



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL

STUDIES

SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONJUGAL VISITATION AND

FAMILY BONDING AMONG INCARCERATED PEOPLE

By: EYOB YIMER

October, 2014

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

**The Relationship between Conjugal Visitation and Family Bonding
among Incarcerated People**

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Psychology in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirement for the Degree of Masters of Arts in Counseling Psychology

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My first and foremost acknowledgement goes to God who has helped me not only in doing this research but also in any step of my life.

I am indebted to MisAshraka, MisRahawa, Inspector Assaye and Commander Alamirew who work in federal administration and, incarcerated people in Addis Ababa central prison center /Kaliti/ that provided me with invaluable information.

I wish to extend my special gratitude to my advisor Dr. AbebawMinaye who took the pain of going through the draft of this thesis and making valuable comments and suggestions.

Finally, my biggest gratitude goes to my beloved family who always support me in my journey.

ABSTRACT

The present study was aimed at the investigation of conjugal visitation and family bonding among incarcerated people. The study was conducted in Addis Ababa, Kaliti correctional center. 136 participants (38 females and 98 males) were selected by using purposive sampling. A self-reported questionnaire that consisted of questions on social background, conjugal visit and family bonding was administered. The data obtained were analyzed using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient and independent sample t- test. The result of correlation coefficient ($r = .275$, $p < .05$, $N = 136$) showed a weak, positive and statistically insignificant relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among families who have no child; and ($r = .53$, $p < .05$, $N = 136$) showed a statistically significant relationship among incarcerated people who have a child or children. The independent sample t-test also demonstrated statistically significant difference (-2.90 , $df = 134$, $p < .05$) between male and female prisoners in preserving family bonding related to conjugal visitation; the result was in favor of male incarcerations. Finally, it was concluded that conjugal visitation is significantly associated with family bonding.

List of tables

Table's pages

Table 1: Study population.....	36
Table 2: Demographic data of the study population	37
Table 3: Imprisonment status of the study population.....	38
Table: 4 Correlations between conjugal visitation and family bonding in families who have no child.....	41
Table: 5 Correlation between conjugal visitation and family bonding in families who have a child or children	42
Table 6: Correlation between years spend in prison and conjugal visitation	43
Table 7: Correlation between years spend in prison and family bonding	44
Table 8: Gender difference in conjugal visitation	45
Table 9: Gender differences in family bonding	46

Table of Contents

Contents	Pages
CHAPTER ONE	1
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2. Statement of the problem	3
1.3. Objective of the study	4
1.4. Significance of the study	5
1.5. Limitations	6
1.6. Delimitation of the study	6
1.7. Operational definition of terms	6
CHAPTER TWO	7
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1. Family.....	7
2.2 Prisoners and their families	8
2.3. Prisoners - Family Communication	8
2.4 Conjugal visitation	10
2.5 Family Bonding.....	14
2.6 Impact of imprisonment on family bonding.....	14

2.7 The Role of Conjugal Visitation in Preserving Family Bonding	17
2.8 Gender differences in Conjugal visit and preserving family bonding	19
2.9. Conjugal visitation in Ethiopia.....	22
2.10. Long term prison, conjugal visit and family bonding	27
CHAPTER THREE	30
3. METHODS OF THE STUDY	30
3.1. Area of the study	30
3.2. Participants of the Study	30
3.3. Sampling procedure.....	31
3.4. Data Collecting Instruments.....	31
3.5. Pilot study.....	33
3.6. Methods of data analysis	33
3.7. Ethical considerations	34
CHAPTER FOUR.....	35
4. RESULTS	35
4.1 Background Characteristics of the Study Population.....	35
4.2. The practice of conjugal visitation among incarcerated people.....	38
4.3. Correlations between conjugal visitation and family	39
4.4 Results of mean difference tests (t-tests).....	43
4.4.1. Gender difference in conjugal visit	43

4.4.2. Gender differences in family bonding	44
CHAPTER FIVE	46
5. DISCUSSION	46
5.1. The practice of conjugal visitation among incarcerated people	46
5.2. The Relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among incarcerated people who have no child.....	48
5.3. The relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among families who have child/children	49
5.4. Correlation between years Spent in prison and conjugal visitation	51
5.5. Correlation between years Spent in prison and family bonding	52
5.6. Gender difference in conjugal visitation	53
5.7. Gender difference in preserving family bonding	54
CHAPTER SIX	57
6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	57
6.1. Summary	57
6.2. Conclusion.....	60
6.3. Recommendations	61

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

For many young people, families act as a critical source of pride, strength and guidance. Family relationships have been found to be the most valued aspect of a young person's life, the majority (73%) of young people nominated parents as their role models and the people they most admire. A further 12% nominated an older brother or sister and 9% nominated a grandparent. Only 6% picked a sport stars or pop culture identity as their main role model (Mission Australia, 2006).

As a human being, incarcerations arrested by whatever cases were influenced on many aspects of their lives by their families. In addition family and parenting variables are key predictors of criminal behavior through the life-course (Farrington 2002; Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber 1986, Cited by Murry, J., 2005). Loss of outside relationships is considered the most painful aspect of confinement for prisoners (Flanagan, 1980). A study from North America shows that more than half of the 1.4 million adults incarcerated in state and federal prisons are parents of minor children. The vast majority of incarcerated parents are male (93%) and are held in state prisons. Among the men held in state prison, 55 percent report having minor children. Among the women, who account for 6 percent of the state prison population, 65 percent report that they have minor children. Over half (58%) of the minor children of incarcerated parents are less than 10 years old (Mumola, 2000).

Family contact is associated with lower rates of self-harm while inside prison. Families are one of the most important factors affecting prisoners' rehabilitation after release (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002, Cited by Murray, J., 2005).

Family is affected and involved in the prison sentence. It affects everybody close. The effects of imprisonment on partners of prisoners are very harmful. Imprisonment of a partner can be emotionally devastating and practically debilitating. Loss of income, social isolation, difficulties of maintaining contact, deterioration in relationships, and extra burdens of childcare can compound a sense of loss and hopelessness for prisoners' partners (Morris, 1965, cited by Murray J. 2005). Children can suffer a range of problems during their parent's imprisonment, such as: depression, hyperactivity, aggressive behavior, withdrawal, regression, clinging behavior, sleeping problems, eating problems, running away, truancy and poor school grades (Murray, J., 2005).

Unfortunately, prisoners' families have been little studied in their own right. The effects of imprisonment on families and children of prisoners are almost entirely neglected in academic research, prison statistics, public policy and media coverage. However, we can infer from prisoners' backgrounds that their families are a highly vulnerable group. Limited research to date suggests that imprisonment can have devastating consequences for partners and children (Mills, 2003).

In Ethiopia, the issues regarding incarcerations, conjugal visitation and family bonding are not studied well. By considering this gap, this study focused on unexplored research questions which

have psychological and social implications. There are a lot of variables that need to be studied regarding incarcerations but this study focused on conjugal visitation and family bonding.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Some of the areas that need serious attention in our country are correction centers, prisoners and their families. Paradoxically it is one of the areas which got least consideration. We can observe these by visiting different correction centers in Addis Ababa. When we think about prisoners the first thing that pops to our mind is conjugal visitation. Conjugal visitation is the right not only for incarcerations but also their families.

This right is well mentioned in our constitution and different laws; but its applicability is very limited not only in our country but also in developed countries that always preceded us in making and implementing human rights. When the right of conjugal visitation is forbidden or limited, spouses who had the right to meet with their lover, and children who had the right to spend time with their father's or mothers' denied the access too. There are spouses who denied their right to have a baby with their incarcerated lover and also there are women who remain childless because they go to menopause while they are in prison.

There are many social and psychological problems raised related to conjugal visit and family bonding. But we have only few studies on the area, specially related with psychology. So the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between conjugal visitation and family

bonding among incarcerations. Accordingly, the study is designed to answer the following research questions:

- How is the practice of conjugal visitation among incarcerated people?
- Is there a significant relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among couples who have child/children?
- Is there a significant relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among couples who have no child?
- Is there a significant relationship between years Spent in prison and conjugal visitation among incarcerated people?
- Is there a significant relationship between years Spent in prison and family bonding among incarcerated people?
- Is there a significant difference between male and female incarcerations with respect to conjugal visitation?
- Is there a significant difference among male and female incarcerations with respect to preserving family bonding as a result of conjugal visitation?

1.3. Objective of the study

General objective

The aim of this study was to show the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among prisoners.

Specific objectives

- To study the practice of conjugal visitation among incarcerated people.

- To study the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among couples who have child/children.
- To study the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among couples who have no child.
- To examine the relationship between years spent in prison and conjugal visitation among incarcerated people.
- To examine the relationship between years spent in prison and family bonding among incarcerated people.
- To examine if there a statistically significant difference among male and female incarcerations with respect conjugal visitation.
- To examine if there a statistically significant difference among male and female incarcerations with respect to preserving family bonding as a result of conjugal visitation.

1.4. Significance of the study

Some possible benefits of this study are:

- It will enrich the existing literature in the field of family counseling and criminal psychology.
- It helps counselors who work with prisoners to have information about the challenges family bonding.
- The result of the study is expected to give direction or to lend to a better understanding of the problems and prospects of prisoners.
- In addition the study may serve as a ground work for further researches on studies to be done in this area.

1.5. Limitations

Some of the challenges which the researcher faced are:

- Absence of previously undertaken research work at the local level.
- Uncomfortable and crowded environment to collect data.
- Unwillingness of incarcerated peoples to give appropriate information and lack of necessary support from officer's /prison/.

1.6. Delimitation of the study

There are a lot of psychological variables that need to be studied among incarcerations; but this study was delimited on the relationship of conjugal visitation and family bonding. The study is also delimited to Kality correctional center.

1.7. Operational definition of terms

Conjugal visitation: visitation of prisoners in the correction center by their wife/husband and their child/children.

Incarceration: prisoners who are sentenced for punishment and live in correction center.

Family bonding: the relationship of prisoners with their wife/husband and their child/children.

CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Family

The family is said to be universal because it is found in more societies than any other social institution, including the economy, the state, religious communities, and educational organizations. Yet this universal term conveys a variety of images. The word family may mean something quite different to an African-American, an American Indian, Southeast Asian refugee, a stepparent, a foster parent, a landlord, or a zoning board member. One's image of family may reflect one's position in the family life cycle ranging from a childless couple to the "sandwich generation" with both young and old dependents to the "empty nest" stage (T. Ooms & S. Preister, 1988).

According to Webster dictionary (2014), "a family is a group of people united by certain convictions or a common affiliation, a group of persons of common ancestry. There are also concepts of family that break with tradition within particular societies or those that are transplanted and form a society or a family unit. The word "family" is often used to simply classify groups. Today we have many types of families we have become familiar with such as the extended family, the adopted family, blended family and foster family".

Family is two or more people who are committed to each other and who share intimacy, resources, decision-making responsibilities, and values. Family plays a crucial role in the wellbeing of young people, having a significant influence on the development of their identity,

beliefs and values. Because of this, families can be both a major strength in a young person's life and also their greatest source of concern and distress.

2.2 Prisoners and their families

Families of prisoners have traditionally been seen as the 'forgotten victims' of the criminal justice system in England and Wales (R Matthews 1989). They can experience a range of problems due to the imprisonment of a relative, such as economic hardship, social stigmatization and emotional difficulties, yet no one statutory or voluntary body has had responsibility for assisting families with these issues. Furthermore, despite commentators such as Woolf (1991) and HM Chief Inspector of Prisons (HMCIP) (1999) recognizing family and community ties as important to the stability of prison regimes and the well-being of prisoners, families have often been ignored in debates surrounding the nature and purpose of imprisonment.

