



October 14, 1983

Profiles of Prison Visitors

N.E. Schafer

Suggested citation

Schafer, N.E. (1983). "Profiles of Prison Visitors." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Criminal Justice Association, Chicago, 14 Oct 1983.

Summary

An exploratory survey of visitors to two men's prisons finds that the visitors differ in some significant ways from prisoners' families previously described in the literature. The results raise some questions about the correlation that has been established between visits and post-release success and provoke suggestions for in-depth research into visitor/prisoner relationships.

Additional information

A revised version of this paper was published as:

Schafer, N.E. (1994). "Exploring the Link between Visits and Parole Success: A Survey of Prison Visitors." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 38(1): 17-31 (Spring 1994).

PROFILES OF PRISON VISITORS

by

N.E. Schafer

JC 8418

School of Justice
University of Alaska, Anchorage

Prepared for presentation at the annual conference of the
Midwestern Criminal Justice Association, Chicago, Illinois,
October 14, 1983.

PROFILES OF PRISON VISITORS

The link between parole success and the maintenance of family ties during incarceration has long been accepted. All available empirical evidence supports this relationship. Ohlin (1954) and Glaser (1964) both found that prisoners with supportive families were far more likely to successfully complete parole than were prisoners without families. Holt and Miller characterized this relationship as "strong and consistent" in their California study (1972:5). Others have found that visits had a positive effect on the prisoners' institutional behavior (Scudder, 1954; Hopper, 1969; et al).

This body of research has formed the basis for a series of recommendations on prison visiting policies. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973) recommended that prisons encourage visits, maximize visiting opportunities, and provide an appropriate and pleasant visiting environment. The Commission and others (e.g., Fenlon, 1972; Weintraub, 1976) have urged that services be provided to prisoners' families in order to facilitate the visit and provide assistance in adjusting to the incarceration of the family member.

Neither the research which establishes the link nor the recommendations to exploit it provide an explanation for the relationship between family interaction and parole success. Studies of prisoners' families could provide an explanation, but most of these focus only on the marital relationship. In these

studies of the prisoners' wives the emphasis has been on the impact of incarceration on the family and particularly on the economic and social strains caused by the incarceration of the breadwinner. None focused on the visit or on its importance to the prisoner. In these studies the inability of the wife to visit her imprisoned husband was stressed. All studies noted her low economic status (Schwartz and Weintraub, 1974; Crasthwaite, 1975; Schneller, 1975; Holland, 1981 and others). Morris (1965) found that the primary reason that wives of English prisoners did not visit their husbands was the expense involved. Homer (1979) estimated that transportation costs to Attica Prison from New York City would constitute "176.25% of the (welfare) wife's total weekly income" (p. 50), a percentage which would make visits virtually impossible. Few studies of other family members have been reported although Morris (1965) included children of prisoners in her study and Friedman and Esselstyn (1965) reported on the school adjustment of the children of inmates in county jails.

An explanation of the relationship between visits and parole success is not to be found by analyzing families who seldom visit. One must study those who do visit. This paper is a preliminary step in that direction.

Background of the Study

While both Glaser (1964) and Ohlin (1954) included letters and telephone calls as well as visits to indicate "active" family interest, the California study (Holt & Miller, 1972) measured only visits and found the strongest relationship between supportive families and parole success.

What is it about the visit that contributes to prisoners' successful release? There are several possibilities. The visit permits role continuance and role practice and thus smooths the adjustment of both family and prisoner to his release. It may be that a demonstration of support during incarceration reflects a promise of continued support after release. It may mean only that the family that has the resources to visit regularly has the resources to provide assistance to the prisoner during the transition from prison to community. It may also reflect a family loyalty and cohesion which pre-existed the period of incarceration and will outlast it.

