prison population.
- The survey completion rate is 70.5%, and inmates who are non-white, older, and male are more likely to have refused to participate.
- Of the 1061 inmates participating in the survey, three-quarters report having at least one biological child, each with two biological children in total, on average. Inmates have one minor biological child, on average, and 54.1% has at least one minor biological child, which is comparable to the 2004 Survey of Incarcerated Fathers, the latter of which focused on minor children (biological, step, or legal guardians) of male inmates.
- The 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents focuses in depth on dependent children of both male and female inmates, who are defined as any children for whom the inmate has legal, financial or parental obligations. Half of inmates report dependent children. This is twice the percentage who report dependent children in the 2013 Intake Study. The definition of dependent children is broader than in the Intake Study, and the Survey of Incarcerated Parents has a higher percentage of female and married inmates who participated, who would be more likely to report having dependent children.
- The 518 inmates with dependent children have a total of 1166 children, indicating each inmate has an average of two dependent children.
- The characteristics of inmates with dependent children (as reported by the inmates) include the following:
    - 60% of inmates are never married, 17.4% is married, and 17.6% is divorced. Two percent is separated, and another 2% is widowed.
    - On average, inmates have obtained some vocational training or trade school and a little over half were employed full-time or part-time at arrest.
    - At the time of arrest, 45.6% of inmates lived with their spouse or significant other (if they lived with any adults), and 51.1% lived with their dependent children (if they lived with any children).
    - Slightly more than half (52.3%) of inmates have given birth to or fathered children with one partner. Nearly half (46.7%) has fathered or given birth to children with two or more partners.
    - Over 80% of inmates spent no time in foster care, but of the 17.6% who has foster care experience, they have experienced two placements, on average. A third of inmates lived in an informal foster care arrangement during childhood (without a formal foster care placement).
    - One-third of inmates report their biological parent(s) had spent time in prison, and two-thirds of inmates reveal they had been involved with one or more youth institutions as minors (Department of Youth Services, Juvenile Court, and/or Child Protective Services).

- Over half (53.6%) of inmates have received information about paying child support since becoming incarcerated. Almost half (46.5%) has a current child support order, and two-fifths (40.9%) reports currently paying child support.

- The characteristics of dependent children of inmates include the following:
  - Slightly more than half of dependent children (52.7%) are male, and less than half of dependent children (47.1%) are female.
  - The average age of dependent children is ten years old.
  - Most dependent children (91.3%) have an incarcerated parent who identifies themselves as the biological parent of the child, 2.9% has an incarcerated parent who is a stepparent, and 4.8% has an incarcerated parent who is the child's parent's boyfriend/girlfriend/partner acting as a parental figure to the child.
  - At the time of the survey, about a fourth of dependent children are still living at the inmate's residence, and 53% is living in a different residence but in the same town or city as where the inmate used to live.
  - More than two-thirds of dependent children (68.5%) have an incarcerated parent who reports providing more than half of the child's financial support at the time of arrest.
  - Fifteen percent of dependent children have been involved with institutions at some point in time (Department of Youth Services, Juvenile Court, and/or Child Protective Services).
  - Just over 5% of dependent children have ever been arrested.
  - Close to 90% of dependent children have incarcerated parents who report they are permitted contact with their child(ren). Phone and mail contact are most commonly and frequently reported between dependent children and their incarcerated parents, followed by personal visits, with email contact and video visitation being much less commonly and frequently reported.
  - 94.4% of dependent children have incarcerated parents who express a great deal of desire to maintain contact with their children.
  - Half of dependent children have incarcerated parents who report that the child had been co-residing with them full-time at arrest, 12.8% report part-time co-residence at arrest, and 35.9% report living in a separate residence at arrest.
  - The most frequently reported responses to dependent children's current living situation by the inmate are that the child is living with his/her other parent, who is the inmate's current spouse or partner (48.1%), the child is living with his her other parent, who is the inmate's ex-spouse or ex-partner (19.7%), the child is living with grandparents (16.4%), or the child is living with other extended family (7.5%).
  - Almost three-fourths of dependent children have inmate parents who report they have contact with the child's caretaker. Phone, letters, and visits are more common sources of contact than email and videoconference.
  - Dependent children are likely to be currently living in high-population counties (Cuyahoga, Franklin, Hamilton, Summit, and Montgomery), reflecting general patterns of the commitment population in Ohio. 12.6% of dependent children reside out-of-state.

- The cross-sectional data are not directly comparable to the 2004 Survey of Incarcerated Fathers, limited by their self-reported nature, and most likely are over-representative of inmates with better family relationships, and under-representative of inmates from certain demographic groups. Despite these limitations, they provide opportunities for further study in combination with other ODRC inmate data sources.

Introduction

As the population of incarcerated persons has grown in the United States, so has the number of children who have at least one parent residing in a correctional institution (Johnson and Waldfogel 2002; Miller 2006; Poehlmann, Dallaire, Loper, and Shear 2010). There are around 810,000 incarcerated mothers and fathers in U.S. prisons, with 1.75 million children having a parent in a state or federal institution, based on 2007 data (Maruschak, Glaze, and Mumola 2010). Described another way, 2.3% of all children in the U.S. have at least one parent in prison (Boudin 2011). Incarcerated parents are much more likely to be male (92% of incarcerated parents) than female (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). However, from 1991 to 2007, there was a 77% increase in the number of children with an incarcerated father, and a 131% increase in the number of children with an incarcerated mother, in state and federal prisons (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). ODRC conducted a survey in 2004 that provided a profile of incarcerated fathers in Ohio prisons (Pettway, Dorsey, and Byorth 2004). In 2014, a revised and updated Survey of Incarcerated Parents was administered to Ohio prison inmates, this time including females, the results of which are summarized in the present report.

Parental incarceration can have a major disruptive effect on the parent-child bond, as the parent-child relationship forms the potential for social attachments with other people during the life course (Poehlmann et al. 2010). A precipitously growing body of research examines relationships between incarcerated parents and their children. These studies tend to cluster around several important topics. These include characteristics of incarcerated parents, characteristics of children of incarcerated parents including where and with whom children reside prior to and while their parents are incarcerated, frequency of and variation in the types of contact between incarcerated parents and children, financial obligations of incarcerated parents to children, factors affecting incarcerated parent and child contact, and effects of parental incarceration and contact during incarceration on children and parents. Essential trends in this literature are highlighted to provide context for interpretation of the

survey findings, although it is not meant to be an exhaustive review. Within the literature, the unit of analysis is either the children of incarcerated parents, or the incarcerated parents of children. In the present study, the focus is on the latter. The goal of this paper is to provide a profile of the percentage of Ohio inmates with children, as well as the characteristics of inmates and their dependent children, as reported by the inmates. A few comparisons are drawn between male and female inmates, although cross-sex comparisons utilizing the survey will be the focus of a future research study.

Literature Review

Incarcerated parents experience disadvantage in multiple ways, much of which predates their imprisonment. About two out of three parents in state prisons did not complete high school (Maruschak et al. 2010; Mumola 2000). A significant proportion of prisoners with children (14%) have spent time in foster care, according to the 2004 Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities (hereafter referred to as "SISFCF"); this refers to having lived in a foster home, agency, or institution during their youth (Johnson and Waldfogel 2002). Foster care involvement is a predictor of juvenile and adult incarceration (DeGue and Widom 2009; Doyle 2008). Two out of five parents imprisoned in a state institution report having grown up in a household receiving public assistance, and a third of incarcerated parents in state institutions report their parents abused alcohol or drugs during their youth (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). Incarcerated parents frequently have more than one child, two on average (Glaze and Maruschak 2008; Myers, Smarsh, Amlund-Hagen, and Kennon 1999). Black men's incarceration rate is seven times that of white men, and racial disparities in incarceration have grown over time (Wildeman 2009). When examined by marital status, state prisoners who are married are the most likely to be parents, followed by separated, divorced, never-married, and widowed inmates (Glaze and Maruschak 2008).