2.3. Prisoners - Family Communication

There are small and large families, and recently many families are separated by distances. Each year in Australia, around 11,000 young people experience family separation as a result of broken relationships (Child Support Agency, 2009). Research has shown strong positive relationships with parents and other family members help children to feel heard, understood, loved, important and valued. They also help foster a sense of belongingness, security and self-worth, and assist in developing high self-esteem, positive self-image, better concentration and a sense of optimism. In addition, strong family relationships assist the development of resilience and social and emotional competency, improving young people's ability to deal with adversity. In contrast,

family conflict has been found to be the greatest cause of unhappiness. Although conflict is recognized as a normal and healthy part of all family relationships, when not handled effectively it has significant and long lasting effects. Children and young people who have experienced more family transitions and conflicts are more likely to be troubled by a wide range of complex emotions including sadness, anger, fear, jealousy, isolation and insecurity. Moreover, the emotional stress young people can experience when they lack a nurturing family environment has been associated with higher levels of problem behaviors such as substance use, delinquency, poor school performance, unplanned teenage pregnancies, risk-taking behavior and suicide (Cavanagh & Huston,2008).

Communication between prisoners and their families provides the most concrete and visible strategy that families and prisoners use to manage separation and maintain connections. Families visit their imprisoned relatives at the institutions where they are held, talk with them by phone, and exchange cards and letters as a means of staying connected.

These contacts allow adults and parents and children to share family experiences and participate in family rituals, e.g., birthday celebrations, religious observances, etc. and help them to remain emotionally attached. They help assure incarcerated parents that their children have not forgotten them and children that their parents love and care about them. They allow prisoners to see themselves, and to function, in socially acceptable roles rather than as prison numbers and institutionalized dependents (C. Finney Hairston. 1991).

Departments of corrections permit different type of communications between prisoners and their kin and encourage the maintenance of family ties, in theory, as desirable correctional practices. In actual situation, the support for prisoners' families vary considerably from one jurisdiction to another and, within jurisdictions from one facility to another is different. As a rule, prisons allow families and children to visit though prisoners in administrative segregation or super maximum prisons may be restricted to televideo and other types of noncontact visits. For many families and friends of prisoners, the visit to a prison is a lesson in humility, intimidation and frustration and a highly charged and anxiety producing event (Fishman, 1990; Girshick, 1996. Cited by Creasie Finney Hairston 2001)..

2.4 Conjugal visitation

A conjugal visit is a private meeting between an inmate and his or her spouse or significant other, during which the couple is permitted to engage in whatever activity they desire. Conjugal visitation is most often a synonym for sex this is not altogether true. This is clearly states by Kevin Wright as follows:

“Married couples in society are understood to have rights inherent to marriage and these are called conjugal rights. Sex is but one component of these rights. Conjugal rights are those which enable married persons to enjoy associating with one another, sympathizing together, confiding together.....” /Kevin Wright, 1977/.

The origins of the conjugal visit had more to do with encouraging work than preserving marital relationships. The earliest program dates back to 1918 when James Parchmann, the warden at Mississippi state penitentiary, introduced conjugal visits as an incentive for inmates to work harder. Although conjugal programs are still used as an incentive for good behavior, they are no longer applied as a means to increase work productivity. Today, the conjugal visit program is designed primarily to preserve family bonds (Patrick Rodgers, 2008).

It is obvious that there is strong natural linkage between husband and wife. Both religious commandments and secular laws support the cohabitation and oneness of spouses. On the revised family code, spouses shall have with one another the sexual relations normal in marriage unless these relations involve a risk of seriously prejudicing their health /Article 53(2) of revised family code, proclamation of 2000/. More surprisingly, the law stipulates that any agreement to the contrary shall be of no effect / Ibid Article 53(3)/.

In other words, relations between married couples are not just a form of entertainment-but a duty. Hence, even the legislatures themselves do not include incarceration as an exception for this right. This is mainly because of the fact that the supreme law of the land considers the family as the natural and fundamental unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and state / Article 34(3) of the constitution of the federal democratic republic of Ethiopia/. This protection will be meaningless if conjugal visit is not allowed at the time when one of the spouses incarcerated. This type of visit promotes healthy relationship and preserve the family bond since it creates trust between themselves though one of them is behind bar. Magdalena S. et al on their

book of human rights reference handbook states that, 'marriage and family are ancient institutions, recognized for centuries as the foundation of society. The state has an obligation to establish marriage and family as institutions under law, but at the same time to respect a person's freedom to enter into marriage and the equal rights of both partners. Even prisoners cannot be prohibited to marry /Supra note 11 pp. 252, Cited by Girma H. 2013/.

In addition to maintain the family bond, conjugal visit has more to do with the concept of rehabilitation. One of the main aims of incarceration is to limit freedom with the aim of rehabilitation. Punishment is inflicted on an offender just to reform them or rehabilitate them so as to make their re-integration into society easier because of the fact that, prisoners are not permanently criminal and could contribute something for them as well as for the society after release from prison. But some may argue that isolation is a way of rehabilitation. But, some researchers believe that, there is nothing rehabilitative on restricting prisoners from having intimacy with their spouses. Because treating peoples like animal is not natural. Hence depriving prisoners' intimacy with their spouses will not meet the objective of incarceration /Girma H. 2013/.

Moreover, allowing conjugal visit for prisoners may decrease the tendency of prisoners to have relationship with similar sex i.e. homosexuality. Since homosexuality is forbidden by all religions as well as national laws, allowing conjugal visit could decrease homosexuality in prisons because prisoners still have intimacy with their spouses /Article 629 of the criminal code

of the federal democratic republic of Ethiopia, May 2005/. The reason for conjugal visit could also be extend to protecting the right of the spouses of prisoners.

Great distances typically separate children from their incarcerated parents. Women are housed in prisons and average of 160 miles from their children, while men are an average distance of 100 miles away. These distances serve as a barrier to prison visits by family members. More than half of incarcerated parents report never receiving a personal visit from their children. Contact in the form of phone calls and letters often proves problematic as well. The number of calls or letters per prisoner is typically limited by corrections policy which could disrupt familial relationships. Both children and parents might have to deal with issues of abandonment and loss, weakened attachment caused by separation, and the possibility of inadequate ongoing care resulting from changes in care giving arrangements (Hagan & Petty, 2002).

Most Prisons present opportunities to improve prisoners' abilities to serve as productive members of their families once they are released. For example, prison-based programs can enhance parenting skills, treat addictions, increase literacy, raise educational levels, and generally prepare inmates for life outside prison. Many of these programs have been shown to reduce recidivism rates and improve the chances of successful reintegration. Some research suggests that these programs also benefit a prisoner's family networks and community. However, for a variety of reasons, these programs are not widely available in all prisons. In fact, in recent years, the share of prisoners participating in these programs has declined. Reasons for reduced

availability include fiscal constraints as well as a shift in corrections departments' policies, with greater emphasis now on punishment rather than rehabilitation (Mumola, 2000).

2.5 Family Bonding

Family is a primary social group consisting of parents and their offspring, the principal function of which is a provision for its members (dictionary.reverso.net, 2014). Family bonding time is time that family Spent together meaningfully. This is a designated time your family plans to interact with each other over a group of activities or a major fun project (houston.cbslocal.com/2011).

Family relationships are an important part of the glue that holds society together and they have traditionally been regarded as one of the key determinants of social cohesion. But important social developments such as the increasingly 'fragile' nature of relationships, dwindling family size, social and spatial mobility, and individualization have had a major impact on the position of the family within society (P.A. Dykstra, 2006).

2.6 Impact of imprisonment on family bonding

When a parent is sent to prison, many dimensions of family functioning undergo significant changes. The family structure, financial relationships, income levels, emotional support systems, and living arrangements may be affected. Intimate relationships are substantially burdened by

incarceration. The forced separation of spouses and other intimate partners creates enormous strains on those relationships, frequently ending them. Few prisons allow conjugal visits or extended contact, which might ameliorate those strains. The artificial nature of same-sex institutions inhibits the cycles of dating, friendships, and courtship experienced in free society. The parent in prison is removed in a psychological sense, not just physically absent. Most aspects of family life are outside their sphere of influence and control the role of conjugal visit in preserving family bond while a spouse or partner is in prison; life for the loved one left behind also undergoes significant changes. With all this struggles strong families are deeply committed to the family unit and to promoting the happiness and welfare of each other (Clemson Extension, 1998. Cited by Begun, A. (2011)).

Imprisonment of a family member imposes significant burdens on families. There is considerable consistency between the few studies which have examined the social, financial, as well as personal (physical and psychological wellbeing) effects. These include financial burdens such as the loss of income and housing stress as well as costs of contact such as travel, telephone and childcare (Codd, 2004). There are also emotional and social impacts such as hostility, loneliness and social isolation (Braman, 2002).

The literature suggests that wives and girlfriends of inmates experience significant personal change, often gaining independence and self-sufficiency (Furstenberg, 1995). Such changes can alter the spouse's expectations of the familial role the prisoner will play upon his or her return. In addition, changes in family composition during an inmate's absence can preclude the prisoner

from resuming his or her role upon return. For example, the introduction of a new father figure in the lives of a prisoner's children may forever alter the father's relationship to his children. The social stigma of incarceration may prompt adult family members to avoid complicated or difficult discussions with children to explain the absence of an incarcerated family member. Being kept in the dark about a family member's incarceration can influence the child emotionally and psychologically, and this in turn impacts the restoration of parent-child relationships (Macdermont & King, 1992. Cited by Murray, J. 2005).

Incarceration can also damage the financial situations of the families left behind. Most parents (71%) in state prison were employed either full- or part-time in the month preceding their arrest. Among incarcerated fathers, 60 percent held a full-time job prior to imprisonment, compared with 39 percent of mothers. For fathers, these wages were the primary source of income for their families (68%). Other sources of income included public assistance (13%), family and friends (18%), and illegal sources (27%). More than half (53%) of fathers had a personal income below \$1,000 and another quarter (25%) had a personal income below \$2,000 in the month prior to their arrest. Mothers relied primarily on wages (44%) and public assistance (42%) as primary sources of income. They also relied on family and friends (26%) as well as illegal sources (28%) for income. Child support only accounted for about 6 percent of mothers' income. More than half (51%) of incarcerated mothers had a personal income below \$600 and another third (35%) had a personal income below \$2,000 in the month prior to their arrest. For incarcerated parents, these sources of income are terminated when they go to prison. Sharing income with one's family is all but eliminated as most prisoners, even those with prison jobs, earn as little as \$350 a

year. This financial loss disproportionately burdens families already living in poverty (Johnston & Carlin, 1996).

Social scientists and program providers define the significance of families and family ties to prisoners and to the achievement of social goals in numerous ways. The impact of incarceration on families has been conceptualized as a form of family crises (Fishman, 1990), loss and demoralization (Schneller, 1976) and victimization of children (Bloom and Steinhart, 1993). More recent work has focused on social capital and the impact of social disinvestment in prisoners' families and communities (Hagan and Coleman, 2001) and on the unintended and intended consequences of social policy (Hairston, 1998), Cited by Murray, J. (2005).

