Chapter V

Findings, Impact, Suggestions and Summary
This is a thesis on 'Impact of Social Work intervention on children of lifers'. Based on the methodology an attempt has been made to find out the impact of social work intervention on children of lifers and also an effort is made to offer some appropriate suggestions to further minimize or nullify their multifarious problems of multipronged approaches.

The findings are based on the responses given by 130 respondents. The findings obtained through the analysis of collected data have been summarized below.

For the purpose of statistical testing, the following null hypothesis were formulated by the researcher.

FINDINGS RELATED TO HYPOTHESIS

1. Null hypothesis for Research hypothesis : 1

   There is no significant difference between the respondents before and after intervention with regard to various dimensions of family environment.

   By administering ‘z’ test to the above hypothesis it is found out that there is a significant difference between respondents before and after intervention with regard to various dimensions of family environment. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected (Table : 24).

2. Null hypothesis for Research hypothesis : 2

   There is no significant difference between the respondents before and after intervention with regard to their level of adjustmental problems in various dimensions.
By administering ‘z’ test to the above hypothesis it is found out that there is a significant difference between respondents before and after intervention with regard to their level of adjustmental problems in various dimensions such as health, emotional, self, home and social adjustmental problems. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected (Table : 42).

3. Null hypothesis for Research hypothesis : 3

There is no significant difference between the respondents’ anxiety before and after intervention.

‘z’ test was administered to test the above hypothesis and it is observed that there is a significant difference between respondents with regard to anxiety before and after intervention. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected (Table No.57).

4. Null hypothesis for Research hypothesis : 4

There is no significant difference between the respondents’ stress level before and after intervention.

To test the above hypothesis, ‘z’ test was administered and it is observed that there is a significant difference between the respondents stress level before and after intervention. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected (Table :68).

5. Null hypothesis for Research hypothesis: 5

There is no significant difference between the respondents before and after intervention and their feeling of alienation.

‘z’ test was administered to the above hypothesis and it is found that there is a significant difference between respondents and their feeling of alienation before and after intervention. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected (Table :79).
6. **Null hypothesis for Research hypothesis: 6**

There is no significant difference between the respondents with regard to general well being before and after intervention.

By administering ‘z’ test to the above hypothesis, it is found out that there is a significant difference between respondents with regard to general well being before and after intervention. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected (Table :90).

**SALIENT FINDINGS OF THE PRESENT STUDY**

*Findings Related to Socio-demographic factors, parent's details, difficulties and expectations from the society*

1. A significant percent (61.6%) of the respondents’ age was found to be 15 years and above.

2. Girls outnumbered the boys (73.8%).

3. An equal percent of the respondents belong to Hindu religion (50.8%) and Christianity (49.2%).

4. Nearly one third of the respondents (29.2%) were from backward class.

5. Majority of the respondents (69.2%) were from nuclear families.

6. Majority of the respondents (80%) hailed from rural areas.

7. Nearly one third of the respondents were either first born (26.2%), second born (29.2%), third born (33.8%) and last born (10.8%).

8. A significant majority (60%) of the respondents’ family size was medium consisting of five members.

9. A significant percent of the respondents have 2 siblings (60%).

10. More than half of the respondents’ (58.5%) fathers were illiterates.
11. Nearly one fifth of their fathers were not found working before being imprisoned and one third of the fathers were coolies engaged in jobs for daily wages.

12. A significant majority of the respondents’ mothers were illiterates (61.5%).

13. Nearly 2/4 of the mothers were not found working (38.5%) and the remaining were engaged in agriculture related jobs.

14. Majority of the respondents’ parents (72.3%) have no regular income.

15. Total family income range from Rs. 500/- to Rs. 1000/- per month in their families.

16. Nearly one fourth of the respondents (23.1%) were brought to institution (special institution to look after their needs) by friends, professionals and priests.

17. Majority of the respondents were studying at school level (72.3%).

18. Nearly 44.6 percent of them have learning difficulties, 24.6 percent of them have speech problem, stammering or stuttering.

19. More than one third of the respondents (35.4%) have the habit of ‘nail biting’, 16.9 percent were in the habit of teeth-grinding and 9.2 percent were in ‘head-banging’ habit.

20. More than half of the respondents (52.3%) were in the habit of ‘lying’. Stealing was found in 24.6 percent, trua. cy was common in 16.9 percent and nearly half of them used to beat others (50.8%) as a result of of anger.

21. Vast majority of the respondents were unable to control their thoughts (98.5%).

22. Except a negligible percent of the respondents (3.1%), who were without friends, the remaining significant percent (61.5%) were associating with 1 – 3 friends.
23. Majority of the respondents (75.4%) were able to move freely with other children who were not the children of lifers.

24. Nearly half of the respondents (44.6%) were able to maintain good relationship with their friends.

25. Vast majority of the respondents’ (86.2%) fathers were imprisoned and the remaining 13.8 percent of the respondents’ mothers were imprisoned.