In regard to the characteristics of children of incarcerated parents, children of inmates are disproportionately racial/ethnic minority children, and this pattern mirrors the racial patterns in incarceration. African American children born in 1990 are nearly seven times more likely to have a parent in prison relative to white children born at the same time (Wildeman 2009). In addition, whereas 2% of white children have multiple family members incarcerated, this is the case among 16% of African American children (Wakefield and Wildeman 2011). Many children with incarcerated parents are quite young. About half (53%) of state prison inmates' children are age nine or younger, according to data from the 2004 SISFCF, while this was true of 58% of children of prisoners in the 1997 SISFCF (Glaze and Maruschak 2008; Mumola 2000). Younger children are more likely to have been in their mother's care at the time of the mother's arrest than older children (Myers et al. 1999). Female prisoners with children are more likely to have been living in the same household with their children prior to arrest relative to male prisoners with children (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). This suggests there is a greater likelihood of immediate disruption of the parent-child bond among younger children with incarcerated mothers than is the case for children of incarcerated fathers or incarcerated parents with older children.

The great majority of children of incarcerated parents live in family settings, with a small percentage in non-family care. Kjellstrand, Cearly, Eddy, Foney, and Martinez (2012) evaluate parents who were participating in a parenting program at a pre-release institution, and find that five percent of the fathers and five percent of the mothers have children in state custody. In the 1997 SISFCF, 10% of mothers and 2% of fathers in state prisons indicate their children are in a foster home, agency or institution (Mumola 2000). If the mother is the incarcerated parent, the children are more likely to be living with a grandparent, whereas if the father is the incarcerated parent, the children are more likely to be living with the other biological parent, who is the child's mother (Dallaire 2007; Foster 2011; Glaze and Maruschak 2008; Johnson and Waldfogel 2002; Kjellstrand et al. 2012; Loper, Carlson, Levitt, and Scheffel 2009; Mumola 2000). Children of incarcerated parents experience family disruption prior to

their parents' prison sentence, with 36% of fathers and 55% of mothers reporting living in the same household as their children during the month prior to their arrest (Glaze and Maruschak 2008).

Incarcerated parents utilize various means of keeping contact with their minor and/or adult children, with three out of four state prisoners having had some type of contact since admission (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). Including both minor and adult children, 53% of state prison inmates talk with children on the phone, 70% have contact through writing letters, and 42% have a personal visit from one or more children (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). Letters and phone calls are more common and frequent compared to personal visits (Johnson and Waldfogel 2002; Shlafer and Poehlmann 2010). Fifty percent of prisoners with children do not receive visits from them (Miller 2006; Loper et al. 2009). Visitation creates additional logistical problems over other types of contact, including lack of inmate control over the setting, long distances families must travel to reach the prison, and family expenses incurred from travel (Myers et al. 1999; Miller 2006; Mumola 2000; Tuerk and Loper 2006).

The exit of a parent from home to prison can prove economically disadvantageous to families already experiencing financial stress. Over 50% of both mothers and fathers in state prisons provided primary financial support for children prior to imprisonment, with 75% of incarcerated parents reporting employment during the month prior to arrest (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). No national study has been done that investigates the number of state or federal inmates who have a child support order and who are paying child support. State-level data from Colorado and Massachusetts suggest that about a fifth to a quarter of current inmates and paroled offenders have child support orders, but inmates begin prison sentences owing over $10,000 in unpaid child support (Griswold and Pearson 2005).

Some key factors influence whether parents maintain contact with children while incarcerated. Parents who were more involved in the daily care of their children prior to incarceration are more likely to maintain contact during incarceration (Tuerk and Loper 2006). Incarcerated parents with higher-

quality relationships with their children's caregivers are more likely to maintain contact with children while in prison through phone calls and visits (Poehlmann, Shlafer, Maes, and Hanneman 2008) and letter-writing (Loper et al. 2009). Children's caregivers may engage in gatekeeping and limit contact between an incarcerated parent and his or her children in order to protect children from distress and potential negative effects on children's behavior associated with seeing their parent in prison (Myers et al. 1999; Shlafer and Poehlmann 2010).

The children of parents who have been incarcerated tend to have poorer outcomes in a variety of areas, from internalizing ("acting in") and externalizing ("acting out") behavior problems, illegal activity, and academic failure (Miller 2006; Myers et al. 1999; Shlafer, Gerrity, Ruhland, and Wheeler 2013; Wakefield and Wildeman 2011). Children also feel grief, trauma, and psychological reactions such as post-traumatic stress disorder associated with witnessing parental arrest, and experiencing parental separation and family transitions in caregiving (Miller 2006; Murray, Farrington, and Sekol 2012; Myers et al. 1999). However, the risk factors that tend to occur simultaneously with parents becoming imprisoned explain most of this effect, with parental incarceration still having an unique effect on children's antisocial behavior even after taking risks such as poverty, parental criminal history, mental health, and substance abuse into account (Murray, Farrington, and Sekol 2012).

Phone and mail contact and child visitation during parental incarceration is associated with positive impacts on the incarcerated parent, which include reduced parenting stress (Tuerk and Loper 2006), reduced depression and anxiety, and to some degree, less anger (Roxburgh and Fitch 2014). In contrast, research shows contact with incarcerated parents has mixed effects on children's behavior, with some studies showing no effects, others showing negative effects, and still others suggesting positive effects (Poehlmann et al. 2010). Children's behavior is positively affected by contact with incarcerated parents when it is accompanied by family intervention programs, and prison family visiting

areas are welcoming to children and not intimidating (Poehlmann et al. 2010). Family relationships are also improved through interventions incorporating the whole incarcerated parent's family unit (Miller 2006; Miller, Perryman, Markovitz, Franzen, Cochran, and Brown 2013).

The 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents gathers information on various characteristics of currently incarcerated parents in Ohio and their dependent children that have been addressed in the literature. Specifically, it asks questions regarding the following: inmates' total number of children born/fathered, number of partners with whom inmates had/fathered children, presence of dependent children, inmate demographic characteristics (marital status, employment, education), presence of adults and children in inmate's household prior to imprisonment, basic characteristics of dependent children, inmate relationship to dependent children, caregiving situation for dependent children during incarceration, institutional involvements of dependent children, contact with, child support paid to, and financial responsibility for dependent children, incarceration history of inmates' parents, and inmates' childhood institutional and foster care experiences.

Procedures and Pilot Study

The second author, Ms. Rona Dorsey, the Southwest Regional Reentry Administrator approached the first author in early 2014 about collaborating on conducting a cross-sectional Survey of Incarcerated Parents, which had not been administered since 2004. The first author, in collaboration with Bureau of Research and Evaluation Assistant Chief Brian Martin, Bureau of Research and Evaluation Senior Researcher Gayle Bickle, and Reentry intern Mary White, revised and expanded the existing 2004 survey to gather a broader array of data. The revision/expansion of the existing survey and associated discussions took place between February and March of 2014.

In late March of 2014, 82 male inmates were randomly selected from the reintegration units at Pickaway Correctional Institution for participation in the pilot study. Unit management staff screened

the inmates, and determined that 20 of them had one or more children and were candidates for participation. The inmates were given passes to the program building to participate in the survey. The first and second authors and Ms. White administered the survey. A total of nine surveys were completed, with the remainder of the eleven inmates refusing to participate. Interviewers spoke with each inmate individually, greeting them and then read the consent form aloud, asking the inmate to sign and provide their ID number only if they agreed to participate. After the male pilot was administered, the research team decided to include survey screener questions that asked about whether the inmate had given birth to or fathered any children, and whether they had any dependent children. Thus, inmates would still be providing information about the presence of children, and not opting to automatically refuse survey participation because they do not have children.