2.7 The Role of Conjugal Visitation in Preserving Family Bonding

Conjugal visit is a scheduled extended visit during which an inmate is permitted to Spent several hours or days in private, usually with legal spouse, and the parties are allowed to engage in sexual intercourse. The widest recognized basis for permitting such a visit in modern times is to preserve family bonds and increase the chances of success for a prisoner's eventual return to life outside prison. Additionally, the incentives of conjugal visits mean that inmates are strongly motivated to comply with the various day to day rules and regulations of the prison. Interestingly, the origins of the conjugal visit had more to do with encouraging work than preserving marital relationships. The earliest program dates back to 1918 when James Parchmann, the warden at Mississippi State Penitentiary, introduced conjugal visits as an

incentive for inmates to work harder. Sex was used as the proverbial dangling carrot for increasing inmate productivity (Patric, 2008).

It is important to support families with a member in prison to maintain contact and to re-establish family relationships upon release. Research shows as early as Hirschi (1969) that family attributes such as inadequate parental care, childhood experiences of criminal activity and dysfunctional family structures have an impact on criminal behavior, whereas positive family environments and attributes serve as protective factors against criminal behavior (Hirschi, 1969; Farrington 2000). Studies have shown that prisoners who have greater contact with family during their incarceration have consistently more positive post-release outcomes than those who have little or no contact. Over time, the system proved quite effective. So over the next 40 years, new prisons included special buildings specifically designed for Sunday "visits." Today, conjugal visitation programs, also known as the Extended Family Visit (Naser and Vigne, 2006. Cited by Urban institute justice policy center. January 2006).

Although conjugal programs are still used as an incentive for good behavior, they are no longer applied as a means to increase work productivity. Today, the conjugal visit program is designed primarily to preserve family bonds. The idea is that supporting these bonds will strengthen the inmate's chances for rehabilitation and lessen rates of recidivism. Thus, most Extended Family Visit programs are limited to inmates and spouses who were legally married prior to incarceration (Patric, 2008).

Typically, countries that offer extended family programs are extremely selective when it comes to choosing who can participate. Not every convict wearing a wedding ring is automatically eligible. Each state's Department of Corrections has its own highly specific set of eligibility rules and requirements. For example, inmates must be serving in a medium security prison or less. They cannot have any recent behavior or rule violations. And once they have jumped through all the necessary hoops, the prisoner must go through a mandatory health screening (Patric, 2008).

On the other side, those wishing to visit the prisoner must also qualify for eligibility. A spouse must (1.) be on the prisoner's approved visitor list (2.) provide proof of relation (3.) pass a background check (4.) submit to a search and (5.) dress appropriately. In North America, the list of banned clothing is extensive but common sense. Transparent clothing, bare midriffs, strapless attire, and anything with obscene or offensive language or drawings won't make it past security /
Supra note 29. Cited by Girma H. 2013/.

As the name implies, Extended Family Visits are not limited simply to spouses. In most states, up to three family members can be present at a visit. The time in the apartment allows the family unit to act as a whole. Internationally, the conjugal visit is seen as an important part of the prisoner's interaction with the outside world - a vivid reminder of life on the other side of the prison walls. In Russia, visitors can bring food and civilian clothing for the prisoner. In Canada, the apartments are designed to look like homes. Some even have gardens and barbecues. In the US, extended family visit programs are justified by 5 of the 6 participating states on the grounds that it helps preserve the family. The hope is that maintaining familial relationships during

incarceration will motivate prisoners to improve their behavior both behind bars and upon release (Patric, 2008).

2.8 Gender differences in Conjugal visit and preserving family bonding

Among prisoners who were allowed to have visits, most did not see their families and friends on a regular basis. A study by Creasie, James & Han-jin Jo, reported that men fared worse than women and whites were better off than other racial groups. When asked how many visits other than with attorneys they had in the past month, about two-thirds indicated that no one had visited them. Sixty-five percent of males and 62% of females did not have a visit in the past month. The study further show that, more than half of parents with minor children (54%) had never seen any of their children since they had been incarcerated. Females reported slightly higher contact with their minor children via visits than males. Fifty-five percent of females, compared with 58% of males, indicated they had not seen their children since admission to prison. In contrast with no visits, 25% of females and 22% of males had visits at least monthly.

One of the most fundamental and noticeable differences between incarcerated mothers and fathers appears to be their level of contact with their children prior to parental incarceration. Arditti, Smock and Parkman (2005) conducted an extensive qualitative study which examined how incarceration affected inmates' roles as fathers. Many of the inmates stated the importance of maintaining a relationship with the mother of their children in order to maintain contact with their child during incarceration. One of the most significant findings from this study was that

fathers cited tension with their child's mothers as being one of the greatest obstacles they faced while parenting from behind bars.

Both incarcerated mothers and fathers are significantly impacted by their inability to have continued contact with their children, particularly if they served as the primary caretaker prior to incarceration. It is important to note that 90% of incarcerated fathers have children who remain in the mother's care during the father's prison term. In contrast, only 28% percent of incarcerated mothers have children who are cared for by the father. (Turek & Loper, 2006).

As mandatory sentencing lengthens, fathers are on average incarcerated for 80 months in state prison and serve just over 100 months in federal prisons. Mothers are incarcerated for shorter sentences, averaging nearly 50 months in state prisons and 66 months in federal institutions (Kennedy, 2012. Cited by Braga, Anthony A., and David L. Weisburg. (2012). Some estimates suggest that 75% of children who have an incarcerated mother also have a father who is criminally involved, has been or is currently incarcerated (Cecil et al., 2008. Cited by Braga, Anthony A., and David L. Weisburg. (2012).

Men are more likely to be repeat offenders, serve longer sentences than women and see their children less often prior to incarceration, thus, it may be more challenging for the children of incarcerated fathers to maintain strong bonds with them. Children are also more likely to live with their mothers during the incarceration of their fathers. "This fundamental difference may explain why the role of the child's mother appears to be more crucial in facilitating and maintaining a relationship between children and their incarcerated fathers" (Berg, 2011. Cited by

Evans, P., Turner, S. and Trotter, C. 2012). Shanhe and Winfree (2005) conducted research that focused on the similarities and difference between male and female prisoners in correctional facilities in Ohio and New Mexico. “Among the many ways women in prison differ from their male counterparts, the most significant may be the most overlooked. When a mother enters prison she is seen as a convict. In her own mind she shares the dual status of inmate and mother, two obviously incompatible roles that she struggles to reconcile” (Cunningham & Baker, pg. 3, 2005). Interestingly, incarcerated mothers ask for family therapy, support groups and post visit counseling at a higher rate than incarcerated fathers (Turek & Loper, 2006). Notably, incarcerated mothers do not reflect the “normal” concept of the American mother, thought to be middle class, married, educated and in possession of financial resources.

2.9. Conjugal visitation in Ethiopia

Both the FDRE constitution and federal prisoners commission establishment proclamation clearly states that prisoners shall have the right to communicate with their spouses, close relatives, friends, medical doctors, legal counselors and religious leaders /Article 21(2) of federal democratic republic of Ethiopia constitution and Article 29 of federal prisons commission establishment proclamation/. Article 13 of regulation 138/2007 /Treatment of Federal prisons council of Ministers Regulations No. 138/2007/ (here in after called the regulation) states the right of prisoners to communicate with visitors in the same manner with the constitution and the proclamation by giving an indication that details shall be determined by a directive to be issued by the administration. However, the federal prison administration commission directive No. 1/2004 (here in after called the directive) is issued 3 years before the enactment of the regulation

and not yet repealed /Federal prisons administration directive on treatment of prisoners No. 01/2004/.

The directive states that, prisoners have the right to be visited by their spouses, close relatives, friends and others only on Saturday and Sunday from 9:00 AM-12:30 AM in the morning and from 1:30 PM-4 PM in the afternoon. At the same time, for religious and national holidays, prisoners could be visited by their visitors from 9:00 AM-12:00 AM in the morning. Further, the directive states that, visitors, who come from place other than the country in which the prison is located, could visit prisoners at any time of the week. The same is true for Ambassadors and representative of consuls when their citizen is in the prison /From prison brochure: 2010/.

Furthermore, prisoners can go out from prisons when their spouse, daughter or son, mother or father, or one of their family members become seriously ill and when one of those mentioned persons are died. But medical report or Kebele certificate that state about the illness or death of the specified person should be submitted for the prison. The regulation on treatment of prisoners sets the minimum age to visit prisoners in which it states that a child below the age of 9 may not be allowed to visit prisoners unless he is accompanied by an adult (Article 16).

Is conjugal visitation a right or privilege?

Typically, the states that allows conjugal visit are extremely selective when it comes to choosing who can participate. Not every convict wearing a wedding ring is automatically eligible. Each state's department of correction has its own highly specific set of eligibility rules and

requirements. For example, inmates must be serving in a medium security prison or less. They cannot have any recent behavior or rule violations. And once they have jumped through all the necessary hoops, the prisoner must go through a mandatory health screening.

That having eligibility criteria for the visit by itself does not make the right a privilege. It is simply a legally prescribed restriction for the exercise of such right. However, having eligibility criteria which have no connection with protecting the right of others or the peace of the prison administration make the right a privilege given to specific persons. But it does not hold water for the researcher. Conjugal visit is a right not a privilege. Article 2(2) of FDRE criminal code; state the principle of legality in a very clear manner /Supra note 23, Cited by Girma H. 2013/.

Though the law does not explicitly state the meaning and extent of the visit, we could understand the intention of the legislatures by analyzing the relation that exists between the prisoner and those people who are listed above just before and after prison. For instance, before prison, the prisoner may have fun with his friends and share both joy and sorrow. This right also continues though he/she is behind bars. On the same fashion, the prisoner relation with his religious councilors continue after prison that is mainly focus on rehabilitating spiritual makeup of the prisoner. But when we see the prior relation of the prisoner and his/her spouse, it is far from having fun and sharing ideas. There is physical oneness between them. That relation should also continue though one of them is behind bars as the other person's relation with who are close to the prisoner continues just like what happens before prison /Girma H, 2013/.

For what type of relationship should conjugal visit be allowed?

Article 21(2) of FDRE constitution simply use the term ‘spouses’ which refers to people who become husband and wife by lawful marriage. According to the revised family code /Article 1 of revised family code/, marriage may be concluded in there ways i.e. before an officer of civil status, in accordance with the religion or custom of the future spouses. So couples who become husband and wife in one of the above mentioned ways could automatically be beneficiary of conjugal visit. However, an argument may be raised on the applicability of such kind of visit for persons who are in irregular union and just boyfriend and girlfriend relationship /Girma H, 2013/.

The revised family code /Article 98-107 of the revised family code/ gives protection for couples who are in irregular union by considering the reality. According to Article 98 of the family, an irregular union is the state of fact which is created when a man and woman live together as husband and wife without having concluded a valid marriage. In this scenario, the law gives protection for such kind of couples because of the fact that, in practice, most people live together as husband and wife, and even the society consider them as husband and wife without concluding lawful marriage in one of the above mentioned ways. The researcher believes that, it would be logical to include prisoners who are in irregular union under the ambit of conjugal visit program by considering the practice in which most couples tends to live together as husband and wife without observing forms of marriage prescribed by law.

On the other hand, the prisoner may be someone who is not in valid marriage or irregular union but just in boyfriend and girlfriend relationship. Allowing conjugal visit, for such kind of couples is out of the intention of the legislatures who wants to include only 'spouses' under the program. Besides that, in every religion having sex before marriage is not allowed and mostly this is not traditionally supported in Ethiopia (Article 629 of the criminal code of the FDRE, May 2005).

For what kind of prisoners should conjugal visit be allowed?