Prison visiting is not pleasant. Many prisons have crowded visiting areas and many have limited visiting hours and restrict the length of the visit (Schafer, 1978). The processing of visitors is not always efficient and sometimes visitors are denied visits because of identification problems, clothing, or the behavior of the prisoner. The distance traveled for a visit may mean the expenditure of considerable time, money and effort. In spite of the hardships involved, many prisoners' families visit frequently and regularly. This paper presents profiles of these visitors as part of a preliminary effort to examine the dynamics of the prisoner/visitor relationship and the importance of that relationship to release success. Only adult visitors were profiled because they have the freedom to choose to continue or to terminate their relationship with the prisoner beyond the period of his incarceration and because they have control over the expenditure of time and resources for both visits and for post-

release support.

Research Method

A survey of visitors was made on consecutive summer weekends in 1976 in two state prisons for adult male felons. The prisons were chosen for their dissimilarity. One is a very old, maximum security, "end of line" prison which is located in a medium-sized city in the central part of the state and is easily accessible. It is within walking distance of train and bus depots and is on a city bus line. The other, a new medium security prison, is in a less populous region, houses less serious offenders, is several miles from any city of size, is surrounded by farm land, and is on a two-lane state highway. Though an inter-city bus does stop on the highway, the line serves only one large city. For most families the prison is accessible only by automobile.

Visiting policies at the two prisons are very different. The centrally located prison has limited visiting facilities and permits contact visits on weekends only. Each visitor may stay for two hours. The less accessible prison permits contact visits seven days a week for six hours per day, and limits visit length only when the number of visitors is so high that all cannot be accommodated. Summer weekends are peak visiting periods at both institutions and were therefore chosen for distribution of the survey questionnaires.

A total of 378 survey questionnaires (184 at the central prison, 194 at the rural one) were returned. The numbers do not reflect the total visitor volume since some refused to accept the

questionnaires and others failed to return them. The questionnaire was simple and could be completed quickly. Though a few questions asked for written answers, most required only check marks. Pencils were distributed with the forms. Since the survey was preliminary, it sought very general information about visiting and about the visitors themselves.

Survey results

Thirteen of the 378 questionnaires have been eliminated from the survey results because they were completed by one-time visitors (members of the clergy, volunteers and one lawyer) leaving an N of 264. The total visitor profile is presented in Figure 1. As might be assumed at institutions which confine only men, women comprised the largest number of visitors, with "female friends" constituting the largest category of women. Although they are not tied by blood or legal bonds to the prisoner this group includes some who are potential sources of release support and are included in the discussion.

The parents of prisoners constituted the second largest category of visitors, but there were more wives in the sample than mothers and nearly twice as many mothers as fathers. Siblings often accompanied parents and represented the next largest group of visitors.

"Other" relatives included grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, and a fair representation of in-laws. This group also tended to accompany the prisoner's nearer relatives. This category was so heterogeneous that it could not be meaningfully pro-

filed and no single group within it was large enough for separate consideration. The same was true of prisoners' children. While many young children were present at visits, not all were the children of the prisoners. There were only four adult children in the sample, too few to be profiled.

Four categories of visitors are profiled, wives, parents, siblings, and "female friends," an N of 323. The last is included because they have the potential to be important sources of parole support. According to Schwartz and Zeisel (1976), who criticized both the attitudes of parole officers toward common-law relationships and those parole rules which prohibit cohabitation, some common-law relationships are stronger than many marriages.

Since the opportunity to practice familial roles is important to the maintenance of family relationships, frequency of contact is a key to the strength of family unity. The frequency of visit by relationship is presented separately in Figure 2 so that comparisons can be made. It should be noted that the information is self-reported and may reflect the respondents' intentions to visit rather than the actual number of visits made, or perceptions of frequency rather than a precise count.

With these cautions in mind, we see that wives and female friends were the most regular visitors: 77.1% of the wives and 66.1% of the female friends visited at least once a week; and 88.6% of the wives and 83.8% of female friends reported visiting at least every other week. Parents visited less frequently:

approximately one-third of the fathers (33.3%) and mothers 32.7%) visited at least once a week. Prisoners' siblings visited even less frequently: 34.6% of the sisters and 16.6% of the brothers visited this often. Since the prisoners' siblings may accompany his parents on a visit, it may be that they were more likely to alternate visits with other brothers and sisters.