In early April of 2014, 53 female inmates at ORW were randomly selected to participate in the next phase of the pilot study. Of those selected, 45 participated, with the remainder of the inmates being unavailable for participation at the time the research team came to the prison. Ms. White, three unit management staff, and the first and second authors conducted the pilot surveys. Immediately after surveys were conducted with inmates, discussions were held with ORW staff to receive input on perceptions of confusing, inconsistent, or incomplete questions on the survey, leading to final survey revisions. A decision was also made to add distinct sections to the inmate consent form indicating agreement or refusal to participate.

Based on the discussion at ORW, several survey revisions were made. Male and female versions of the survey were created with gender-specific wording to further eliminate confusion about survey questions (i.e., “mothers” for women and “fathers” for men). Multiple options were provided to question answers regarding relationships (“boyfriend/girlfriend/husband/wife/partner”) to allow for inmates to identify both opposite- and same-sex intimate relationships. Inmates were assigned a

random survey identification number that differed from their ODRC inmate identification number, to assure confidentiality and anonymity during data entry of survey responses. A separate file with the master list of survey ID numbers and corresponding inmate identification numbers is kept on the first author's password-protected computer. This information will only be used to merge in other variables from the offender database for further studies, after which the inmate identification numbers will be permanently stripped from the data analysis files.

Support for and input on the survey and its administration procedure was obtained from Mr. Ed Voorhies, Managing Director of Operations for ODRC. The first and second authors created an instruction sheet for survey administration to be sent to each institution along with the surveys. A letter was sent to regional directors of the prisons introducing the survey, along with survey materials at the end of June 2014. Phone and videoconference trainings on survey administration were conducted with staff from each institution by region at the beginning of July 2014. Final male and female inmate samples were drawn by Dr. Martin and sent out to each institution in mid-July. The second author concurrently sent out survey administration instructions, the consent form, copies of the male and female survey instruments, and the list of sampled inmates via e-mail to each prison for their staff to print and make copies for survey administration.

Final survey data collection took place between July 17 and August 31, 2014, with unit management staff being responsible for administering the surveys to the inmates. The female institutions were an exception, given the high number of sampled inmates. Thus, the first author and two interns from ODRC's Bureau of Research and Evaluation assisted unit management and program staff with survey administration at ORW. ODRC Office of Offender Reentry staff, including the second author, assisted with interviewing inmates at DCI. Institutions returned completed surveys and consent

forms either via personal courier or interoffice mail to the first author. If any identifying information, such as the inmate's ID number, was placed on the survey or consent form, it was removed.

The first author delivered completed surveys to MaCI during August of 2014. Under the direction of Ms. Janet Carter, inmates from the education department with strong data entry skills entered the data into an Excel spreadsheet in August and September. Completed surveys were picked up and returned to the Bureau of Research and Evaluation in October of 2014 by the first author. Data were read into SPSS and initial coding and data quality checks and clean-up was conducted in October through December of 2014 by the first author, who completed coding and data analysis in January and February of 2015. A small number of inmates did not complete surveys, but had missing consent forms that would have indicated refusal to participate in the survey. Prison staff notes on lists of sampled inmates returned with the completed surveys and information in DOTS were concurrently used to determine why an inmate did not complete the survey (i.e., out to court, in segregation, in process of transferring to another institution, medical issues, etc.).

Final Analytic Sample

Samples of 1149 male offenders and 360 female offenders were drawn from each Ohio institution, with the exception of the reception centers for males (Correctional Reception Center and Lorain Correctional Institution), and Franklin Medical Center for females. The combined total sample is 1509 inmates. To be included in the sample, inmates had to have been incarcerated for at least nine months, and have at least two months left in their sentence prior to being released, as of as of June 30, 2014. This was to assure that visitation patterns with families were established, and that inmates would be available to ask for survey participation prior to release. Inmates also were selected proportional to their representation in the prison system, such that institutions with larger inmate populations had a larger numbers of inmates sampled. A 10% oversample was incorporated to account for potential

inmate refusals and unavailability of prisoners. A decision was made to select inmates regardless of demographic characteristics, such as age, so that broader generalizations can be made about the percentage of Ohio inmates who do and do not have various types of children, regardless of whether inmates are still in the prime childrearing years of the life course. Four female inmates were excluded from the sample from ORW who participated in the pilot study, leaving a total of 1505 inmates for initial inclusion in the analyses.

Of the 1505 inmates, 398 refused to participate, 46 inmates had missing surveys (see reasons in Appendix 1), and 1061 completed a survey (70.5% completion rate). An analysis was performed to assess whether there were statistically significant differences between inmates who completed the survey and inmates who refused participation. This is shown in Appendix 2. The analysis shows that inmates who refused to take the survey are more likely to be older at the time of commitment as well as older at the time of survey data collection, male, and members of racial/ethnic minority groups, as opposed to younger, female, and white non-Hispanic.

To be considered for inclusion in most of the analyses (and to have completed the survey), respondents had to answer "yes" to the question about whether they had dependent children, as well as provide specific information on the section of the survey asking about characteristics of each dependent child. A *dependent child* is any child for whom the inmate has a significant legal, financial, or parental obligation, some examples of whom could include biological children, stepchildren, spouse/partner/boyfriend/girlfriend's children, grandchildren, adopted or foster children, nieces, or nephews. Of the 1061 inmates, 522 responded "yes" to the question about whether they had dependent children. Four of the 522 inmates did not complete the section of the survey where they responded to questions about the characteristics of their dependent children, so their responses are excluded from analysis, leaving 518 inmates. An additional fifteen inmates (beyond the 522 reporting

dependent children) either responded “no” to whether they had dependent children but still reported on the characteristics of one or more children, or had a missing response to the question about dependent children but reported on the characteristics of one or more children. These inmates are also excluded from the analysis for failing to meet the criteria for inclusion.

Analyses of results were conducted in two different ways. For questions that are about the inmates themselves, the data file is structured so that each inmate is a single case in the data. For the questions that are about the inmates’ dependent children, survey questions were asked about each of the children individually, and they could report on up to ten children. A copy of the data file was restructured so each child of an inmate became a single case in the data. This allowed for greater clarity in reporting the findings of the portions of the survey asking specifically about each the inmates’ children. Thus, findings can be represented such that a particular percent of children exhibit a specific characteristic (e.g., “2.9% of inmates’ dependent children are stepchildren”), rather than making broader and therefore less potentially useful generalizations at the inmate level (e.g., “1.7% of inmates have one or more dependent stepchildren”) (latter calculation not shown in tables).

Results

Inmate-level findings: Profile of inmate's family experiences and children



It should be noted that findings may differ from those of the 2004 Survey of Incarcerated Fathers, as the earlier survey focuses on minor children (age seventeen and younger) of male inmates who are biological children, stepchildren, or children for whom the inmate has legal guardianship, while most of the present study focuses on dependent children (who could be of any age) of both male and female inmates, although comparisons are drawn to the 2004 survey where possible. Of the 1061 inmates completing the 2014 survey, all but one reported on the total number of biological children they have, regardless of age or where or whether they are living (Chart 1). A quarter (25.3%) of responding inmates report having no biological children, another one-quarter (25.2%) of inmates report one child, and one-fifth (20.8%) of inmates report two biological children. The other 29% of inmates have three or more children, with two inmates reporting thirteen children and one inmate reporting the highest number of biological children, which is seventeen. The average number of biological children per inmate is two (Appendix 3).