There may be an argument that, conjugal visit should not allow for specific prisoners, for instance, who are convicted on rape and other forms of sexual abuse. But the researcher believes that, conjugal visit should be allowed allow for all prisoners irrespective of the crime they commit since it is a right given to all naturally. Even prisoners who are convicted on rape and murder should have an access to such visit. Firstly, this is a right given to all people irrespective of his/her status. Secondly, there is no rehabilitation that could be achieved by precluding him /her from having intimacy with his/her spouse. Rehabilitation could be achieved only by treating people like people. /Girma H, 2013/.

What are the eligibility criteria for conjugal visit?

Since conjugal visit in Ethiopia does not extend to building separate room for couples and leaving them to have time together, it would be wise to refer the eligibility criteria from other states which allowed conjugal visitation. In Connecticut those who wish to visit the prisoner must: be on the prisoner's approved visitor list, provide proof of relation, pass a background

check, and submit to a search address appropriately (visitors are not allowed to wear revealing, seductive, or offensive clothing or attire that draws undue attention), there is a prohibition on weapons, escape, alcohol and drugs. There are strict bans on giving or receiving written documents and ex-felons.

A problem which must now be dealt with in the conjugal visitation program is the spread of HIV. Kevin Wright (1977) states the practice of Mississippi Department of Corrections as follows:-

“In mates who are known to have the virus are denied the conjugal privilege if their partner is not infected. If both the inmate and the spouse are HIV positive, they may continue the visits if the commissioner of corrections grants a written petition. If spouse of an inmate is a non-infected person but still desires to participate in the program, then upon petitioning the commissioner, may state in writing that the couple will practice safe sex. This type of visit will be at the discretion of the commissioner or his authorized staff.”

2.10. Long term prison, conjugal visit and family bonding

According to Drenkhahn (2011) long-term imprisonment is a sort of withdrawal from freedom and from complicated free society. This withdrawal makes it hard to keep in contact with family and friends outside and to keep track of how life outside works. Friends and family are thus crucial during the execution of the sentence for not getting lost in prison life and for support after release. Therefore, developing contact with the outside world are important element of a strategy to counteract the damaging effects of long term imprisonment. As stated on European

prison rule (2006), in order to maintain and develop family relationship arrangement for visits with family shall allow for contacts in a manner as normal as possible.

European prison rule (2006) also stated that prisoners should be granted prison leave to visit a sick relative, attend a funeral or for other humanitarian reasons such as the birth of a child. Prisoners shall also be allowed to inform the families immediately about their imprisonment or transfer to another institution in order to keep and maintain the family relationship. EPR also states that long-term prisoners shall contact with their families to prevent or counteract the damaging effects of long term detention. The recommendation puts special emphasis on the prevention of the breakdown of family ties. Therefore, prisoners should be allocated as closely as possible to their families or close relatives and letters, telephone calls and visit should be allowed with the maximum possible frequency and privacy.

In a study of long term inmates in Missouri, Sabbath and Cowles (1992) found that the most serious problems for long term prisoners included lack of adequate visitation due to travel distance for loved ones, privacy during visitation, privacy in cells and crowding. These problems are indicative of inadequate visitation of long-term prisoners. An earlier study, carried out by Flanagan (1980) to examine the attitudes and perspectives of long term inmates, asked inmates serving sentences of 10 years or more to prioritize what they saw as the most serious deprivations of imprisonment. The 5 problems they listed, from most to least serious, were missing somebody, missing social life, worrying about how they will cope when released, feeling that their lives are being wasted and feeling sexually frustrated.

When asked to describe the single most important or serious problem that they had encountered since being incarcerated, loss of relationships with family and friends outside the prison was consistently mentioned as the most serious deprivation. Some long term inmates cut themselves off from these relationships as a means of avoiding the anxiety and despair that accompany separation. However, for the majority of inmates who do not use this strategy, family ties become a two-edged sword over the years, providing encouragement and support and at the same time, making it more difficult to serve time (Flanagan, 1980).

Another research by Begun (2011) which was designed to see how inmate visitation patterns, relate to phases of the incarceration period (i.e., the beginning, middle, and pre-release) and the variable of time demonstrated that there is negative relationship between phase of incarceration period and inmate visitation.

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODS OF THE STUDY

3.1. Area of the study

The area of this study was Kality correction center. It is located in Akiki-Kality sub-city, Woreda 07, Kebele 10/11. This prison administration is the largest correction center in Ethiopia which was established in 1991 G.C. In this correction center there are approximately three thousand five hundred males and, six hundred and fifty females for correction. There are also more than five hundred military and civil workers.

3.2. Participants of the Study

The participants of this study were incarcerations in Kality correctional center. These participants were prisoners who Spent a year and more in the correction center, who are married and have children or have no children.

Table 1: Study population

Sex of respondents	Incarcerations; Numbers (%)
Female	38(27.94)
Male	98(72.05)
Total	136(100)

3.3. Sampling procedure

The area for this investigation was selected purposefully because; it is the most suitable site for this study. Using criterion sampling technique, one hundred and thirty six (136) participants of this study were selected from two groups. Ninety eight (98) were males and thirty eight (38) females. The criteria to select these participants were their marital status and years they spent in prison. Incarcerated people who got married (with or without children), and spent one year and above in prison are the only participants of this research. The rationale for selecting participants who spent more than a year in prison is, prisoners who spent less than a year have a greater possibility of visitation and get attention from their relatives and spouses since they are new for the prison environment. Because of frequently fluctuating number of incarcerated population, and uncertain information about the exact number of who spent a year and above, made it mandatory to use non-probability sampling technique which is criterion/ purposive sampling.

3.4. Data Collecting Instruments

The tool used to collect data from study participants was questionnaire. The questionnaire had three sections. The first is introductory section that contains questions to collect background information or demographic data about the subjects, the second section contained questions to assess practice of conjugal visitation and the third contains family bonding questions which is divided in two parts, for those who have children and don't have children.

The questionnaire was first prepared in English and then translated to Amharic and back to English. Translation was done by language experts. Before embarkation on correction of data for

the final study, the instrument was tried out on 40 incarcerations (20each) from two groups (female and male). After piloting, the instrument was refined and the necessary adjustments were made.

To measure the extent of family bonding among incarcerations and their families, family bonding scale called Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES III), developed by David H. Olson, Joyce Portner, and Yoavn Laveein in 1986 was used. This scale has 40 questions and it seemed to measure the extent of family bonding among a study population in its face value.

The scale needed modification and adaptation to fit the purpose of the present study. Statements have been substituted, reconstructed, modified, simplified and items which were insignificant for the area of the study eliminated to facilitate their comprehensibility for the study population. The scale for this study has twenty questions and yields a total possible score ranging from 20 to 45, with higher scores representing strong family bonding and lower scores representing the opposite.

The questions on conjugal visitation were prepared by the researcher referring different books like H.Olson and Defrain (2010). After the preparation of these questions proper content validation were done by subject advisor and reliability check were done. The questions regarding

conjugal visitation are five with possible total score ranging from 5 to 17. Higher scores represent frequent conjugal visitation and lower scores represent rare frequency.

3.5. Pilot study

The pilot study was conducted on 40 selected incarcerated participants using criterion sampling technique. The criteria to select these participants were their marital status (incarcerated people who got married (with or without children)) and years they Spent (a year and above) in prison. From these participants half of them (20) were males and half of them (20) were females. Data were collected using questionnaire and analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlation-Coefficient and independent sample t-test. All data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20.

By analyzing collected data, efforts were done to make sure if the instrument or the scale is reliable enough to measure conjugal visitation and family bonding in the study population. Then reliability index of Cronbach alpha 0.78 was obtained for the family bonding scale and reliability index of Cronbach alpha 0.71 was obtained for conjugal visitation questions.

3.6. Methods of data analysis

Different statistical techniques were employed to analyze the data that was obtained from participants. These were included descriptive statistical values such as mean, median and

standard deviations. The data collected about the practice of conjugal visitation was analyzed using frequency and percentage.

The main statistical analysis was done by using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient to see whether there is a statistically significant relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among couples who have child and who have no child, between years Spent in prison and family bonding and, between years Spent in prison and conjugal visitation.

Independent sample t-test was also used to see if there is statistically significant difference among male and female incarcerations with respect to conjugal visitation and preserving family bonding. All analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Science software (SPSS) version 20 and test of significance were performed using $\alpha = 5\%$ level of significance.

3.7. Ethical considerations

This research focused on the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among incarcerations and it involved sensitive and personal information. For this purpose the researcher obtained the formal written permission from the Federal Prison Administration to conduct the research. Another way of addressing ethical issues was by obtaining written informed consent from participants. Explanations were given for all participants that they have the right to agree or disagree to participate in the study, and they were informed in detail about the purpose of the study before signing the consent forms attached with the questionnaire.

The researcher has taken utmost care to insure privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of participants. They were warned not to write their names on any part of the questionnaire. The information gained from participants was kept confidential. Hence, anonymity was guaranteed by not using any information that might identify participants and expose their information to a third party, especially for prison administration staffs and the family members of participants without their permission. The data encoded in the computer was also protected using passwords.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESULTS

This chapter presents the main findings of the investigation under four sections. In the first section the background characteristics of the study participants have been summarized using descriptive statistics (mean, median, standard deviation, frequencies and percentages). In section two, the practice of conjugal visitation among incarcerations has been summarized. The third section deals with correlation between conjugal visitation and family bonding. In section four, the difference between male and female incarcerations with respect to conjugal visitation and family bonding has been examined using independent sample t-test.

4.1 Background Characteristics of the Study Population

The background characteristics of the study participants which is obtained from the instrument used to assess conjugal visitation are summarized in Table 2 as follows:

Table 2: Demographic data of the study population

Characteristics	Number	%
1. Sex:		
Male	98	72.10
Female	38	27.90
Total	136	100.0
2. Age		
Mean	38.00	-
Median	35.00	-
Standard deviation	13.586	-
3. Marital Status		
Married and have children		
Married and no children	114	83.80
Divorced after conviction	12	8.80
Total	10	7.40
	136	100
4. Educational Status		
Illiterate	10	7.4
Elementary	51	37.5
High school	38	27.94
College	37	27.20
Total	136	100

Table 2 shows the demographic characteristics or social backgrounds of the study participants. The mean age of participants is 38.00 years, standard deviation of 13.58, and the median being 35.0. The sex composition reads 98 (72.1%) and 38 (29.9%) for male and female respectively. According to the data, 92 (67.6%) of respondents are Orthodox Christians, 22 (16.2%) Muslims, 19 (14.0%) Protestants, 1 (0.7%) Catholics and the rest 2 (1.5%) are followers of other religions.

Regarding marital status, majority of the respondents 114 (83.8%) reported that they are married and have children, only 10 (7.4%) respondents of the total population reported that they are divorced with their spouses after conviction. The respondents are also requested to point out their educational status. Accordingly, 10 (7.4%) of the respondents reported that they are illiterates. 51 (37.5%) attended elementary school and 38 (27.94%) attended high school. Only 37 (27.2%) of the respondents attended college.

Table 3: Imprisonment status of the study population

Characteristics	Number	%
1. Sentence of prisoners		
2-5	56	41.20
6-10	35	25.70
11-15	13	9.60
16-20	32	23.50
Total	136	100
2. Years spent in prison		
1-2	68	50.0
2-5	46	33.80
6-10	18	13.20
>10	4	2.90
Total	136	100

Table 3 depicts the conviction of the prisoners and the years they spent in the prison. Accordingly, almost half of the prisoners (41.20%) sentenced from 2-5 years, 35 (25.70%) sentenced from 6 to 10, and 13 (9.60%) of the prisoners sentenced from 11-16 years and the rest 32 (23.50%) of the prisoners sentenced from 16-20 years.