Many factors influence the frequency with which families can visit: distance, time, access to transportation, and such personal characteristics as age, economic status, and number of children. The prison's accessibility and its visiting policies also impact on frequency of visit. The vast majority of all respondents visited at least once a month: 95.2% of wives, 89.1% of the mothers, 85.1% of fathers, 78.0% of the brothers and sisters, and 90.0% of the female friends. When the obstacles to visiting are considered, the visitors in the sample appear to constitute a promising group for a preliminary examination of prisoner/family relationships.

Profiles

Prisoners' Wives

Because the wives of the prisoners have been the subjects of most of the reported studies of prisoners' families and are the relatives most likely to be included in family counseling programs their responses are of special interest. They are profiled in Figure 3.

Prisoner's wives have been characterized in the literature as living in urban areas with their minor children and supported in

large measure by public assistance. The wives in this sample were not atypical. They were young, as might be expected, since the average age of prisoners is 26 in one prison, 28 in the other. Nearly three-quarters (73.7%) were thirty or younger and only two (3.3%) were over forty. Forty-seven of the wives (78.7%) had children, most of whom were dependent minors. Of these 47, 22 (47%) were on public assistance, while 17 (36.2%) were employed. Since more than a third of the wives with children were employed, more of the prisoners' wives in this sample had jobs than were on public assistance: 28 (46%) were employed; 24 (39.3%) received welfare payments; and six (10%) indicated that they were unemployed but did not check the welfare payments box. The number of children seemed to be a factor in the source of income: employed wives had an average of 1.6 children while wives on public assistance had an average of 2.6 children.

In this the visiting wives did not fit the typical characterization, but if Homer (1979) and Crosthwaite (1975) are correct in assessing the difficulties of visiting for wives on welfare, these women should constitute a smaller percentage of the actual visitors.

The visiting wives were typically living with their minor children in largely urban areas, but they tended not to be on welfare and were not as limited by stringent budgets from frequent and regular visits. Their jobs were usually low-paying "pink collar" ones.

Parents constituted a large number of the visitors to prisoners (22.5% of the total). They are a very likely source of release support for their convicted sons and are profiled in Figure 4. Since there were twice as many mothers as fathers in the sample, it was hypothesized that marital status might explain the difference, i.e., fathers might accompany their wives on visits but divorced fathers often lose touch with their children. Divorced mothers, on the other hand, are the most likely parent to have raised the children and to continue the relationship into adulthood. Certainly the large proportion of visiting fathers who were married (88.8%) suggests that this may be the case, but 74.5% of the mothers were married and only 7.3% were divorced. The numbers are too small to be conclusive, but an intact family may be a factor in the unity of the prisoner's family. Six mothers and one father did not respond to this questionnaire item.

Few of the parents were limited by age or infirmity from frequent visits. Half of the parents were fifty or younger; 70%, sixty or younger. The frequency of the visit appeared to depend more on distance than on age. Most of the parents (87.8%) visited at least once a month. Of those who visited less frequently (N=10) five lived outside the state; one married couple traveled more than 1000 miles four times yearly for a visit; one mother traveled 500 miles to visit this often; and one couple visited twice a year from their home over 350 miles from the institution.

As a group the visiting parents lived as traditional working

class families. Nearly half of the parents were employed (40% of the mothers and 74.1% of the fathers). Most of the unemployed mothers were married (88.9%) and many of them wrote "housewife" by the employment item. A very small number of the mothers indicated that they received public assistance (11%).