1043 inmates reported on the number of biological children they have who are age seventeen and younger (18 inmates had no response to the question) (Chart 2). Of the inmates who responded to the question, 45.9% has no minor biological children, just under one quarter (24.5%) has one minor biological child, and 14.2% has two biological minor children. The remaining 15.4% of inmates who responded to the survey question report having between three and ten minor biological children. When the results are reported separately by sex of inmate, 43.5% of female inmates (n=278 with valid data) report no minor biological children, 24.1% reports one minor biological child, and 14% reports two minor biological children. The other 18.4% of female inmates have between three and six minor biological children. Among male inmates (n=765 with valid data), 46.8% reports no minor biological children, 24.7% reports one minor biological children, 14.2% reports two minor biological children, and the remaining 14.2% reports from three to ten minor biological children. On average, inmates report having one biological child age seventeen and younger (Appendix 3). In the 2004 Survey of Incarcerated Fathers, it is reported that 48.4% of male inmates have no minor children (biological, step, or legal guardians), 21.7% of male inmates have one minor child, 15.2% of male inmates have two minor children, and the residual 14.7% of male inmates have three or more minor children. The percentages

are quite similar, even though the 2014 survey question on minor children focuses only on biological children, and the 2004 survey question focuses on a broader array of minor children.



As noted earlier, 522 of 1047 inmates (49.9%) responding to the 2014 survey have one or more dependent children (14 inmates had no response to the question) (Chart 3). For comparison purposes, ODRC's 2013 Intake Study, which highlights the characteristics of offenders newly committed to prison, defines dependent children as those co-resident children under the age of 18 who are biological children, stepchildren, or children of an inmate's boyfriend or girlfriend. In the Intake Study, 25.3% of inmates (both male and female) report they have one or more dependent children (Bates 2014). Thus, the percentage of inmates reporting they have dependent children in the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents is nearly double that reported in the Intake Study. This discrepancy may be partly explained by the broader definition of dependent children in the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents, which considers a broader array of children (i.e., nieces, nephews, grandchildren, adopted, or foster children), as well as children age eighteen and older who are still financially or otherwise dependent upon parents.

Further, the demographic characteristics of inmates in the 2013 Intake Study are compared to those of inmates who participated in the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents (see Appendix 4). Few inmate demographic characteristics were asked about in the Survey of Incarcerated Parents, so those in

the analysis are derived from the inmate master file. Although both studies report that being never-married is the most common marital status, the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents has a greater proportion of married participants and a smaller proportion of single or legally separated participants, as compared to the Intake Study. The Survey of Incarcerated Parents also has a higher proportion of female participants than is the case with the Intake Study, and married and female inmates are more likely to have dependent children.

The rest of the results focus on the inmates with dependent children in the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents, as those with dependent children were the only persons who were asked to complete the rest of the survey questions. As noted earlier, four of 522 inmates did not complete the questions about the characteristics of their dependent children, so their responses are excluded from the remaining analysis, leaving 518 inmates. Findings are reported for those with valid (non-missing) data on each survey question, with Charts 1 through 17 showing frequency of inmate responses to questions pertaining specifically to the inmates themselves. Therefore, each question response where the sample size is less than 518 suggests that some inmates had no response to the question. The percentages reported are not comparable with the 2013 Intake Study, since the Intake Study asks questions of all inmates committed during the 2013 study period, not just those with dependent children.



The majority of inmates (60.0%) with dependent children report their marital status as never married (Chart 4). Just under one fifth of the inmates (17.4%) are currently married, and just under one-fifth of inmates are divorced (17.6%). About two percent of inmates are legally separated and another 2% of inmates are widowed. For comparison purposes, the inmate self-report of marital status presented here was cross-tabulated with inmate marital status in the offender master file, for those with dependent children (analysis not shown). There were high levels of consistency for those who said they are never married in both data sources (96.8%), and somewhat high rates of consistency between those who said they were married in both data sources (70.8%). Consistency for the other marital statuses was considerably lower (see Appendix 5 for a summary).


Chart 5. Inmate (n=518) Employment Status at Time of Arrest
40.0
35.0
30.0
25.0
20.0
15.0
10.0
5.0
0.0
37.8
12.5
13.7
4.2
0.4
16.8
5.4
4.6
3.7
0.8
Employed full-time
Employed part-time
Doing illegal activities for income
On disability
On leave from work
Unemployed and seeking work
Unemployed and keeping house or caring for children
Unemployed and in school
Unemployed and not seeking work nor going to school, nor keeping house/caring for...
Refused

In regard to employment status at the time the inmate was arrested, just over half of inmates with dependent children were employed (50.3%), with a little over a third (37.8%) indicating full-time employment, and 12.5% indicating part-time employment (Chart 5). Over one out of ten (13.7%) of inmates with dependent children were engaged in illegal activities for income at the time of arrest. One-sixth of inmates (16.8%) were unemployed and seeking work. A little more than 4% of inmates were on disability, and the remaining 13.7% of inmates were unemployed and either keeping house, going to school, or not engaged in any activities. Less than 1% of inmates did not wish to report on their employment situation when they were arrested.



Educational attainment of inmates with dependent children is explored in Chart 6. This is an ordinal variable, coded such that less than high school=1 through Bachelor's degree or higher=7. The most common level of educational attainment reported by inmates with dependent children is a GED or

high school diploma, which has been earned by 43.2% of inmates, but the mean educational level reported by inmates corresponds to the category of "some vocational training or trade school" (Appendix 3). A quarter of inmates with dependent children have less than a high school education (25.3%). Another 19.5% of inmates have some college. 6.4% of inmates with dependent children have completed an Associate's degree or higher.

Inmates with dependent children reported a wide variety of living situations prior to incarceration (Chart 7). In regard to the adults with whom they were living at the time, a little less than half (45.6%) was living with their significant other or spouse. The next most common response from almost 15% of inmates with dependent children was that they were living with extended family, and 11.8% reports they were living alone with no one else, neither adults nor children. Almost one out of ten (9.3%) inmates was living with their spouse or significant other and extended family, while 7.7% resided only with their children, and no adults. When the other categories in Chart 7 are summed, the remaining 10.8% of inmates with dependent children were living with friends and/or roommates, in complex household with various friends/roommates, significant others, and/or extended family members, were homeless, or report they did not know their living situation.


Chart 7. Adults With Which Inmate (n=517) Lived Immediately Prior to Prison
50.0
45.0
40.0
35.0
30.0
25.0
20.0
15.0
10.0
5.0
0.0
45.6
14.7
4.4
9.3
1.5
1.4
1.9
7.7
11.8
1.2
0.4
Spouse/partner/boyfriend/girlfriend
Extended family only
Friends/roommates only
Spouse/partner/boyfriend/girlfriend and extended family
Spouse/partner/boyfriend/girlfriend and friends/roommates
Spouse/partner/boyfriend/girlfriend and friends/roommates
Extended family and friends/roommates
Spouse/partner/boyfriend/girlfriend and extended family and friends/roommates
Lived with children only, no adults
Lived alone with no one else
Homeless
Don't know



In regard to the children with whom they were residing prior to incarceration, just over a half of inmates with dependent children were only living with those children (51.1%) (Chart 8). Interestingly, 18.6% of inmates with dependent children report not living with those children, but living with other adults only, prior to going to prison. About one out of ten inmates with dependent children (9.5%) were living alone with no one else, and 8.5% was living with a combination of dependent and unrelated children. About 5% of inmates with dependent children lived with children who were unrelated to

them. When the remaining categories are summed, the other 7.1% of inmates were living in households containing a multifaceted combination of adult children with or without dependent and unrelated children, were those who lived in a group home/institution, or had been homeless.



When asked about the number of partners with whom they have fathered children or given birth, inmates with dependent children most commonly have one to three partners (Chart 9). A little more than half (52.3%) has given birth to or fathered children with one partner, a little more than one quarter (29.0%) has children with two partners, and 11% has children with three partners. About 7% of inmates respond that they have children with four or more partners. The average number of partners with whom inmates have children is two (Appendix 3).