Regarding the years the incarcerations Spent in the prison, 68 (50.0%) of the prisoners Spent from one to two years in the prison, 46 (33.80%) of the prisoners Spent 2-5 years in the prison, 18 (13.20%) of the prisoners Spent 6-10 years in prison. The rest (4) 2.90% Spent more than 10 years in the prison.

4.2. The practice of conjugal visitation among incarcerated people

According to the data that collected from 138 participants (38 females and 98 males) regarding the practice of conjugal visitation among incarcerated people 35 (92.1%) females and 96 (97.95%) males reported that, the practice of conjugal visitation in the correction center they had been rehabilitating is not good enough or helpful to preserve their family ties (relation) and interaction.

As participants explained, the practice was held with limited privacy, with no separate visiting spots that guards were in control of the environment and sometimes they interfere with their conversation. Because of the wire fences that prisoners and visitors are separated, sharing private conversation was very difficult. Since the number of visitors allowed at a time is very high, their nearness to one another and the shortness of the time they stayed together made it very difficult for a prisoner and his visitor (family) to hear each other and mostly they should go back without saying what they wanted to say.

As 114 (83.8%) of participants reported, losing intimate contact with their children and romantic and sexual relationship with their spouse made very significant psychological influence on them such as, fear that their children will loss sense on their parenthood and their spouses may cheat

on them to satisfy their sexual need or to get more children. The rest 12 (8.8%) participants who were married and bear no child reported that they felt very uncomfortable that their spouses lost their right to be fathers or mothers. They also scared that their spouses get frustrated and engaged in another affair.

All 138 (100%) of participants agreed that the practice of conjugal visitation in their correctional center need to get serious attention from government and social workers to rehabilitate incarcerated people, to made them productive citizens in the prison center and after they get released and especially, to save their marital and familial relationships from break down.

4.3. Correlations between conjugal visitation and family

The relationship between the predictor and criterion variables was examined using Pearson product-moment correlation analysis and presented in this section. Computing correlation between dependent and independent variables facilitate a way to see the magnitude, significance and direction of the relationship between the variables.

According to Ratner (2014), correlation Values between 0 and 0.3 (0 and -0.3) indicate a weak positive (negative) linear relationship via a shaky linear rule, values between 0.3 and 0.7 (-0.3 and -0.7) indicate a moderate positive (negative) linear relationship and values between 0.7 and 1.0 (-0.7 and -1.0) indicates a strong positive (negative) linear relationship via a firm linear rule. Therefore, in this study all correlation results are interpreted in light of this rule.

Table: 4 Correlations between conjugal visitation and family bonding in families who have no child.

		Conjugal visit	Family bonding
Conjugal visit	Pearson Correlation	1	.275
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.241
	N	20	20

*P < 0.05

**P < 0.01

As mentioned in chapter one, examining the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among families who have no child was one of the objectives of this study. Accordingly the following result is found regarding the relationship of these two variables. The correlation matrix displayed in table 3 shows correlation coefficient $r = .275$ ($p < .05$, $N = 20$) which implies weak and positive relationship between family bonding and conjugal visitation for those who have no child. The relationship of these two variables was not found to be statistically significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table: 5 Correlation between conjugal visitation and family bonding in families who have a child or children

		Conjugal visit	Family bonding
Conjugal visit	Pearson	1	.532**
	Correlation		
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	116	116

*P < 0.05 **P < 0.01

As can be seen in the above table correlation-coefficient calculated for conjugal visitation and family bonding among families who have one child or more than one child using Pearson product-moment correlation is $r = .53$ ($p < .05$, $N = 116$). This result implies that there is statistically significant positive and moderate relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding. This indicates that whenever prisoners who have a child get conjugal visitation their family bonding will increase and vice versa.

Table 6: Correlation between years Spent in prison and conjugal visitation

		Years Spent in prison	Conjugal visit
Years Spent in prison			
	Pearson correlation	1	-.240**
	Sig (2-tailed)		
	N	136	.005

*P < 0.05 **P < 0.01

One of the basic objectives of the study was to check whether there exist relationship between years Spent in prison and conjugal visit. For that reason, this section deals with the association between conjugal visit and years Spent in prison. As can be seen in the above table, correlation-coefficient calculated for years Spent in prison and conjugal visit using Pearson product-moment correlation is $r = -.240$ ($p < .01$, $N = 136$).

This result implies that there is statistically significant negative (opposite) and weak relationship between prisoner's stay in prison and visitations they receive from their spouses and children. Even if the relationship appears to be very weak, there is statistically significant relationship at the 0.01 level of significance. This indicates that when the prisoners Spent more time in prison the conjugal visitation they receive from their spouses will be decreased and vice versa.

Table 7: Correlation between years spent in prison and family bonding

	Years Spent in prison	Family bonding
Years Spent in prison		
Pearson correlation	1	-.217*
Sig (2-tailed)		

N	136	.011
		136

*P< 0.05

**P< 0.01

As mentioned in chapter one, examining the relationship between years Spent in prison and family bonding as a result of conjugal visit was another objectives of this study. Accordingly the following result is found regarding the relationship of these two variables. The inter-correlation matrix displayed in table 7 shows a significant association ($P<0.05$) among the predictor and outcome variables. In brief, the two variables have weak, negative and significant relationship. This implies that when prisoners Spent more time in prison their family bonding will decreases. This could be associated with the decrease in conjugal visit they receive from their spouses.

4.4 Results of mean difference tests (t-tests)

Investigating gender differences in conjugal visitation and family bonding were one of the objectives of this study. The obtained result is presented as follows:

4.4.1. Gender difference in conjugal visit

Table 8: Gender difference in conjugal visitation

Sex	N	Mean	Standard	t	df	Sig (2 tailed)
-----	---	------	----------	---	----	----------------

		deviation				
Female	37	7.8108	3.65025			
				-.695	134	.488
Male	99	8.2525	3.15693			

Mean difference tests (t-tests) were carried out to find out whether there were significant differences in conjugal visit between male and female incarcerations. The observed t-value for female and male incarcerations regarding conjugal visitation was found to be $-.695$ ($df = 134$). Thus the t-test revealed that there is gender difference regarding conjugal visit among male and female incarcerations; indicating that male incarcerations receive more conjugal visit from their female spouses than female incarcerations. The mean scores for female and male incarcerations in conjugal visit were, 7.81 with standard deviation of 3.65 and 8.15 with standard deviation of 3.15 respectively.

4.4.2. Gender differences in family bonding

Mean difference tests (t-tests) were carried out to find out whether there were significant differences in family bonding between male and female incarcerations.

Table 9: Gender differences in family bonding

Sex	N	Mean	Standard deviation	t	df	Sig (2 tailed)
Female	37	24.4595	5.76674			
				-2.909	134	.004*
Male	99	27.3838	4.99940			

* t- Value is significant at the 0.05 level

The observed t-value for female and male incarcerations regarding family bonding was found to be -2.90 (df = 134, $p < .05$). Thus the t-test revealed that there is statistically significant gender difference in preserving family bonding among female and male incarcerations. As the result shows, male incarcerations have strong family bond and attachment with their families than female incarcerations. The mean score for male and female incarcerations in preserving family bonding was 27.38 with standard deviation of 4.99 and 24.45 with standard deviation of 5.76 respectively.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results of the present study are discussed in line with the basic questions raised in chapter one. The theme of the research questions centered around the practice of

conjugal visitation in Kality correctional center and the importance of conjugal visitation in preserving family bonding among incarcerated people and their families. In addition to this, difference between female and male incarcerated people in preserving family bonding is discussed in this section. It also provides possible explanations for the results presented in chapter four.

5.1. The practice of conjugal visitation among incarcerated people

As it is explained in chapter four of this study, regarding the practice of conjugal visitation among incarcerated people, 35 (92.1%) females and 96 (97.95%) males reported that, the practice of conjugal visitation in the correction center they were rehabilitating is not good enough or helpful to preserve their family communication and interaction. As they explained, the practice was held with limited privacy, no separate visiting spots, interference of guards, with in short time and totally very uncomfortable and non-private environment.

As 114 (83.8%) of participants reported, losing intimate contact with their children and romantic and sexual relationship with their spouse made very significant psychological influence on them such as, fear that their children will loss sense on their parenthood and their spouses may cheat on them to satisfy their sexual need or to get more children. The rest 12 (8.8%) participants who were married and bear no child reported that they felt very uncomfortable that their spouses lost their right to be fathers or mothers. They also scared that their spouses get frustrated and engaged in another affair.

All 138 (100%) of participants agreed that the practice of conjugal visitation in their correctional center need to get serious attention from government and social workers to rehabilitate incarcerated people, to made them productive citizens in the prison center and after they get released and especially, to save their marital and familial relationships from break down.

According to the FDRE constitution and federal prisoners commission establishment every prisoner has the right to communicate with their close relatives, friends, medical doctors, legal counselors, religious leaders and especially with their spouses. However, as the researcher of this study recognized from collected data and observation at the time of data collecting process, the government and the society leave aside the need of adequate conjugal visitation towards incarcerated people. As a researcher R. Jeffery (1971) said a prison without sufficient conjugal visit will be school of crime. This is because it will be foolishness to think that criminals in the prison will not talk the crimes they committed, their failure in their motive of commission and generally their criminal experience. It was due to this reason that 95 % of those sent to prison are eventually returned to a life of crime unless they have been rehabilitated while in prison. In addition, it will not be difficult to imagine the prisoner who had antisocial attitude and who was living for long period of time with those criminals who have anti-social attitude in the prison will be a great threat for the social harmony when he/ she comes out of prison unless he / she is rehabilitated while in prison.

5.2. The Relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among incarcerated people who have no child

Investigating the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among incarcerated people that have no child was one of the objectives of this study. As mentioned earlier (in chapter four), no significant relationship ($r = .275$, $p < .05$, $N = 20$) between conjugal visitation and family bonding among families who have no child.

According to Miranda, 2011. (Cited by Begun 2011) Children improve relationships and bond to their family members. Making a habit of displaying interest in the wellbeing of your spouse and children will make them more likely to consult family members when there are personal problems occurring. In effect, the opportunity of getting consult from family members increases their trust and family bonding between them.

In line with this finding, Larson (2011. Cited by Drenkhahn. K, Dudeck.M, Dünkel .F. 2011) reported that children are the glue that holds a marriage together. Childfree couples have less emotional attachment and get divorced more often than couples who have at least one child. According to Jacobson's finding (as cited on Larson, 2011) the divorce rate in 1948 for couples without children, was 15.3 per 1,000. Where one child was present, the estimate rate was 11.6 per 1,000. The figure thus continues to decrease, and in families with four or more children, it was 4.6. Altogether, the rate for couples with children was 8.8 per 1,000. In other words, the rate for childless couples was almost double the rate for families with children. This clearly shows that families without a child are more vulnerable to face attachment problem with their spouses since children are major sources of love and happiness between married couples.

Another study by Rufus (as cited on Larson, 2011) discovered that divorced couples in the United States, 66 percent are childless compared with 40 percent who have kids. This is because absence of children in marriage weakens emotional ties between married couples and leads to loneliness and divorce.

5.3. The relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among families who have child/children

One of the basic questions raised in this study was the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among families who have one child or more than one child. Therefore, the present study indicated a statistically significant, positive and moderate relationship ($r = 0.53$, $p < .05$, $N = 116$) between conjugal visitation and family bonding among incarcerated people who have one or more than one child.

As the result shows that incarcerated people with child/children have better family bonding than those who have no child. The present findings with respect to incarcerated people that have one or more than one child are in agreement with previous research outcomes.