The visiting siblings of the prisoners also reflected traditional working class values. This is not surprising since many accompanied their parents on visits to their brothers. The siblings are profiled in Figure 5. Older siblings tended to be employed, younger ones in school. A good portion of the adult siblings who visited were married (42.0%), but more (48.0%) were single. Since the visiting sisters and brothers were quite young (68% were 25 or younger), this is not surprising. The profile suggests that this group was not only young, but also energetic: 60% were employed, and none of the visiting siblings checked the welfare box. Although young, this group of siblings could become important sources of release support for their imprisoned brother who may serve several years before being paroled. Regular contact increases the likelihood of this support.

The degree to which one can consider the next category of visitors as potential sources of release support is open to question. Women visitors to men's prisons are of several types. Some are common-law partners of long standing who hope to continue their relationship after the prisoner's release. They may be promising sources of emotional and financial support during the parole period. They are among the most loyal visitors, traveling frequently and regularly to the prison. Another type of

female friend is the woman who occasionally accompanies a relative on visits to the prison. She is not likely to be a part of a future support network.

Between these two groups are others who may or may not continue the relationship with the prisoner they visit. Some of the women in the sample are volunteer prison visitors who have formed friendships with prisoners through religious or civic groups. They visit regularly but not frequently, and may provide continued friendship and support after the prisoner's release.

Another portion of this group falls into a category which might be termed "prison-attracted women." These women seldom have relationships with men in the free community, and seem to prefer relationships with incarcerated men. Some meet one prisoner through visits with another and some form liaisons with prisoner after prisoner. Those who were identified as members of this group during the research period arrived in a holiday mood. Two women who came together changed to party dresses in the visitors' restrooms, and seemed to view the visit as a pleasant social affair.

Since the survey instrument was not designed to differentiate among these visitor types, all female friends are profiled in Figure 6. This is by far the largest category of visitor but because of the different kinds of relationships represented the profile is not very revealing. They were nevertheless an interesting group. They were young; more than half were 25 years old or younger. Not surprisingly they were also unmarried: 85%

were either single (58.5%), divorced (24.6%) or widowed (1.5%). Fewer had children than was supposed (38.5%), although a larger number of respondents skipped this item. Some may have done so because they had no children, but the number of no responses is too large to permit conclusions to be drawn. Most of these young women were employed (60.8%); 23 were unemployed (17.7%) and 20 (15.4%) checked the welfare box. The female friends who visited appeared to be young, single, childless and employed. Most probably did not find the expense of a visit prohibitive.

The last item in Figure 7 shows the number of female friends who visited more than one prisoner. Most other categories of visitor checked no on this item, but 17.7% of the female friends did visit other prisoners. Some of them did so as volunteers but some were from the prison-attracted group.

Nearly 80% did not visit other prisoners. Among these are those loyal women who have had common-law relationships with the prisoner and who may be important to the prisoner's post release success. Many are willing to test a return to their former relationship and to provide housing and encouragement during the crucial early weeks of release. Schwartz and Zeisel (1976) suggested that common law partners often are not given the opportunity to assist the prisoner. Rules (and state laws) against cohabitation lead parole officers to press for marriage which places strains on an already delicate relationship. This group is worthy of more careful study.

Discussion

The results of this preliminary survey of prison visitors suggest that family unity as exemplified by visits may vary by relationship and may depend for continuance on a variety of factors beyond the control of the prisoner or his visitor, some of which may preexist the period of incarceration. Such factors as type of crime, length of sentence, criminal history, family history and even economic background must be studied in order to thoroughly assess the relationship between visits and parole success, and each of these should be analyzed by type of relationship.

Of all the family relationships studied here, the prisoner's relationship with his wife is the most precarious. Some wives remain unfailingly loyal, but many are unable or unwilling to continue the relationship. A felony conviction is grounds for divorce in most states and many prisoners receive divorce decrees while they are incarcerated. Many prisoners' wives are living under difficult circumstances: they have been left in near poverty to raise their children alone. The personal hardships caused by the criminal activities of their husbands may result in growing bitterness and resentment and lead them to dissolve the marriage. In addition, the enforced loss of sexual intimacy can have a detrimental effect for both marriage partners. Conjugal relationships can be important to the preservation of the marriage.