26. A significant percent of the respondents’ parents (66.8%) were in prison for more than 10 years.

27. Family disputes (23.1%), land disputes (12.3%) and emotional imbalance (20%) of their parents were the predominant reasons for committing crimes.

28. One third of the respondents (33.8%) did not consider and believe that their parents were criminals.

29. Majority of the respondents (78.5%) were extremely unhappy because they were not sure of their parents’ release.

30. Nearly half of the respondents (46.2%) expressed that their parents were very good.

31. Vast majority of the respondents (95.4%) visit their imprisoned parents.

32. Only a meagre percent of the respondents 16.3 percent have the possibilities of visiting their parents monthly once.

33. Almost all the respondents invariably expressed ‘excitement’ and ‘happiness’ when they happened to meet their parents.

34. Nearly one third of the respondents (33.8%) wanted to become ‘teachers’, 24.6 percent desired to become doctors, 4.6 percent were willing to become engineers and 20 percent of the respondents have determined to become theologians.

35. Vast majority of the respondents (93.8%) were longing for love and affection from their parents.
36. Vast majority of the respondents (93.8%) were keen in acquiring 'acceptance' from the society to which they belong.

**Findings related to the key variables: Family Environment, Adjustment, Personality, Anxiety, Stress, Alienation and their General Well Being**

1. Before intervention a vast majority of the respondents (81.5%) have perceived poor and uncongenial family environment. After intervention, unpredictably a vast majority of the respondents could perceive high and congenial family environment (84.6%).

2. Before intervention only 40 percent of respondents were extroverts but after intervention nearly 56.9 percent of the respondents were found to be extrovert. Neurotic personality before intervention (38.5%) has been considerably reduced to 27.7 percent.

3. Before intervention, a significant majority (70.8%) had high level of adjustmental problems whereas after intervention, majority of the respondents (67.7%) had low level of adjustmental problem.

4. Before intervention a significant percent of the respondents had high level (69.2%) anxiety. But, after intervention, only 44.6% of the respondents had high level of anxiety.

5. Before intervention, majority of the respondents (72.3%) had high level stress. But, after intervention, only 32.3 percent of them had high level stress.

6. Before intervention, a significant percent of the respondents (64.6%) had the feelings of alienation. After intervention only 36.9 percent of the respondents were experiencing low level alienation.

7. General well being of the respondents was low in 69.2 percent of them before intervention. But after intervention, majority of them had high level of general well being (73.8%).
Impact of social workers intervention had resulted in the reduction of adjustmental problems, stress, anxiety, feelings of alienation in the respondents. On the other hand, intervention has increased their understanding of family environment and general well being. Though personality traits are relatively permanent in individuals, a slight modification in their insight and perception has changed a few introvert and neurotics as extroverts.

Overall impact of social workers’ intervention on children of lifers in various dimensions of different factors are listed below in percentage.

1. Family environment : 34.88%
2. Adjustmental problem : 26.29%
3. Anxiety : 23.48%
4. Stress : 21.41%
5. Alienation : 15.45%
6. General well being : 23.56%

Findings related to significant association / difference / relationship with reference to family environment

1. There is a significant difference between respondents of before and after intervention as regards the various dimensions of family environment such as cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual ability, active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organization, control and overall environment.

2. Various dimensions of family environment such as cohesion, conflict, intellectual ability, active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organization in family and over all family atmosphere have not
significantly correlated with the age of the respondents both before and after intervention.

3. There is a significant correlation between the respondents’ age and expressiveness in family, achievement orientation in families and control in families before intervention which could be attributed to the reason that they were advancing in age. But after intervention, it is seen that there is no significant correlation between the age of the respondents and their expressiveness and control in families.

4. There is no significant difference between the respondents’ gender with regard to various dimensions in family environment such as cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual ability, moral religious emphasis, organization, control in family and overall family environment both before and after intervention. There exists a significant difference between the respondents’ gender and their active recreational orientation in families before intervention but these two factors did not significantly differ after intervention.

5. There is a significant difference between the respondents’ religious background (Hindu, Christian) with regard to the dimension of active recreational orientation in family before social workers’ intervention. The mean score reveals that Christian respondents perceived a higher level of organization in their family environment.

6. There is a significant difference between the respondents’ religious background and the dimension of cohesion and conflict in family environment after intervention. This means that the mean score reveals Christian respondents having high level of cohesion after intervention which could be due to strong religious thoughts imparted to them by Christian beliefs.

7. There is no significant difference between the respondents’ religious background (Hinduism, Christianity) with regard to the various
dimensions of family environment such as cohesion before intervention, conflict and organization after intervention.