As both the above and this result demonstrated that, conjugal visitation plays an important role in preserving incarcerated people's family bonding and serve as rehabilitation strategies for the

incarcerations. In relation to this, Patric (2008) reported that conjugal visit is important in preserving family bonds and increase the chances of success for a prisoner's eventual return to life outside prison, Further, underscoring the importance of positive family environments in serving as protective factor against criminal behaviour and divorce.

Similarly, a study by Holt and Miller (1972) on incarcerated people reported that, prisoners who have greater contact with family during their incarceration, have consistently, more positive family relation and post-release outcomes than those who have little or no contact. In agreement with this study, a study by Robinson et al., (2010) showed that conjugal visits assist with the preservation of family bonds and increase the chances of success for a prisoner's reintegration into their families after release.

Among the possible explanations that can be given to the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding, communication barrier may be one possible factor. Communication between prisoners and their families provides the most concrete and visible strategy that families and prisoners use to manage separation and maintain connections. When family members are sent to prison they failed to communicate with other family members frequently due to different reasons. As a result, their family bond undergoes significant change and become weak and inconsistent. According to Mumola (2000), great distance typically separates children from their incarcerated parents. These distances serve as barriers to prison visits by family members and disrupt familial relationships.

5.4. Correlation between years Spent in prison and conjugal visitation

One of the basic objectives of the study was to check whether there exist relationship between years Spent in prison and conjugal visit. As stated in the previous chapter, correlation-coefficient calculated for years Spent in prison and conjugal visit using Pearson product-moment correlation is $r = -.240$ ($p < .01$, $N = 136$). This result implies that there is statistically significant negative (opposite) and weak relationship between prisoner's stay in prison and visitations they receive from their spouses and children. Even if the relationship appears to be very weak, there is statistically significant relationship at the 0.01 level of significance. This indicates that when the prisoners Spent more time in prison the conjugal visitation they receive from their spouses will be decreased and vice versa.

In line with this finding Begun (2011) reported that, there is negative relationship between inmate visitation and phase of incarceration period further indicating that inmate visitation is greater during early incarceration and immediately prior to release. In addition, Sabbath and Cowles (1992) indicated that lack of adequate visitation was the most serious problem of long term prisoners. This is due to travel distance for loved ones, privacy during visitation, privacy in cells and crowding. These problems are indicative of inadequate visitation of long-term prisoners.

5.5. Correlation between years Spent in prison and family bonding

The following result is found regarding the relationship between years Spent in prison and family bonding variables. As the result shows, there is a significant association ($P < 0.05$) among the predictor and outcome variables. In brief, the two variables have weak, negative and significant relationship. This implies that when prisoners Spent more time in prison their family bonding will decrease. This may be associated with the decrease in conjugal visitation they receive from their spouses.

In agreement with the above finding, EPR manual suggested that arrangement for visits with family shall allow for contacts in a manner as normal as possible in order to maintain and develop family relationship further, underscoring the absence of good family bonding among long term prisoners. Most of the time long term prisoners lost their family contact and visitation than short term prisoners. This could be because of the decrease in conjugal visit. As time passes spouses fail to pay attention for their incarcerated inmates and fade up with them and this will create a big gap and distance between the incarcerated inmates and their families outside the prison. When the gap between the incarcerated inmates and their families become extensive their family bonding becomes weak.

Another study by Flanagan (1980) which is conducted to examine the attitudes and perspectives of long term inmates demonstrated that loss of relationships with family and friends outside the prison was the single most important or serious problem that prisoners had encountered since being incarcerated. That is why the EPR manual suggests that long term prisoners shall contact with their families to prevent the breakdown of family ties.

5.6. Gender difference in conjugal visitation

The observed t-value for female and male incarcerations regarding conjugal visitation was found to be $-.695$ ($df = 134$). Thus the t-test revealed that there is gender difference regarding conjugal visitation among male and female incarcerations; indicating that male incarcerations receive more conjugal visit from their female spouses than female incarcerations. The mean scores for female and male incarcerations in conjugal visit were, 7.81 with standard deviation of 3.65 and 8.15 with standard deviation of 3.15 respectively.

One explanation for this difference could be that, in our country, females are more responsible and concerned about their family. Most of the time wives are economically and emotionally dependent on their husbands and they can't tolerate the separation from their husbands. They frequently visit their husbands to get emotional support. The other factor that is related with the difference between male and female in conjugal visit can be that most women are not employed and have more time to family matters. Women have more time to visit their husbands since they are not fully employed. In our context, men are breadwinner in their respective families and have fulltime job. Therefore they have no enough time to family matters and to visit their incarcerated wives.

In contrast with this finding, a study by Creasie, James & Han-jin Jo, (2004) indicated that female incarcerations receive more visit than their male counterparts. Further, the study indicated that, Females have slightly higher contact with their minor children via visits than males. Fifty-

five percent of males, compared with 58% of females, indicated they had not seen their children since admission to prison.

5.7. Gender difference in preserving family bonding

The independent t-test analysis revealed that there is statistically significant gender difference between female and male incarcerated people in maintaining family ties. Further the result indicated that male incarceration scored significantly higher mean value (Mean =27.38) on family bonding than female incarcerations (Mean =24.45), which implies that male incarcerations preserve their family bonding than female incarcerations.

There can be some possible explanations for that. Most of the times, in Ethiopian culture women are frequently subjected to the responsibility of their marriage and families than men. Therefore, when women get into prison their husbands do not give much attention like wives do and do not visit them frequently. As a result incarcerated women face a problem of preserving their family bonding while they are in prison. In contrast when male incarcerations stay in prison their wives visit them frequently and help them to keep their attachment to their families stay strong. In our culture, wives are expected to handle their family matters and work for their family unity than husbands.

Another explanation that can be given to the difference between male and female incarceration in preserving family bonding is mother's ability to keep the family together despite of structural changes. Most of the times, when wives sent to prison many dimensions of family functioning

undergo significant changes. With the absence of mothers, fathers are expected to handle and adjust changes that occurred in the family as a result of imprisonment of their spouses. Specifically, they are expected to deal with things that are related with their children's physical, academic and emotional needs. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to fathers to effectively deal with their children's need while working a full time job. Therefore, the above situations forced them to give their children to their mother's relatives or their own relatives and the children may be looked after by their grandparents, friends of the family or other relatives. This departure from their biological parents creates a significant gap in their union as a family and affects the family attachment as a whole during imprisonment and following her release.

Even though, many dimensions of family functioning undergo significant changes when husbands sent to prison women are capable of dealing with many problems. Practically mothers are more nurturing and caring in nature so they keep their children close to them despite of the economic hardship they face as a result of imprisonment of their spouse. In supporting this statement, Turek & Loper (2006) reported that only 28% of incarcerated mothers have children who remain in the father's care during the mother's prison term. In contrast, 90% percent of incarcerated fathers have children who are cared for by the mother. Therefore, the role of the child's mother appears to be more crucial in facilitating and maintaining a relationship between children and their incarcerated fathers.

On the contrary, Turek & Loper (2006) indicated that it is more challenging for the children of incarcerated fathers to maintain strong bonds with them than the children of incarcerated mother.

They reported men incarceration's problem in keeping their attachment with their children without denying the role of mother's in facilitating and maintaining a relationship between children and their incarcerated fathers.

CHAPTER SIX

6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

6.1. Summary

The main purpose of this study was to find out the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among incarcerated people in Kality correctional center. In addition, the study was aimed at investigate the gender difference among incarcerations in terms of family bonding.

To this effect, the following basic questions were formulated for investigation:

1. How is the practice of conjugal visitation among incarcerations?
2. Is there a significant relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among couples who have children?
3. Is there a significant relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among couples who have no children?
4. Is there a significant relationship between years Spent in prison and conjugal visitation among incarcerated people?
5. Is there a significant relationship between years Spent in prison and family bonding among incarcerated people?
6. Is there a significant difference between male and female incarcerations with respect to conjugal visitation?
7. Is there a significant difference among male and female incarcerations with respect to preserving family bonding?

The following procedure was done in order to answer these vital questions. The participants of the study were selected from Kaliti correctional centre. The correctional centre was selected purposely for the availability of incarcerations. From this study site 136 married incarcerations were selected in order to fill the questionnaire, which is prepared to measure their family bonding.

In seeking answer to the aforementioned questions, the study used a self-reported questionnaire as data collection instrument. This scale was adopted and reconstructed from the existing measure of David Olson (1986).

The data collected were analyzed using Pearson product-moment correlation and independent sample t-test analysis. Accordingly, the following results were obtained:

1. The finding of this study indicated that almost all incarcerated people are not satisfied with the process of conjugal visitation held in the prison center.
2. Conjugal visitation was significantly related with family bonding among families who have one child or more than one child. The present finding further suggests that there is a strong and positive family bond among families who have one or more than one child.

3. Conjugal visitation not found to be slightly related with family bonding among families who have no child. The result of correlation analysis clearly showed that there was a weak, positive correlation between the criterion and outcome variables.
4. There is statistically significant negative and weak relationship between years Spent in prison and conjugal visit. In brief, when the prisoners Spent more time in prison the conjugal visitation they receive from their spouses will be decreased and vice versa.
5. Family bonding was found to be slightly related with years Spent in prison among incarcerations. The result of correlation analysis clearly showed, weak, negative and statistically significant relationship, between years Spent in prison and family bonding.
6. Regarding the gender difference in conjugal visit, the result of independent sample t-test showed statistically significant difference between male and female incarcerations. The result demonstrated that there is difference between male and female incarcerations in receiving conjugal visitation from their spouses. The mean value of male incarcerations found to be higher than female incarcerations.
7. The difference between male and female incarcerations with respect to preserving family bonding was found to be statistically significant. The result of the study indicated a statistically significant difference between male and female incarcerations in preserving family ties. Male incarcerations scored the highest mean value on family bonding scale than female incarcerations.

6.2. Conclusion

From the preceding findings, therefore, we arrive at the following conclusions:

1. The practice of conjugal visitation in central prison administration is at its minimal level and should get attention from concerned bodies.
2. Having a child in a family have a positive impact on the relationship of the family when it is followed by conjugal visitation. In line with this, the present study depicts that, families who have one child or more than one child showed a positive, moderate and statistically significant relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding. Thus it can be fairly stated, on the basis of the findings that families who have one child or more than one child tend to have strong family bond.
3. Regarding the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among families who have no child, the association found to be positive, weak and not statistically significant. Based on this findings one can conclude that families who have no child tend to have weak family bond.
4. Based on the result of Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, one can conclude that the time prisoners Spent in prison is significantly associated with conjugal visit they receive from their spouses. Even if the relationship is very week, when prisoners Spent more time in prison the conjugal visit they receive from their spouses tend to become less.

5. The relationship between years Spent in prison and family bonding between the prisoners and their families was found weak, negative and statically significant. Based on this result one can conclude that family bonding of prisoners can be influenced by the time they Spent in prison. This could be because of the decrease in conjugal visitation. When prisoners Spent more time in prison they receive less conjugal visit from their spouses. In effect, this will lead to weak family bonding between the prisoners and their families.
6. This research revealed that being male or female incarceration has an influence on conjugal visit behaviour. In the present study, there existed difference between male and female incarcerations with respect to conjugal visit. Male incarcerations receive more conjugal visit from their spouses than their female counterparts.
7. Regarding gender differences in preserving family bond, this study revealed that there existed difference between male and female incarcerations. Thus, male incarcerations included in this study seem to have strong family bond compared to their female counterparts.