Inmates were also asked about childhood living experiences and institutional involvement. When inmates with dependent children were asked whether they were ever in foster care, 82% said they never were (Chart 10). Less than one-fifth has foster care experience. A little over 6% of inmates report they spent less than a year in foster care, 3.1% spent one to two years in care, another 3.3% spent three to four years in care, and 4.1% spent five or more years in care. On average, inmates report never having been in foster care during their youth (Appendix 3).



Among those who had said they spent time in foster care, inmates were asked to indicate in how many foster homes they had lived (Chart 11). Fewer than one-half (43.6%) said they had been in one foster home, 16.0% said they had been in two foster homes, 11.7% reports residence in three foster homes, and one out of five (20.2%) reports residing in four or more foster homes. The average number of foster homes reported by inmates (if there were any placements) is two (Appendix 3).

Chart 12. Inmate (n=517) Was Raised by Someone Other Than Biological Parents, Without a Formal Placement



A third of inmates with dependent children (32.3%) report having lived in an informal foster care arrangement, wherein they were not placed by social services, but they were raised by someone other than their biological parent(s) (Chart 12). Therefore, the experience of informal non-parental care arrangements is more common among the Ohio inmates with dependent children than is experience with formal foster care placements. The other two-thirds of inmates do not identify such an arrangement during childhood.



One third of inmates with dependent children indicate that their biological parents spent time in prison, while 62.1% does not report parents having been incarcerated (Chart 13).



Inmates with dependent children also respond affirmatively to institutional involvement during their youth, and inmates could report involvement in multiple institutions, so responses are not mutually exclusive (Chart 14). Almost a quarter (23.8%) reports commitment to a Department of Youth Services facility at some point, 53.3% reports they were involved with juvenile court prior to turning eighteen, and 12.2% reports involvement with child protective services. A little more than one-third of inmates with dependent children (36.8%) report no involvement with any of these institutions, whereas two-thirds was involved with one more youth institutions. Less than 1% of inmates refused to answer the question (0.4%) or did not know about their youthful institutional involvement (0.2%) (not shown in the chart).



In the last section of the survey, inmates were asked about their experiences with child support. More than half (53.6%) of inmates with one or more dependent children report that they have received information about paying child support since incarcerated, while 45.2% of inmates have not (Chart 15).



A little less than half of inmates with dependent children (46.5%) have a child support order, whereas 52.3% of inmates do not have one (Chart 16).



Two-fifths (40.9%) of inmates with dependent children report they are currently paying child support, while 58.8% of inmates are not (Chart 17).

Child-level findings: Profile of inmates' dependent children

The 518 inmates with dependent children report on a total of 1166 children. This suggests that each inmate with dependent children has, on average, two children for whom they have legal, financial, and/or parental obligations. Charts 18 to 33 show the frequency of inmate responses to each of the child-focused questions. While the unit of analysis in this section is children of inmates, it should be remembered that the findings are based on the incarcerated parents' perceptions of their relationships with the children. Responses with a sample size less than 1166 also reflect missing data on a particular survey item.



Examining the children's characteristics as reported by the inmates, 52.7% of the children are male, and 47.1% are female (Chart 18).



A little more than a quarter of dependent children are six to nine years old, while another quarter of dependent children are ten to thirteen years old, suggesting a slight majority of dependent children of Ohio prisoners are of elementary school age or are in early adolescence (Chart 19). Another 19.8% of dependent children of inmates are in the preschool age group (two to five years old); while 19.5% of dependent children are in middle adolescence (ages fourteen to seventeen). Fewer than 3% of inmates have dependent children who could be classified as infants (a year old or younger), and the remaining 7.2% of dependent children of inmates are adults age eighteen or older. The average age of dependent children is ten (Appendix 3).



In regard to the relationship between the inmate and child (Chart 20), 91.3% of the dependent children have an inmate parent who identified themselves as the biological parent, with the second most common category being that the inmate is a parental figure to the child of his or her partner/boyfriend, or girlfriend (4.8%). Just a little less than 3% of dependent children have an inmate parent who identifies themselves as the stepparent of the child. The remaining dependent children have an incarcerated parent serving other parental roles (e.g., legal guardian, adoptive stepparent, grandparent, or aunt or uncle).



A cross-tabulation was performed to better understand marital statuses of incarcerated parents occupying specific parental roles toward dependent children (Chart 21). Dependent children who have incarcerated parents classifying themselves as biological parents are most likely to have parents who report they are never married (57.3%), followed by currently married (20.7%) or divorced (17.0%). Children who have incarcerated parents classifying themselves as stepparents are most likely to have

parents whose marital status is married (55.9%), with never married (23.5%) and divorced (14.7%) as the next most common marital statuses. Children with incarcerated parents classifying themselves as a parental figure to the child of their partner/girlfriend/boyfriend most commonly have incarcerated parents who report their marital status is never married (80.4%), with fewer reporting their marital status as married (7.1%), divorced (5.4%), or legally separated (7.1%). Therefore, it appears that dependent children with an incarcerated parental figure who is a stepparent most commonly live in a remarried stepparent family, whereas children who have an incarcerated parental figure who is their parent's partner live in unmarried cohabiting stepparent families.

Although the trajectory of residential mobility of children of incarcerated parents is not explored here, four-fifths is living outside the former residence of the incarcerated parent/parent figure (Chart 22).



As reported by the incarcerated parent, around one-fifth (21.9%) of dependent children live at the former residence of their inmate parent (Chart 22). 52.7% of children live in a different home than that where the inmate used to reside, but within the same town or city. Slightly more than 7% of children reside in a different town or city than the inmate's prior residence, and 14.2% of children live in a different county altogether than where the inmate was living prior to incarceration.



Many children have incarcerated parents who before prison were taking on financial responsibility for their dependent children (Chart 23). Over two-thirds of dependent children have an incarcerated parent who was contributing more than half of their financial support at the time of arrest, whereas 28.8% of

children have an incarcerated parent who was providing less monetary support than that (Chart 23).



A small number of dependent children of incarcerated parents were involved with institutions (Chart 24). Nearly 3% of dependent children were reported by their incarcerated parents to have been involved with DYS by being committed to a facility, while 3.9% of dependent children were reported by their incarcerated parents to have been adjudicated for or charged with a crime in juvenile court. Almost 10% of dependent children were involved in some manner with Child Protective Services, according to their incarcerated parents, with 15% of children having involvement in at least one institution (although they could potentially be involved with more than one). 2.9% of the children have incarcerated parents who do not know about their institutional involvements, whereas 0.3% has parents who refused to answer the question (not shown in Chart 24).



Arrests of dependent children were highly uncommon. Slightly more than 5% of the children have been arrested, and 92.4% of the dependent children have no arrests (Chart 25).

The survey also asks several questions about the incarcerated parents' average frequency of contact with each dependent child during their entire period of incarceration.



The vast majority of dependent children (89.9%) have incarcerated parents who report they are allowed contact with their child while incarcerated (Chart 26). Small percentages of dependent children have incarcerated parents who report that they are not allowed contact by the courts (4.1%) or by the other parent or guardian of the child (4.0%).



When examining the dependent children in terms of the frequency of each of the different types of contact their incarcerated parent have with them, phone and mail contact are most frequent and most common, followed by visits, with email contact and video visitation being noticeably less common and less frequent (Chart 27). Dependent children's incarcerated parents' responses to the contact

variables indicate that they have phone contact at least once a month, personal visits less than once a month, mail contact at least once a month, e-mail contact less than once a month, and they never have video visitation, with their dependent children, on average (Appendix 3).