Although the wives in this sample reported that they visited regularly and frequently, we may question whether this pattern

will be continued for the entire period of their husband's incarceration. Even when the marriage survives until parole, the problems of readjusting to the marital situation may place strains on the relationship. Marital problems may even jeopardize parole success.

The strength of a prisoner's marriage may be directly related to the length of his sentence. The willingness of young women whose husbands are imprisoned to bear the burden of poverty and the loss of both companionship and sexual intimacy may depend on the duration of the hardship. Further research in this area is needed and prisons should be encouraged to maintain records on the marital status of prisoners and on the divorce rate during incarceration. Unless we can control for the many factors which may intervene in the marital relationship, even wives who visit may not constitute a reliable sample for the study of prisoner/family relationships.

The parent-child relationship is not subject to as many of these constraints. Certainly the imprisonment of a son can place such a severe strain on the parents that a breakdown in their relationships with their son results. The social stigma of having a convicted criminal in the family could be sufficient cause to terminate the relationship. Some parents may reach a crisis in tolerance following a son's history of problem behavior. We may assume, however, that the parents in the sample who do visit are seeking to continue their relationship with the prisoner.

While the parents in the visitor sample report visiting less frequently than the wives, their circumstances are such that budgetary problems are not likely to change the pattern of regularity. The majority of the parents are employed; many of the mothers who are not employed are living in a household with an employed breadwinner. They seem able to afford regular visits and to afford to subsidize the visits of the prisoner's sisters and brothers. They are also the visitors most able to provide temporary financial assistance for the prisoner in the crucial early weeks of release.

The marital status of the parents in the sample and the indication that the prisoner's siblings follow the visiting patterns set by their parents suggest that prisoner-family unity is a preexisting phenomenon which will prevail in spite of the problems raised by the incarceration of one family member. The visit may be a manifestation of family unity rather than a means of achieving or maintaining it.

This possibility and the clear traditional working or middle-class backgrounds of the visiting parents raise questions about research linking visits with parole success. More research may find a link between parole success and family economic status.

Conclusion

The research of Holt and Miller (1972), Glaser (1964) and others finds a strong link between family support as measured by visits and the post-release success of the prisoner. Because of this link, other authors have recommended that prisons encourage

family visits by increasing visiting opportunities, improving visiting facilities, providing services for visitors, and even subsidizing the cost of visits for indigent families (National Advisory Commission, 1973; Schwartz and Weintraub, 1976; and others).

Since prisoners' wives are apparently the least able of the visitors to afford the cost of visits, programs which provide subsidized visits and child care services could contribute to the frequency of the visit and add to the strength of the marriage. Counseling services could also have a positive effect on the marital relationship. Counseling can prepare both partners for release adjustment problems and can increase each partner's understanding of the problems faced by the other.

Since the prisoner's common-law relationships are subject to the same strains, services provided for wives could be extended to these women. The visits of other "female friends" should not be discouraged. Their contact with the prisoner can offset the problems associated with "loss of heterosexual relationships" discussed by Sykes (1958). These include problems with self-image caused by immersion into a unisex environment and problems related to readjusting to a heterosexual one after release. Role practice may be important in a variety of relationships, not just familial ones.

Such services might also contribute to the prisoner's relationships with parents, siblings, and other relatives. Though family unity may be strong enough to result in regular visits by

families with traditional working-class backgrounds, some prisoners have supportive parents who cannot afford the cost of regular visits. Visit subsidies could strengthen the unity of these families and of families whose relationships with the prisoner are marginal. Since family members are likely to be called upon for both emotional and financial assistance upon the prisoner's release, counseling services which help prepare both family and prisoner for post-release adjustment problems can be beneficial regardless of the degree of family unity prior to incarceration.