8. There is a significant difference between the respondents' type of family (Joint family type, nuclear family type) with regard to the dimension of expressiveness in family environment before intervention. Regarding this dimension, the mean score reveals that the respondents from nuclear family exhibit high level of expressiveness.

9. There is no significant difference between the respondents' type of family (joint family and nuclear family type) and the various dimensions of family environment such as cohesion, independence, achievement, orientation, intellectual ability, active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organisation, control in families and overall family environment both before and after intervention.

10. There is no significant difference between the respondents' type of family, their expressiveness and conflict in families after intervention.

11. There is no significant association between the respondents' native place (Urban, rural and Semi urban) and all the dimensions of family environment namely cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual ability, active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organization, control in families and overall family environment.

12. There is no significant association between the respondents' mothers' education and all the dimensions of family environment namely cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual abilities, active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organization, control in families and over all family environment.
13. There is no significant association between the respondents’ fathers’ education and all the dimensions of family environment namely cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual ability, active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organization, control in families and overall family environment.

14. There is no significant association between the respondents’ birth order in their families and the all the dimensions of family environment namely cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual ability, active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organization, control in families and overall family environment.

15. There is a significant correlation between the number of family members of the respondents and the dimensions of family environment such as expressiveness and family members’ active recreational orientation after social workers intervention.

16. There is no significant correlation between the respondents’ number of family members and the various dimensions of family environment such as cohesion, conflict, independence achievement orientation, intellectual abilities, moral religious emphasis, organization, control and overall family environment before and after intervention.

17. There exists no significant correlation between the respondents’ siblings and all the dimensions of family environment namely cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, achievement orientation, intellectual abilities, active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organization, control and overall family environment before and after intervention.

18. There exists a significant difference among the various communities (Backward, most backward and others) of the respondents with regard to
the family environment dimension such as respondents’ achievement orientation.

19. There is also no significant difference among the various communities belonging to the respondents (Backward, most backward, others) with regard to the dimensions of cohesion, expressiveness, conflict, independence, intellectual abilities, moral religious emphasis, organization, control and overall family environment both before and after intervention.

20. There is no significant difference between the respondents of various communities and the respondents’ achievement orientation before intervention.

21. Dimensions such as conflict, independence, intellectual cultural orientation, active recreational orientation have no significant relationships with the dimensions of family environment except the dimension of moral religious emphasis in families which has significant relationship with organization in families. This reveals the fact that the families are more organized when religious emphasis is more in families. Likewise achievement oriented families have significant relationship with control in families.

22. It is found that all the dimensions of family environment have significant relationship with again all the dimensions of family environment except intellectual cultural orientation before intervention.

23. Cohesion in families in family environment has a significant relationship with expressiveness in families and organization in families. This reveals the fact that more the cohesion, more will be their expressiveness and organization in family environment after intervention.

24. Independence in families, moral religious emphasis in families and organization in families have significant relationship with the expressiveness in family environment after intervention.
25. Conflict in families has significant relationship with the dimensions of independence in families, intellectual, cultural orientation, active recreational orientation and moral religious emphasis in families.

26. Dimension of independence in family environment has significant relationship with the dimensions of moral religious emphasis and organization in family environment after intervention.

27. ‘Achievement orientation’ dimension in family environment has significant relationship with the dimensions of intellectual cultural orientation and moral religious emphasis in family environment after intervention.

28. ‘Intellectual cultural orientation’ dimension in family environment has no significant relationship with the dimensions of active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organization and control in family environment after intervention.

29. Dimensions of active recreational orientation has significant relationship with the dimensions of organization and control in family environment after intervention. Dimension of moral religious emphasis has a significant relationship with the dimension of organization in family environment after intervention.

30. It is found that the dimensions of cohesion, expressiveness, achievement orientation, active recreational orientation, moral religious emphasis, organization and control have significant relationship with the same dimensions of family environment after intervention.

Findings related to significant association / difference / relationship with reference to Personality

1. Social workers intervention’ had a good influence on them and hence, only 15.4 percent were in introversion personality type which gives the
fact that 4 introverts were able to come out of their traits and become extroverts. Likewise, there is a slight difference in the respondents’ neurotic personality after intervention. Nearly 7 respondents were able to introspect their neurotic emotions and behaviours and transform into extrovert personalities.

2. There is no significant association between the personality of the respondents (Introvert, extrovert and neuroticism) and the various socio demographic characteristics such as age of the respondents, sex of the respondents, religious background of the respondents, caste of the respondents, type of family of the respondents, native place of the respondents, birth order of the respondents, number of family members, siblings and mothers education of the respondents before intervention.

3. There is no significant association between the personality of the respondents (Introvert, extrovert and neuroticism) and the various socio demographic characteristics such as age of the respondents, sex of the respondents, religious background of the respondents, caste of the respondents, type of family of the respondents, native place of the respondents, birth order of the respondents, number of family members, siblings and mothers education of the respondents after intervention.