Examining Chart 27 more closely, in regard to phone contact with dependent children, responses are split between children with incarcerated parents who never have contact (24.4%), and nearly half of dependent children whose incarcerated parents have more frequent phone contact at once per week (24.8%) or daily or almost daily (22.0%). Smaller percentages of dependent children have incarcerated parents who report phone contact less than once per month (11.7%) or at least once a month (15.9%). Looking at the trends in personal visits, almost half of dependent children have incarcerated parents who report never having visits with the child (48.7%), or infrequent visits. Over 25% of dependent children have incarcerated parents who report visits of less than once per month, or at least once per month (18.3%). Just 2.2% of children have inmate parents who report a greater frequency of visits of once a week or more.

Cards and letters are a more common form of contact between dependent children and incarcerated parents than visits (Chart 27). While 27% of dependent children have incarcerated parents who report never having mail contact with their child, 20.6% of dependent children have parents who report sending or receipt of mail less than once a month, and 29.1% of children have incarcerated parents who report mail contact at least once per month. A little more than one out of five (22.1%) of dependent children have incarcerated parents with mail contact occurring once a week or more frequently. A sizeable majority of dependent children have an incarcerated parent who reports never having video visitation (87.7%), while 11.4% has some video visitation, with a little over 2% having weekly video visitation. Similarly, e-mail contact is not common, with 70.2% of dependent children having incarcerated parents who report never having e-mail contact with their child, while fewer than

10% reports email contact in any of the categories indicating frequency of less than once a month, once a month, once a week, or daily.



Despite low levels of some types of contact, an overwhelming number of dependent children (94.4%) have incarcerated parents who have a great deal of desire to have contact with their child (Chart 28). Fewer than 2% of children have an inmate parent who has no desire to have contact with them, and 2.2% of children have an inmate parent with some desire to have contact with them. On average, the parents of dependent children report that they have a great deal of desire for contact with them (Appendix 3).



At the time of arrest, about half of dependent children had incarcerated parents who report their child lived with them full-time when the parent was arrested (Chart 29). More than one-third (35.9%) of dependent children have incarcerated parents who report that they and the child were not residing together at arrest, and 12.8% of dependent children have incarcerated parents stating that they were co-residing with the child part-time.



The largest proportion of dependent children (48.1%) is currently residing with their other biological parent, who is the current spouse or partner of the incarcerated parent (Chart 30). Another 19.7% of dependent children are residing with the other biological parent, who is the ex-spouse or ex-partner of their incarcerated parent. Next most common is family care, with 16.4% of dependent children residing with their grandparent(s), as reported by the incarcerated parent, and 7.5% of dependent children living in households containing other extended family members. Very small percentages of dependent children of incarcerated parents are currently living in non-family care,

including households with no related adults (2.3%), foster care (1.1%), adoptive homes (1.0) or group homes and institutions (0.3%), as reported by the incarcerated parent.



Most dependent children have incarcerated parents who have current contact with their child's caretaker (73.8%), with one-quarter (24.3%) of children having incarcerated parents who report no contact with the child's caretaker (Chart 31). Inmates were asked which methods they used to keep contact with their dependent children's caretakers, and they could report multiple methods (Chart 32).



The most common is phone contact, with 63.8% of dependent children having incarcerated parents who responded they used this to keep in touch with their child's caretaker, followed by writing letters (47.1%), visits (24.6%), email (20.9%), and videoconference (5.4%). Over three-fourths of dependent children's incarcerated parents use one or more methods to keep in touch with their child's caretakers, whereas one-fifth of dependent children have parents in prison who do not utilize any of these methods.

Inmates were also asked in what county their dependent children were residing (Chart 33). The most common responses to Ohio county of residence of dependent children, as reported by incarcerated parents include Cuyahoga (13.5%), Franklin (10.9%), Hamilton (7.5%), Summit (5.4%), and

Montgomery (5.0%). There are 12.6% of dependent children whose incarcerated parents revealed that they do not live in Ohio.



Summary and Discussion

Findings from the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents provide a valuable wealth of information on the parenting experiences of Ohio inmates. The survey findings are limited to providing a snapshot of men and women who were currently incarcerated during the summer of 2014, and information from those who are willing to discuss their children and families with staff. Findings reveal that while a quarter of inmates have no biological children, those with children have on average two biological children in total, and of those children, one biological child who is age 17 or younger. This parallels the national trend in which U.S. prison inmates report a mean of two children (Glaze and Maruschak 2008;

Myers, Smarsh, Amlund-Hagen, and Kennon 1999). Half of inmates who completed the survey have dependent children for whom they have a legal, financial, and/or parental obligation, who are the focus of the survey. The percentages of inmates reporting minor children are very similar between the 2004 Survey of Incarcerated Fathers (which focuses upon biological children, stepchildren, or children for whom the inmate is a legal guardian) and the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents (where a specific question on minor children refers only to biological children).

According to self-report, inmates with dependent children are predominately never-married, with a third of them indicating being married or divorced. A quarter of incarcerated parents have not completed high school, and another two-fifths of incarcerated parents have earned a high school diploma or GED. At the time they were arrested, half of Ohio inmates were employed full-time or part-time, almost a third unemployed (some of whom were in school and/or keeping house), and the rest were doing illegal activities for income or were on disability or leave from work. High school completion rates are higher among Ohio inmates than among state prisoners interviewed in national surveys (Maruschak et al. 2010; Mumola 2000).

The largest number of Ohio inmates with dependent children was living only with a spouse or partner prior to incarceration (if they were living with any adults in their household), and was only living with their dependent children (if they lived with any children in their household), although almost 20% of inmates were living only with adults and none of their children in the household before going to prison. This reflects the broader trend of incarcerated parents experiencing family disruption prior to imprisonment (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). Inmates with dependent children have fathered or given birth to children typically with one or two partners. While most Ohio inmates with dependent children have never spent time in foster care, 17.6% reports some time spent in a formal placement. This is very comparable to the 2004 SISFCF data (Johnson and Waldfogel 2002). Those inmates with foster care

experience usually had one or two foster care placements, while one-fifth of former foster children who reported on number of placements experienced many transitions (four or more placements). Informal care by someone other than the inmate's parents is more common than formal foster care placements, with one-third of inmates reporting this.

A third of Ohio inmates with dependent children also report that one or both of their parents served time in prison. Although over a third of inmates with dependent children report no institutional involvement during their youth, almost a fourth was committed to a DYS facility, over half was involved in juvenile court, and more than one out of ten was involved with child protective services. This provides evidence of disruption and transition in the families of origin of incarcerated parents in Ohio. Over half of incarcerated parents with dependent children have received information about paying support while in prison. Almost half has a child support order, and over two-fifths reports they are currently paying child support. Most Ohio inmates with dependent children and child support orders indicate they are meeting their child support obligations. A cross-tabulation (not shown) between inmate responses to these two questions reveals that 83.8% of Ohio inmates with a child support order report they are paying child support, while 15.8% of inmates with an order are not paying and 0.4% of inmates with an order do not know whether they are paying child support.

Turning to the characteristics of dependent children, slightly more than half is male, and slightly less than half is female. Over two-fifths of dependent children are quite young (age nine or younger) and another 45% of dependent children are in their teens, similar to reports from inmates on their children in the SISFCF data (Glaze and Maruschak 2008; Mumola 2000). Over 90% of dependent children are biological children, but 7.7% of dependent children are stepchildren in married and cohabiting stepparent families for whom inmates are taking on parental obligations. This finding points to the diversity in family structure of the families of incarcerated persons. Slightly more than 20% of

dependent children are currently residing at the incarcerated parent's former residence. When inmates are asked if the child lived with him or her at the time of the inmate's arrest, almost two-thirds reported the child was living with them full or part-time, but the other third was not. Hence, residential transitions probably occurred for many children prior to the arrest of their parent, although it is unclear if some of the children ever lived with their incarcerated parent, and/or if they experienced multiple moves between households.