Prisoners who do not have families are in a difficult position. If ties with the "outside" are important to parole success, programs which match volunteer visitors with prisoners might be strengthened and expanded. Further studies of prisoner-family unity might illuminate the importance of such ties to both rehabilitation efforts inside the prison and successful reintegration into society. Though lay visitors were among the friends, both male and female, in the study they could not be treated as a separate category of visitor, and their roles in the rehabilitation of the prisoner should also be studied.

This study was a preliminary one intended to identify some of the factors related to prisoner-family unity which provide suitable areas for further research into the link between visits and parole success. A major impediment to such research is the failure of the institution to gather information on visiting, visitors, or even the family relationships of the prisoners. Schafer (1977) noted that 51% of the 168 prisons responding to a visiting survey could not supply information on the number of

their residents who had received no visits and 38% did not maintain records on the marital status of prisoners. Researchers must encourage correctional institutions to routinely include such information in statistical profiles of prisoners and to compile visiting information annually.

Since all the evidence indicates that successful completion of parole is related in a significant way to the maintenance of family ties during incarceration, research into the dynamics of this relationship could play an important role in the development of correctional policies and programs and contribute to our understanding of interpersonal behavior.

REFERENCES

- Fenlon, Sister Maureen (1972) "An innovative project for wives and families of prisoners," FCI Treatment Notes 3 (2): 1-12.
- Fenton, N. (1959) The Prisoner's Family. Palo Alto, CA: Pacific Books.
- Friedman, Sidney and Esselstyn, T. Conway (1965) "The adjustment of children of jail inmates," Federal Probation 36 (4): 27-33.
- Glaser, D. (1964) The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Holt, N. and Miller, D. (1972) "Explorations in inmate-family relationships," Research Report #46. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Corrections.
- Homer, E.L. (1979) "Inmate-family ties: desirable but difficult," Federal Probation 43:47-52.
- Hopper, C.B. (1965) "Conjugal visiting at the Mississippi State Penitentiary," Federal Probation 29 (2): 39-46.
- Morris, Pauline (1965) Prisoners and Their Families. New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc.
- Neussendorfer, Joseph (1969) "Marriage group-counseling inside," American Journal of Correction 13 (4): 33-34.
- Ohlin, L.E. (1954) "The stability and validity of parole experience tables," Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Chicago.
- Schafer, N.E. (1977) "A descriptive study of policies and practices related to the visiting of prisoners," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, University Microfilms.
- _____ (1978) "Prison visiting: a background for change," Federal Probation 42 (3): 42-44.
- Schneller, Donald P. (1975) "Prisoners' families: a study of some social and psychological effects of incarceration on the families of Negro prisoners," Criminology 12 (4): 402-415 (Feb.).
- Schwartz, M. and Zeisel, L. (1976) "Unmarried Cohabitation: a national study of parole policy," Crime and Delinquency 22 (April): 137-48.
- Scudder, K. (1954) "The open institution," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 293: 476-97.

Stollery, P.L. (1970) "Families come to the institution: a 5-day experience in rehabilitation," Federal Probation 34 (4): 20-26.

Weintraub, Judith F. (1976) "The delivery of services to families of prisoners," Federal Probation (Dec.): 28-31.

FIGURE 1 PRISON VISITORS

RELATIONSHIP TO PRISONER	MAXIMUM SECURITY PRISON		MEDIUM SECURITY PRISON		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
WIFE	31	17.2	30	16.3	61	16.8
MOTHER	26	14.4	29	15.8	55	15.1
FATHER	8	4.4	19	10.3	27	7.4
<u>TOTAL PARENTS</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>18.9</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>26.1</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>22.5</u>
SISTER	11	6.1	15	8.1	26	7.1
BROTHER	10	5.5	14	7.6	24	6.6
<u>TOTAL SIBLINGS</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>11.7</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>15.8</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>13.7</u>
CHILD (UNACCOMPANIED)	3	1.7	1	.5	4	1.1
OTHER RELATIVE	12	6.7	10	5.4	22	6.0
FEMALE FRIEND	72	40.0	58	31.5	130	35.7
MALE FRIEND	7	3.9	8	4.3	15	4.1
TOTAL	180	100.1*	184	99.9*	364	99.9*