6.3. Recommendations

At last, though this research cannot be considered perfect, and final, the findings seem to have some practical implication to intervention programs and future research. Specifically:

1. Studies have shown that prisoners who have greater contact with family during their incarceration have consistently more positive post-release outcomes and good family ties than those who have little or no contact, in agreement with this findings. So the prison administrations need to give enough time and space for incarcerations during conjugal visitations.
2. The findings of this study have suggested that family bonds of married incarcerations are strongly associated with conjugal visitation. Therefore the prison administrations need to prepare suitable environment for married incarcerations in order to have coitus.
3. Since this study cannot claim to be perfect and lasting answer to incarcerations problem, more in-depth research should be conducted on the area of conjugal visitation and family bonding from psychological perspective.
4. Nongovernmental organizations, sociologists, social workers and psychologists need to give more support to prison administration to crate comfortable conjugation area for incarcerations and their families.

Reference

- Arditti, Smock and Parkman (2005). Father Incarceration and its role on Co-parenting Support and Parenting Stress. Nandi D. Nelson, McNair Scholar The Pennsylvania State University.
- Begun, A. (2011). Effects of Prisoner Location on Visitation Patterns. *Journal of Criminal Justice & Social Sciences*.
- Boswell & Wedge, (2002). Centre for Social and Educational Research, 2002.
- Braga, Anthony A., and David L. Weisburg. (2012). Pulling Levers Focused Deterrence Strategies to Prevent Crime. No. 6 of Crime Prevention Research Review. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- Braman, (2002). In the shadow of prison: Families, imprisonment and criminal justice.
- Cavanagh, S.E & Huston, A.C. (2008). The timing of family instability and children's social development, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(5), 1258-1269.
- Child support agency (2009). Facts and figures 08-09. Retrieved from http://www.csa.gov.au/_documents/publications/facts_and_figures_2009. Pdf.
- Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Federal Negarit Gazetta, Proclamation No. 1/ 1995.
- Creasie. Finney Hairston. (1991). Family Ties during Imprisonment. 18 J. Soc. & Soc. Welfare. Indian university school of social work.
- Creasie Finney Hairston (2001). Prisoners and Families: Parenting Issues During Incarceration. Jane Addams College of Social Work University of Illinois at Chicago.

- Creasie F. H, James R., & Han-jin Jo. (2004). Family Connections during Imprisonment and Prisoners' Community Reentry. Jane Addams Center for Social Policy and Research. Chicago, Illinois.
- Criminal Code of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Federal Negarit Gazzeta, Proclamation No. 414/2005.
- Cunningham & Baker, pg. 3, (2005). Making Appropriate Parenting Arrangements in Family Violence Cases: Applying the Literature to Identify Promising Practices. Family, Children and Youth Section Research Report 2005-FCY-3E.
- D. Johnston and M. Carlin. (1996). Enduring Trauma among children of incarcerated criminal offenders. Progress: Family Systems Research and Therapy 5: 9-36.
- David H Olson; Joyce Portner; YoavLavee. (1985). Faces III: Family Adaptability And Cohesion Evaluation Scales, St. Paul (Minn.) : Family Social Science.
- Drenkhahn. K, Dudeck.M, Dünkel .F. (2011). Long-Term Imprisonment and Human Rights. Routledge printers, New York.
- European Prison Rules, Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the European Prison Rules (2006).
- Evans, P., Turner, S. and Trotter, C. (2012). The Effectiveness of Family and Relationship Therapy: A Review of the Literature. Melbourne: PACFA.
- F.F.Furstenberg. Jr. (1995). Fathering in the inner-city: Parental Participation and Public Policy. In Research on Men and Masculinities Series, 7 by M.S. Kimmel and M. Marsiglio (119-47). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Federal Negarit Gazetta Extra Ordinary Issue No. 1/2000, The Revised Family Code Proclamation No. 213/2000

- Flanagan, T. J. (1980). The pains of long-term imprisonment. British Journal of Criminology, 20, 148-156.
- Girma H. (2013). Human right protection of prisoners. Senior Ess. Dire Dawa University, Faculty of Law.
- Hagan and petty. (2002). Returning Captives of the American War on Drugs: Issues of Community and Family Reentry. Paper prepared for the Reentry Roundtable, Washington DC. Oct. 12-13, 2000.
- [http://dictionary.reverso.net/english-definition/family %20 bonding](http://dictionary.reverso.net/english-definition/family%20bonding)
- <http://houston.cbslocal.com/2011/10/26/the-importance-of-family-bonding-time/>
- Johnston & Carlin, (1996). The wrong road: efforts to understand the effects of parental crime and incarceration. Criminology & Public Policy Volume 5, Issue 4, pages 703–719, November 2006.
- K. McDermott and R.D King. 1992. Prison Rule 102: Stand by Your Man. The impact of penal policy on the families of prisoners. In prisoners' children: What are the issues?. Edited by R. Shaw. London: Rutledge.
- Kevin Wright (1977). Conjugal Visitation: A U.S perspective, a research paper for partial fulfillment of the requirements for criminal justice. University of Southern Mississippi.
- Magdalena S., Theovan B., Gudrum D., William J., Human rights reference handbook, (3rd ed, 2004), University of Peace
- Mills, A. (2003) Coping, Vulnerability and Disruption: Facilities for Prisoners with Special Needs, PhD dissertation: University of Wales, Cardiff.
- Mission Australia. (2006). National survey of young Australians. (2006). Key emerging issues. Sydney: Mission Australia.

- Mumola C. (2000). *Incarcerated Parents and Their Children*. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Special Report. NCJ 182335. Washington DC, US Department of Justice.
- Murray, J. (2005). *The effects of imprisonment on families and children of prisoners*. Cullompton, England; Willan.
- Noah Webster. (2014). *Webster Dictionary*. latest online edition. Wikimedia publisher, inc.
- P.A. Dykstra, A.C. Liefbroer, M. Kalmijn, G.C.M. Knijn, & C.H. Mulder (2000-2006). *Family Relationships: The Ties That Bind*. A Sociological and Demographic Research Program.
- Patrick Rodgers. (2008). *Preserving family bonds behind bars*.
- Ratner, B. (2014). *The Correlation Coefficient: Definition*. Retrieved from <http://www.dmstat1.com/res/TheCorrelationCoefficientDefined.html>
- R Matthews. (1989). *Privatizing Criminal Justice*. Sage Publications Ltd London, EC2A 4PU, England.
- Sabbath M. J., & Cowles, E. L. (1992). Problems associated with long term incarceration. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 4(2), 9-11.
- T. Ooms & S. Preister, (1988). *Using Family Criteria in Policymaking and Program Evaluation*. A consensus report of the Family Criteria Task Force. Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar, Eds.
- *Treatment of Federal Prisoners*, Federal Prisons Administration Directive No. 01/2004

- Turek & Loper, (2006). Elements of Promising Practice in Programs Serving Fathers Involved in the Criminal Justice System. August 21st, 2008. National Responsible Fatherhood Clearinghouse
- United Nation Standard from: http://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/AGMs/Notes_and_comments.
- Urban institute justice policy center. (january 2006). Ohio prisoners' reflections on returning home. 2100 m street, n.w. Washington, D.C. 20037.

APPENDICES

አዲስ አበባ ዩኒቨርሲቲ
የድህረ ምርቃ ትምህርት ቤት
የካውንሲሊንግ ሳይኮሎጂ ትምህርት ክፍል

የዚህ መጠይቅ ዋና አላማ የወላጆች የሕግ ታራሚዎች የመጠየቅ ሁኔታ ቤተሰብአዊነትን ከመጠበቅ ጋር ያለውን ግንኙነት ለማጥናት የሚያስችል መረጃ መሰብሰብ ነው። ከመጠይቁ የሚገኘውም መረጃ በሙሉ በማረሚያ ቤት ውስጥ ያለውን የመጎብኘት ሁኔታ፣ ቤተሰባዊነትን ከመጠበቅ አንፃር በሚጎበኙና በማይጎበኙ ታራሚዎች መካከል እንዲሁም በሴትና በወንድ ታራሚዎች መካከል ያለውን ልዩነት፣ በዋናነት ቤተሰባዊነት ከመጎብኘት ጋር ያለውን ግንኙነት ለማጥናት ብቻ ይውላል።

ይህ ጥናት ስኬታማ ሊሆን የሚችለው እናንተ ለእያንዳንዱ ጥያቄ በምትሰጡት ትክክለኛና እውነተኛ ምላሽ በመሆኑ በእያንዳንዱ ክፍል ውስጥ ያሉትን መመሪያዎች በጥንቃቄ በማንበብ ለጥያቄዎቹ ትክክለኛ መልስ በመስጠት እንድትተባበሩኝ በትህትና እጠይቃለሁ። ለመጠይቁ የምትሰጡት ምላሽ በሚስጥር ተጠብቆ ለጥናቱ ውጤት ብቻ የሚውል ሲሆን ስማችሁን በመጠይቁ በየትኛውም ቦታ ላይ መጻፍ አያስፈልጋችሁም ።

ሰለ ትብብርዎ ከልብ አመሰግናለሁ!

ክፍል 1: መሰረታዊ መረጃ

መመርያ: ከዚህ በታች የእርስዎን መሰረታዊ መረጃ፤ በክፍል ሁለት ከትዳር አጋር ጋር ስላልዎት ጥምረት እንዲሁም በክፍል ሦስት ከልጆችዎ ጋር ስላልዎት ግንኙነት የሚገልጹ ጥያቄዎች ቀርበዋል። እባክዎ ጥያቄዎቹን በጥንቃቄ በማንበብ ምርጫዎ ላይ ያክብቡ።

1. እድሜዎ ስንት ነው?

ይግለጹ: _____

2. ጾታ?

ሀ. ሴት

ለ. ወንድ

3. ሃይማኖትዎ ምንድነው?

ሀ. ኦርቶዶክስ ለ. ሙስሊም ሐ. ፕሮቴስታንት መ. ካቶሊክ ሠ. ሌላ (ይግለጹ): _____

4. የትዳር ሁኔታዎ?

ሀ. ያገባና ልጅ ያለው

ሐ. ያገባ ግን ከፍርድ በኋላ የተፋታ

ለ. ያገባ ግን ልጅ የሌለው

መ. ሌላ (ይግለጹ): _____

5. የትምህርት ደረጃዎ?

ይግለጹ: _____

6. ብሔርዎ ምንድነው?

ይግለጹ: _____

7. ወደ ማረሚያ ቤት ከመግባትዎ በፊት ሥራዎ ምን ነበር?

ሀ. የመንግስት ሠራተኛ ለ. የግል ሥራ ሐ. መንግስታዊ ያልሆነ ድርጅት ሠራተኛ መ. ነጋዴ

ሠ. ገበሬ ረ. ተማሪ ሰ. የቀን ሠራተኛ ሸ. የቤት እመቤት ቀ. ሌላ (ይግለጹ): _____

8. ምን ያህል ዓመት ተፈረድብዎ?

ይግለጹ: _____

9. ወደ ማረሚያ ቤት ከገቡ ምን ያህል ጊዜ ይሆንዎታል?

ይግለጹ: _____

ክፍል 2: በቤተሰብ መጠየቅ

10. ለምን ያህል ጊዜ በትዳር አጋርዎ ይጎበኛሉ?

ሀ. በየዕለቱ

መ. በአስራ አምስት ቀን አንድ ጊዜ

ለ. በሳምንት አንድ ጊዜ

ሠ. በወር አንድ ጊዜ

ሐ. በሳምንት ከአንድ ጊዜ በላይ

ረ. ፈጽሞ አልጎበኝም

11. በትዳር አጋርዎ በሚጎበኙበት ወቅት ምን ያህል ደቂቃዎችን አብረዎት ያሳልፋሉ?