Seven out of ten dependent children have an incarcerated parent who stated they were providing more than half of their child's monetary support at the time the parent was arrested. The vast majority of children of incarcerated parents have not been involved with any institutions. Less than 10% has been involved with child protective services at some point in time, and less than 5% has been committed to the Department of Youth Services facilities or made appearances in juvenile court. Just 5% of dependent children of incarcerated parents have ever been arrested. Almost 90% of dependent children have incarcerated parents who are permitted contact with them, and 95% of dependent children have parents in prison who say they have a strong desire to maintain contact. In terms of type of contact, letters and phone calls are most common and frequent, with personal visits being less common, and email and video visitation occurring very infrequently or never. Just under half (48.7%) of dependent children have a parent in prison who report never having personal visits, which reflects the high rates of inmates not receiving visits from children (50%) found in other studies (Miller 2006; Loper et al. 2009).

The three most commonly reported living arrangements of the dependent children of inmates are the child's other parent (either the current or ex-significant other [spouse, partner, boyfriend, or girlfriend] of the inmate, who is the child's other parent), or the child's grandparent(s), while only 2% of children are reported to be in foster care or adopted. This is in line with residential trends reported for

children of inmates, wherein children tend to live with either grandparents (in the case of an incarcerated mother) or their other parent (in the case of an incarcerated father), only rarely experiencing foster care placements or other non-family care (Dallaire 2007; Foster 2011; Glaze and Maruschak 2008; Johnson and Waldfogel 2002; Kjellstrand et al. 2012; Loper, Carlson, Levitt, and Scheffel 2009; Mumola 2000) although a comparison between male and female inmates is not conducted here. Three-quarters of dependent children have incarcerated parents who maintain contact with their caretakers, most commonly via phone calls and writing letters, and less commonly through visits and email, with only 5% of dependent children having parents in prison who utilize videoconferencing for caretaker contact. More than two-fifths of dependent children of incarcerated parents reside in high-population metro areas in Ohio, although the remainder lives in various regions around the state. Almost 13% of dependent children reside outside Ohio, which could point to potential difficulties with visitation.

The descriptive statistics provided in this report provide a useful picture of the family experiences of inmates and their dependent children, but some inmate groups are overrepresented, and other groups are underrepresented in the survey. The intent of the sampling strategy used in the Survey of Incarcerated Parents is to include a broad snapshot of offenders across age and other demographic groups. However, those inmates who agreed to participate are more likely to be younger, female, and white non-Hispanics, whereas those refusing participation are more likely to be older, male, and non-white and/or Hispanic. Compared to the 2013 Intake Study, which provides a portrait of inmates who entered the prison system during the spring, inmates completing the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents have a higher likelihood of being female and married, both groups of whom are more likely to report having children in their care prior to arrest (Glaze and Maruschak 2008). This may help to explain the greater percentage of inmates who report having dependent children in the Survey of Incarcerated Parents (50%) as compared to the Intake Study (25%).

Other limitations of the survey include an inability to test the time ordering of events, and a bias in the number of biological children reported by inmates because of survey response patterns. The Survey of Incarcerated Parents is cross-sectional, and causal relationships between variables cannot be ascertained without administering longitudinal surveys to track the same parents over time. Despite piloting the survey, there is a likelihood that some confusion may have remained in relation to who is considered a dependent child, and the number of such children may be underestimated here. Inmates may have had difficult past histories involving children (i.e., contentious family relationships or criminal histories involving children). Therefore, the reported total number of inmates' biological children may be underestimated in this regard. Also, upon hearing that a survey was to be administered regarding children, childless persons may have been more likely to refuse, and so the overall counts of number of biological children gleaned in the screener questions may not accurately reflect the number of biological children inmates have.

Further data limitations were created by the need to cap the amount of data collected in the survey to a reasonable amount. Inmates were not asked if their dependent child(ren)'s other parent was also incarcerated, and therefore it is possible that some dependent children have two parents in prison in Ohio or elsewhere. Had this information been gathered, it would allow for comparisons between families with one and two incarcerated parents. Furthermore, time constraints and potential interviewee fatigue, particularly when being asked about each dependent child, resulted in an inability to ask more in-depth questions about perceptions of relationships with family members. This could have proven useful for providing more context for interpreting the findings.

The next step is to conduct bivariate and multivariate analyses to establish if there are associations between the variables. For example, an association between inmates' parental incarceration and childhood experiences in foster care placement can be assessed, as can a relationship

between contact with a dependent child's caretaker (which might indicate something about the quality of the relationship between the caretaker and the inmate) and contact with the child him or herself. Further comparisons can be made between male and female inmates and how their family experiences are different and similar. Additional data sources, such as prison misconduct data, can be merged into the data file to conduct an assessment of the relationship between contact with children and inmate misbehavior. Inmate self-report data may vary considerably from more official records, and so consistency between inmate self-report of child support payments and state data on child support payments can be compared. The data have rich potential to be used to explore a variety of associations between incarcerated parents' family characteristics and incarceration experiences.

References

Bates, J. (2014). *2013 Intake Study.* Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Bureau of Research and Evaluation.

Boudin, C. (2011). Children of incarcerated parents: The children's constitutional right to a family relationship. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 101(1),* 77-118.

Dallaire, D.H. (2007). Incarcerated mothers and fathers: A comparison of risks for children and families. *Family Relations, 56,* 440-453.

DeGue, S. & Widom, C.S. (2009). Does out-of-home placement mediate the relationship between child maltreatment and adult criminality? *Child Maltreatment, 14(4),* 344-355.

Doyle, J.J. (2008). Child protection and adult crime: Using investigator assignment to estimate causal effects of foster care. *Journal of Political Economy, 116(4),* 746-770.

Foster, H. (2011). The influence of incarceration on children at the intersection of parental gender and race/ethnicity: A focus on child living arrangements. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 9,* 1-21.

Glaze, L.E., & Maruschak, L.M. (2008). *Bureau of Justice Statistics special report: Parents in prison and their minor children.* Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Griswold, E.A., & Pearson, J. (2005). Turning offenders into responsible parents and child support payers. *Family Court Review, 43(3),*358-371.

Johnson, E.I., & Waldfogel, J. (2002). Parental incarceration: Recent trends and implications for child welfare. *Social Service Review, 76(3),* 460-479.

Kjellstrand, J.M., Cearly, J., Eddy, J.M., Foney, D., & Martinez, C.R. (2012). Characteristics of incarcerated mothers and fathers: Implications for preventive interventions targeting children and families. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34,* 2409-2415.

Loper, A.B., Carlson, L.W., Levitt, L., & Scheffel, K. (2009). Parenting stress, alliance, child contact, and adjustment of imprisoned mothers and fathers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 48,* 483-503.

Maruschak, L.M., Glaze, L.E., & Mumola, C. J. (2010). Incarcerated parents and their children. In J.M. Eddy & J. Poehlmann (Eds.), Children of incarcerated parents: A handbook for researchers and practitioners (pp. 33-51). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Miller, K.M. (2006). The impact of parental incarceration on children: An emerging need for effective interventions. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 23(4),* 472-486.

Miller, A.L., Perryman, J., Markovitz, L., Franzen, S., Cochran, S., & Brown, S. (2013). Strengthening incarcerated families: Evaluating a pilot program for children of incarcerated parents and their caregivers. *Family Relations, 62,* 584-596.

Mumola, C.J. (2000). *Bureau of Justice Statistics special report: Incarcerated parents and their children.* Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Murray, J., Farrington, D.P., & Sekol, I. (2012). Children's antisocial behavior, mental health, drug use, and educational performance after parental incarceration: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. Psychological Bulletin, 138(2),* 175-210.

Myers, B.J., Smarsh, T.M., Amlund-Hagen, K., & Kennon, S. (1999). Children of incarcerated mothers. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 8(1),* 11-25.