*may not total 100% due to rounding

Figure 2: Visiting Frequency by Relationship

FREQUENCY:	<u>WIVES</u>		<u>MOTHERS</u>		<u>FATHERS</u>		<u>SIBLINGS</u>		<u>FEMALE FRIENDS</u>	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
more than once a week	10	16.4	10	18.2	1	3.7	2	4.0	25	19.2
every week	37	60.7	8	14.5	8	29.6	11	22.0	61	46.9
every two weeks	7	11.5	20	36.4	8	29.6	9	18.0	23	17.7
every month	4	6.6	11	20.0	6	22.2	13	26.0	8	6.2
every two months	1	1.6	2	3.6	0	0.0	5	10.0	4	3.1
four times a year	0	0	2	3.6	2	7.4	4	8.0	1	0.8
two times a year	0	0	1	1.8	1	3.7	2	4.0	0	0.0
once a year	1	1.6	1	1.8	1	3.7	0	0.0	3	2.3
N.R.	<u>1</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3.8</u>
TOTALS	61	100.0	55	99.9*	27	99.9*	50	100.0	130	100.0

* does not total 100% due to rounding

FIGURE 3 VISITOR PROFILE: PRISONER'S WIVES

3.1 AGE

	NUMBER	PERCENT
under 21	3	4.9
21-25	26	42.6
26-30	16	26.2
31-40	14	23.0
41-50	1	1.6
51-60	1	1.6
OVER 60	0	0.0
NO RESPONSE	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	61	99.9*

3.2 NUMBER OF CHILDREN

	NUMBER	PERCENT
0	14	22.9
1	12	19.7
2	17	27.9
3	7	11.5
4	3	4.9
5	2	3.3
6	2	3.3
NO RESPONSE	<u>4</u>	<u>4.5</u>
	61	100.0

3.3 EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	NUMBER	PERCENT
EMPLOYED	28	45.9
UNEMPLOYED	6	9.8
PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	23	37.7
NO RESPONSE	<u>4</u>	<u>6.5</u>
	61	99.9*

3.4 EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND CHILDREN

<u>NUMBER OF CHILDREN</u>	<u>NUMBER OF EMPLOYED WIVES</u>	<u>NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED WIVES</u>	<u>NUMBER OF WIVES ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE</u>	<u>NO RESPONSE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
0	9	4	1	-	14
1	7	1	4	-	12
2	7	1	9	-	17
3	3	-	4	-	7
4	2	-	1	-	3
5	-	-	2	-	2
6	-	-	2	-	2
<u>NO RESPONSE</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4</u>
TOTAL	28	6	23	4	61

3.5 TRANSPORTATION

	NUMBER	PERCENT
WALK	2	3.3
PRIVATE CAR	43	70.5
BUS	6	9.8
TRAIN	8	13.1
AIRPLANE	1	1.6
CAB	<u>1</u>	<u>1.6</u>
	61	99.9*

* does not total 100% due to rounding

Figure 4: Profile of Visitors:
Prisoners Parents

4.1 MARITAL STATUS

	<u>MOTHERS</u>		<u>FATHERS</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>	
	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent
MARRIED	41	74.5	24	88.8	65	79.3
SINGLE	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
DIVORCED	4	7.3	0	0.0	4	4.9
WIDOWED	4	7.3	2	7.4	6	7.3
NO RESPONSE	<u>6</u>	<u>10.9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3.7</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8.5</u>
TOTAL	55	100.0	27	99.9*	82	100.0

4.2 AGE OF VISITORS

AGE	<u>MOTHERS</u>		<u>FATHERS</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>	
	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent
31-40	3	5.5	0	0.0	3	3.6
41-50	26	47.3	15	55.5	41	50.0
51-60	17	30.9	9	33.3	26	31.7
OVER 60	5	9.1	3	11.1	8	9.7
NO RESPONSE	<u>4</u>	<u>7.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4.9</u>
TOTAL	55	100.0	27	99.9*	82	99.9*