ሀ. ከ15-25 ደቂቃ

ሐ. ከ25-45 ደቂቃ

ለ. ከ45-60 ደቂቃ

መ. ከአንድ ሰዓት በላይ

ሠ. ሌላ (ይግለጹ): _____

12. በማረሚያ ቤት ውስጥ በትዳር አጋርና በልጆች የሚደረገው ጉብኝት፤ ቤተሰባዊ ግንኙነትን ከመጠበቅ አንፃር በተለየ ሁኔታ ትኩረት ሊሰጠውና ሊሻሻል ያስፈልገዋል ብለው ያምናሉ?

ሀ. አዎ

ለ. አላምንም

13. በማረሚያ ቤት ውስጥ በትዳር አጋርዎና በልጆችዎ ሲጎበኙ በቅርብና በሩቅ ዘመድ እንዲሁም በጓደኛ ከሚጎበኙበት ሰዓትና ሁኔታ የተሻለ ጉብኝት እንዳገኙ ይሰማዎታል?

አዎ አይደለም ሌላ (ይግለጹ): _____

14. በትዳር አጋርዎና በልጆችዎ በሚደረግልዎ ጉብኝት በቂና ደስተኛ እንደ ሆኑ ይሰማዎታል?

አዎ አይደለም ሌላ (ይግለጹ): _____

ክፍል 3: በታራሚውና በትዳር አጋር መካከል ስላለው ቤተሰባዊ ግንኙነት

15. ወደ ማረሚያ ቤት ከመግባትዎ በፊት ከትዳር አጋርዎ ጋር የነበርዎት ግንኙነት ምን ይመስል ነበር?

ሀ. በጣም ጥሩ ለ. ጥሩ ሐ. መካከለኛ መ. መጥፎ ሠ. በጣም መጥፎ

16. በቅርብ ቤተሰቦችዎና በጓደኞችዎ ከሚጎበኙበት በተሻለ ሁኔታ በትዳር አጋርዎ እየተጠየቁ እንደ ሆነ ይሰማዎታል?

ሀ. አዎ ለ. አይሰማኝም

17. በትዳር አጋርዎ የሚደረግልዎ ጉብኝት ምን ይመስላል?

ሀ. እየጨመረ ነው ለ. እየቀነሰ ነው ሐ. ያው ነው መ. ተቋርጧል

18. ከትዳር አጋርዎ ጋር ለረዥም ጊዜ የግብረ ሥጋ ግንኙነት ባለማድረግዎ ለትዳር አጋርዎ ያለዎት ፍቅር እንደቀነሰ ይሰማዎታል?

ሀ. አዎ ለ. አይሰማኝም

19. የትዳር አጋርዎ በሚወስዷቸው ማንኛውም ውሳኔዎች ላይ እንዲሳተፉ ለእርስዎ እድል ይሰጡዎታል?

ሀ. አዎ ለ. አይሰጡኝም

ክፍል 4: በታራሚውና በልጆች መካከል ስላለው ቤተሰባዊ ግንኙነት

29. ልጆችዎ ቶሎ ቶሎ እርስዎን እንዲጠይቁዎትና አብረዎት እንዲያሳልፉ ከእለት ወደ እለት ፍላጎትዎ እየጨመረ ነው?

- ሀ. አዎ
- ለ. አይደለም

30. ልጆችዎ ከማረሚያ ቤት በፊት ይቀርቡዎት እንደነበረው አሁንም እንደዚያው ይቀርቡዎታል?

- ሀ. አዎ
- ለ. አይቀርቡኝም

31. ልጆችዎ እርስዎን በሚጎበኙበት ጊዜ ምስጢር ማካፈል፣ ጠንካራ ማቀፍና አብሮ የመቆየት ዝንባሌ ያሳያሉ?

- ሀ. አዎ
- ለ. አያሳዩም

32. ልጆችዎ ከእነርሱ ጋር ዳግም አብረው የሚሆኑበትን ጊዜ ይናፍቃሉ/ ይጠይቁዎታል?

- ሀ. አዎ
- ለ. አይናፍቁም

33. የትዳር አጋርዎ በሌሉበት ሁኔታ ልጆችዎ እርስዎን ለመጎብኘት ብቻቸውን መጥተው ያውቃሉ?

- ሀ. አዎ
- ለ. አያውቁም

34. ልጆችዎ በተለያዩ ጉዳዮች ላይ ውሳኔ ሲወስኑ እንደ ወላጅ ያማክሩዎታል?

- ሀ. አዎ
- ለ. አያማክሩኝም

35. ከትዳር አጋርዎና ከልጆችዎ ጋር በተያያዘ እንዲሁም በእርስዎ የመጎብኘት/ የመጠየቅ ሁኔታ ላይ ያለዎትን ተጨማሪ አስተያየት ይግለጹ፡ _____

የዚህ ጥናት መረጃ ሰብሳቢ በማረሚያ ቤት የሚኖርዎት ቆይታ ጤናማና መልካም እንዲሆንልዎ ይመኛል፡፡

በድጋሚ ከልብ አመሰግናለሁ!

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
Department of Counseling Psychology

The objective of this questionnaire is to get some relevant information about the relationship between conjugal visit and family bonding. The information obtained from the responses of the items will help me to show the relationship between conjugal visitation and family bonding among prisoners, and the different between male and female Incarcerations with respect to conjugal visit and family bonding.

The study can be successfully accomplished only when you complete all the items honestly and frankly. Please feel free and be genuine. Your response will be kept confidential. You are not expected to write your name at any place of the questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation!

PART 1: Socio-demographic information

Direction: Below are given items supposed to describe your socio demographic status, your relationship with your spouse and children. After reading each question carefully, indicate your response by circling the alternatives that you think refers to your status.

1. How old are you

Mention: _____

2. Sex?

A. male

B. female

3. What is your marital status?

a. married and have children

b. married but haven't children

c. married but divorced after the charge

d. other _____

4. What is your level of education?

Mention: _____

5. What is your Ethnicity?

Mention: _____

6. What was your job before you entered the prison?

a. Government employee

d. Merchant

g. Daily laborer

b. Private employee

e. Farmer

h. House wife

c. NGO employee

f. Student

i. Others (Mention)

7. How long is your prison term?

Mention: _____

8. How long did you stayed here?

Mention: _____

Part 2: Conjugal visitation

9. How many times does your spouse visits you?

- a. daily
- b. once in a week
- c. more than once in a week
- d. once in 15 days.
- e. once in a month
- f. never

10. How much time do you spend with your spouse during the visitation?

- a. 15-25 Minutes
- b. 25-45 Minutes
- c. 45-60 Minutes
- d. more than one hour
- e. others

11. Do you think that the conjugal visit should get much attention in order to preserve family bonding?

- a. yes
- b. no

12. Do you feel that you are visited by your spouse more than your relatives and friends?

- a. yes
- b. no

13. Are you satisfied by the visit you get from your spouse?

- a. yes
- b. no

PART 3: Questions about the relationship between the prisoner and his/ her spouse

14. How was your relationship with your spouse before you entered the prison?

- a. very good
- b. good
- c. medium
- d. bad
- e. very bad

15. Do you feel that you are visited by your spouse more than your relatives and friends?

- a. yes
- b. no

16. Do you see any change on your spouse regarding the visitation, if so?

- a. the visitation is increasing
- b. the visitation is decreasing
- c. it the same as before
- d. it is terminated

17. Do you think that having no sexual relationship with your spouse decreases your love for your spouse?

- a. yes
- b. no

18. Does your spouse gives you the chance to take part in every decision he /she made?

- a. Yes
- b. no

19. Do you get information about your children and your spouse frequently?

- a. Yes
- b. no

20. Do you have a need of getting a child from your spouse at this time?

- a. yes
- b. no

33. Do they come alone (without your spouse) to visit you?

- a. yes
- b. no

34. Do they ask you for advice as a parent while they make decision?

- a. yes
- b. no

35. If you have any other idea regarding conjugal visit you can write here?

Thank you again, for your cooperation!

Scoring schemes of the scales for data collection

1. Conjugal visitation

Item number	Options and the corresponding weights						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	Omission
10	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
11	1	2	3	4	5	–	0
12	2	1	–	–	–	–	0
13	2	1	–	–	–	–	0
14	2	1	-	-	-	-	0

2. Family bonding scale

Item number	Options and the corresponding weights						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	Omission
15	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
16	2	1	–	–	–	–	0
17	4	3	2	1	–	–	0
18	1	2	–	–	–	–	0
19	2	1	–	–	–	–	0
20	2	1	–	–	–	–	0
21	2	1	–	–	–	–	0
22	1	2	–	–	–	–	0
23	2	1	–	–	–	–	0
24	1	2	–	–	–	–	0
25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	2	1	-	-	-	-	0
27	2	1	–	–	–	–	0
28	2	1	–	–	–	–	0
29	2	1	–	–	–	–	0

30	2	1	-	-	-	-	0
31	2	1	-	-	-	-	0
32	2	1	-	-	-	-	0
33	2	1	-	-	-	-	0
34	2	1	-	-	-	-	0

1. Reliability for conjugal visitation questions and family bonding scale

- Reliability for conjugal visitation questions

Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
.71	5

- Reliability for family bonding scale

Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
.78	22

Informed Consent Form

I hereby confirm that I understand the purpose of this document and the nature of the research project, and I consent to participate voluntarily in the research project. I understand that I am at autonomy to withdraw from the project at any time.

I'm voluntary to participate in this study:

Signature of participant _____ Date _____

Name and Signature of supervisor _____ Date _____

Name and Signature of Data Collector _____ Date _____

Thank you for your cooperation!

Family Bonding Scale

Validation Form

This scale is designed to measure family bonding among incarcerations in Kality correctional centre. It is adapted from measures of David Olson. As part of the effort to design a reliable family bonding scale you are kindly requested to judge the adequacy of each item in measuring the variable under consideration. Your evaluation will be based on the following two questions

1. Do you think the item measure the variable mentioned?
2. How strong is the item in measuring the variable?

For question 1, above, if you think an item measures the variable under question check “Yes”: if you are uncertain check “?” and if you believe the item does not measure the variable check “No”.

For question 2, check, “3” if an item is very strong “2” if it is average and “1” if it is weak in measuring the variable under question.

Description

Family bonding is emotional attachment, intimacy and connectivity between family members. The conceptual clustering of concepts from family theory and family therapy literature revealed three central dimension of family behavior: cohesion, adaptability (change), and communication.

Family cohesion assesses the degree to which family members are separated from or connected to their family. It is defined as: the emotional bonding that family members have toward one another. Specific concepts used to diagnose and measure the cohesion dimension are: emotional bonding, boundaries, coalition, time, space, friends, decision-making, interests and recreation.

Family adaptability (change) has to do with the extent to which the family system is flexible and able to change. It is defined as: the ability of a marital or family system to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress. Specific concepts used to diagnose and measure the adaptability dimension are: family power (assertiveness, control, discipline), negotiation style, role relationships and relationship rules.

Family communication is the third dimension and it facilitates movement on the other two dimensions. A separate scale for assessing Parent-Adolescent Communication is available from the authors (Barnes and Olson, 1982). Also a separate 10-item scale on Marital Communication is included in the ENRICH inventory and is available from the authors (Olson, Fournier, and Druckman, 1980). Both of these scales are included in the Family Inventories Manual.