Pettway, C., Dorsey, R., & Byorth, B. (2004). *Incarcerated fathers: A Statistical Profile.* Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Bureau of Research.

Poehlmann, J., Dallaire, D., Loper, A.B., & Shear, L.D.(2010). Children's contact with their incarcerated parents. Research findings and recommendations. *American Psychologist, 65(6),* 575-598.

Poehlmann, J., Shlafer, R.J., Maes, E., & Hanneman, A. (2008). Factors associated with young children's opportunities for maintaining family relationships during maternal incarceration. *Family Relations, 57,* 267-280.

Roxburgh, S., & Fitch, C. (2014). Parental status, child contact, and well-being among incarcerated men and women. *Journal of Family Issues, 35(10),* 1394-1412.

Shlafer, R.J., Gerrity, E., Ruhland, E., & Wheeler, M. (2013). Children with incarcerated parents—Considering children's outcomes in the context of family experiences. In Cari Michaels (Ed.),

Children's mental health eReview: Incarcerated parents. St. Paul, MN: University of Minnesota Extension. Children, Youth, and Family Consortium.

Shlafer, R.J., & Poehlmann, J. (2010). Attachment and caregiving relationships in families affected by parental incarceration. *Attachment and Human Development, 12(4), 395-415.*

Tuerk, E.H., & Loper, A.B. (2006). Contact between incarcerated mothers and their children: Assessing parenting stress. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 41(3),* 26-43.

Wakefield, S., & Wildeman, C. (2011). Mass imprisonment and racial disparities in childhood behavior problems. *Criminology and Public Policy, 10(3),* 793-817.

Wildeman, C. (2009). Parental imprisonment, the prison boom, and the concentration of childhood disadvantage. *Demography, 46(2),* 265-280.

Appendix 1. Reasons for Missing Incarcerated Parent Surveys

(n=46)

Reason	n
Furlough or release	8
Medical reasons	4
Out to court	3
Movement to another specialized housing unit (i.e., RTU or SMU)	4
Institutional transfer	9
Consent form not signed by inmate or no consent form included with survey	2
Multiple reasons in combination with a stint in segregation	3
Unknown reason(s)	13
Total	46

Appendix 2. Bivariate Relationships Between Inmate Characteristics and Refusal to Participate in Survey of Incarcerated Parents[1]

	Inmate participated in survey			Inmate refused to participate in survey			Test of significant differences between female and male inmates with dependent children
	n	%	Mean (Std.Dev.)	n	%	Mean (Std.Dev.)	
Race/ethnicity							X^2=8.121, df=1, p=.004**
White non-Hispanic	603	75.8	--	193	24.2	--	
Hispanic, Asian, Black, Native American, or Other Race	458	69.1	--	205	30.9	--	
Inmate marital status[2]							X^2=3.482, df=5, p=.626
Never married	605	71.4	--	242	28.6	--	
Married	171	76.0	--	54	24.0	--	
Divorced	94	74.6	--	32	25.4	--	
Legally separated	16	84.2	--	3	15.8	--	
Widowed	13	72.2	--	5	27.8	--	
Common law couple	2	66.7	--	1	33.3	--	
Sex							X^2=25.194, df=1, p=.000***
Female	278	83.5	--	55	16.5	--	
Male	783	69.5	--	343	30.5		
Inmate has one or more violent offenses for which he/she is incarcerated							X^2=1.388, df=1, p=.239
No	227	75.4	--	74	24.6	--	
Yes	834	72.0	--	324	28.0	--	
Inmate security level—most recent[2]	1061	--	1.8 (0.9)	398	--	1.9 (0.9)	t=-1.059, df=1457, p=.290
Age at time of survey	1061	--	37.5 (12.2)	398	--	40.7 (13.2)	t=-4.193, df=663, p=.000***
Age at commitment	1061	--	31.2 (10.7)	398	--	32.5 (11.2)	t=-2.038, df=1457, p=.042*

[1]Data on inmate characteristics are taken from the master ODRC inmate file, which contains official inmate records. Inmate marital status reported in this file differs in some cases from marital status as self-reported in the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents. [2]Security level is measured such that Level 1=1, Level 2A/2B=2, Level 3A/3B=3, Level 4A/4B=4, Level 5A/5B=5, Death row=6.

Appendix 3. Means and Standard Deviations of Continuous Variables, as Reported by Inmates in the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents[1]

Variable	Valid n	Mean (Std. Dev.)	Range of Responses
Inmate-level			
Total number of biological children	1060	1.86 (1.86)	0 to 17 children
Total number of children age 17 or under	1043	1.12 (1.45)	0 to 10 children
Highest education level completed	516	2.70 (1.71)	1=Less than high school to 7=Completed Bachelor's degree or higher
Number of partners with whom inmate has fathered/given birth to children	506	1.78 (1.14)	1=One partner to 10=Ten partners and 11=More than 10 partners
Length of time in foster care, if ever	511	1.39 (1.00)	1=Never to 5=Five or more years
Number of foster homes in which inmate lived (if was ever in foster care)	86	2.09 (1.22)	1=One to 4=Four or more
Child-level			
Child's age	1162	10.19 (5.85)	One year or less to 44 years old
Average frequency of phone contact	1129	3.10 (1.49)	1=Never to 5=Daily
Average frequency of personal visits	1106	1.73 (0.85)	1=Never to 5=Daily
Average frequency of mail contact	1135	2.52 (1.20)	1=Never to 5=Daily
Average frequency of video visitation	1139	1.20 (0.62)	1=Never to 4=At least once a week
Average frequency of e-mail contact	1139	1.71 (1.23)	1=Never to 5=Daily
Inmate's desire for contact with child	1133	2.94 (0.31)	1=None to 3=A great deal

[1] Responses of "Don't Know" or "Refused" are excluded from the calculations.

Appendix 4. Comparison of Demographic Characteristics of Inmates in the 2013 Intake Study and Inmates Participating in the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents

	2013 Intake (n= 3298)[1]			Participants in the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents (n=1061)[2]		
	n	%	Mean	n	%	Mean
Race						
White	2009	60.9	--	610	57.5	--
African American	1214	36.8	--	426	40.2	--
Asian, Native American, Other Race	75	2.3	--	25	2.3	
Inmate marital status						
Single, never married	2313	71.2	--	605	67.1	--
Married	350	10.8	--	171	19.0	--
Divorced	353	10.9	--	94	10.4	--
Legally separated	211	6.5	--	16	1.8	--
Widowed	22	0.7	--	13	1.4	--
Common law couple	--	--	--	2	0.2	--
Sex						
Female	494	15.0	--	278	26.2	--
Male	2804	85.0	--	783	73.8	--
Age at commitment	3298	--	32.1	1061	--	31.2

[1] Bates, J. (2014). *2013 Intake Study.* Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, Bureau of Research and Evaluation.
[2]This column of data is calculated using the master ODRC inmate file, which contains official inmate records.

Appendix 5. Comparison of Inmate Marital Status As Reported in the 2014 Survey of Incarcerated Parents and the ODRC Master Offender File, Among Inmates with Dependent Children (n=450)[1]

	Inmate Marital Status in Master File				
	Never married	Married	Divorced	Legally separated	Widowed
	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
Inmate Marital Status in Survey of Incarcerated Parents					
Never married	270 96.8%	8 2.9%	0 0.0%	1 0.4%	0 0.0
Married	15 20.8%	51 70.8%	2 2.8%	3 4.2%	1 1.4%
Divorced	16 20.0%	27 33.8%	35 43.8%	2 2.5%	0 0.0%
Legally separated	5 62.5%	2 25.0%	1 12.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Widowed	3 37.5%	4 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Don't know	2 66.7%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	6 1.3%	2 0.4%

[1]13.1% of inmates are missing data on inmate marital status from the master file.