4.3 EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	<u>MOTHERS</u>		<u>FATHERS</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>	
	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent
EMPLOYED	22	40.0	20	74.1	42	51.2
UNEMPLOYED	18	32.7	4	14.8	22	26.8
PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	6	10.9	0	0.0	6	7.3
NO RESPONSE	<u>9</u>	<u>16.4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>11.1</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>14.6</u>
TOTAL	55	100.0	27	100.0	82	99.9*

4.4 NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN FAMILY

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>MOTHERS</u>	<u>FATHERS</u>
1	3	5
2	10	4
3	4	4
4	6	3
5	1	1
6	4	1
7	2	-
8	1	-
9	0	-
10	2	1
NO RESPONSE	<u>22</u>	<u>8</u>
TOTAL	55	27

*May not total 100% due to rounding.

FIGURE 5

PROFILE OF VISITORS: PRISONERS' SIBLINGS

5.1 MARITAL STATUS

	SISTER		BROTHER		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
MARRIED	14	53.8	7	29.2	21	42.0
SINGLE	11	42.3	13	54.2	24	48.0
DIVORCED	1	3.8	2	8.3	3	6.0
WIDOWED	0	0.0	1	4.2	1	2.0
NO RESPONSE	0	0.0	1	4.2	1	2.0
TOTAL	26	99.9*	24	100.1*	50	100.0

5.2

AGE	SISTER		BROTHER		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
UNDER 21	8	30.8	4	16.7	12	24.0
21-25	9	34.6	12	50.0	21	42.0
26-30	5	19.2	4	16.6	9	18.0
31-40	1	3.8	3	12.5	4	8.0
41-50	1	3.8	0	0.0	1	2.0
51-60	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
OVER 60	2	7.7	1	4.2	3	6.0
TOTAL	26	99.9*	24	100.0	50	100.0

5.3 EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	SISTER		BROTHER		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
EMPLOYED	15	57.7	15	62.5	30	60.0
UNEMPLOYED	9	34.6	7	29.2	16	32.0
NO RESPONSE	2	7.7	2	8.3	4	8.0
TOTAL	26	100.0	24	100.0	50	100.0

*may not total 100% due to rounding

FIGURE 6 VISITOR PROFILE: FEMALE FRIENDS

6.1 AGE

	NUMBER	PERCENT
UNDER 21	23	17.7
21-25	49	37.7
26-30	27	20.8
31-40	23	17.7
41-50	6	4.6
51-60	0	0.0
OVER 60	0	0.0
NO RESPONSE	<u>2</u>	<u>1.5</u>
TOTAL	130	100.0

6.2 MARITAL STATUS

	NUMBER	PERCENT
MARRIED	14	10.8
SINGLE	76	58.5
DIVORCED	32	24.6
WIDOWED	2	1.5
NO RESPONSE	<u>6</u>	<u>4.6</u>
TOTAL	130	100.0

6.3 NUMBER OF CHILDREN

	NUMBER	PERCENT
0	45	34.6
1	21	16.2
2	15	11.5
3	9	6.9
4	3	2.3
5	0	0.0
6	1	.8
9	1	.8
NO RESPONSE	<u>35</u>	<u>26.9</u>
TOTAL	130	100.0

6.4 EMPLOYMENT

	NUMBER	PERCENT
EMPLOYED	79	60.8
UNEMPLOYED	23	17.7
PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	20	15.4
NO RESPONSE	<u>8</u>	<u>6.1</u>
TOTAL	130	100.0

6.5 VISIT OTHER PRISONERS

	NUMBER	PERCENT
YES	23	17.7
NO	103	79.2
NO RESPONSE	<u>4</u>	<u>3.1</u>
TOTAL	130	100.0