*Findings related to significant association / difference / relationship with reference to Adjustment*

1. There is a significant difference between the respondents (before and after intervention) with regard to their level of adjustmental problems in various dimensions such as health adjustmental problems, emotional adjustmental problems, self adjustmental problems, home adjustmental problems, social adjustmental problems and overall adjustmental problems.
2. There is no significant relationship between the children of lifers' age with regard to their health adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

3. There exists a significant relationship between the age of the respondents and their emotional adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

4. There is a significant relationship between the respondents' age and their self adjustmental problems before intervention. But after intervention, there is no significant relationship between the respondents' age and their self adjustmental problems.

5. There exists a significant relationship between the respondents' age and their home adjustmental problems and overall adjustmental problems both before and after intervention but respondents' age and social adjustmental problems has been found to be insignificant before intervention.

6. There exists a strong significant relationship between the respondents' age and various dimensions of adjustmental problems such as home social and overall adjustmental problems after intervention.

7. There is no significant difference between the respondents' gender with regard to adjustmental problems in the dimensions of health, emotional, self, home, social and overall adjustmental problems before and after intervention except from self adjustmental problems where we find a significant difference between the respondents' gender and problems in self adjustment after intervention.

8. There is no significant difference between the religious belief of the respondents (Hindu, Christian) with regard to adjustmental problems in various dimensions such as health, emotional, self, home, social and overall adjustmental problems before and after intervention.

9. There is no significant difference between the respondents who hail from joint family type and nuclear family type with regard to various
dimensions of adjustmental problems such as health, self, home adjustmental problems before social workers intervention.

10. There exists a significant difference between the respondents who hail from joint family type and nuclear family type with regard to their problems in emotional and social adjustment.

11. There exists no significant difference between the respondents who hail from joint family type and nuclear family type with regard to the dimensions of adjustmental problems such as health, self, home, emotional, social and overall adjustment problems.

12. There exists no significant association between the respondents’ native place (Rural urban and semiurban) and their level of health adjustmental problems before and after intervention.

13. There is no significant association between the respondents’ native place and their level of in emotional adjustment before and after intervention.

14. There is no significant association between the respondents’ native place and their problems in self adjustment before and after intervention.

15. There is no significant association between the respondents’ native place and their level of problems in home adjustment before and after intervention.

16. There is no significant association between the respondents’ native place and their level of social adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

17. There is no significant association between the respondents’ mothers’ education (school level 25; illiterates 40) and their health adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

18. There is no significant association between the respondents’ mothers’ education and their emotional adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.
19. There is no significant association between the respondents' mothers' education and their problems in self adjustment both before and after intervention.

20. There is no significant association between the respondents' mothers' education and their problems in home adjustment before and after intervention.

21. There is no significant association between the respondents' mothers' education and their problems in social adjustment before and after intervention.

22. There is no significant association between the respondents' mothers' education and their problems in overall adjustment both before and after intervention.

23. There is no significant association between the respondents' fathers' education (School level 24; degree holder 4; illiterates 37) and their health adjustmental problems before and after intervention.

24. There is no significant association between the respondents' fathers' education and their emotional adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

25. There is no significant association between the respondents' fathers' education and their self adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

26. There is no significant association between the respondents' fathers' education and their home adjustmental problems before and after intervention.

27. There is no significant relationship between the respondents' fathers' education and their social adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.
28. There is no significant association between the respondents’ fathers’ education and their overall adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

29. There is no significant correlation between the number of family members of the respondents and various dimensions of adjustmental problems namely health, emotional, home, social and overall adjustmental problems after intervention.

30. There is no significant correlation between the number of family members of the respondents and their three dimensions of adjustmental problems such as self, home and social adjustmental problems.

31. There is a significant correlation between the number of family members of the respondents and their health adjustmental problems, emotional adjustmental problems and overall adjustmental problems before intervention.

32. There is no significant association between the respondents’ birth order (ordinal position) in their family and the dimensions of various adjustmental problems.

33. There is no significant association between the respondents’ birth order in the family and their adjustmental problems to health both before and after intervention.

34. There is no significant association between the respondents’ birth order and their level of emotional adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

35. There is no significant association between the respondents’ birth order and their level of self adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

36. There is no significant relationship between the respondents’ birth order and their home adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.
37. There is no significant relationship between the respondents' birth order and their social adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

38. There is no significant association between the respondents' birth order and their overall adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

39. There is no significant relationship between the siblings of the respondents and the level of adjustmental problems in various dimensions of health, emotional, self, home, social and overall adjustmental problems both before and after intervention.

40. There is no significant difference among the various community of the respondents (Backward, most backward and others) with regard to dimensions of adjustmental problems namely health adjustmental problems, emotional adjustmental problems, self adjustmental problems home, adjustmental problems, social adjustmental problems and overall adjustmental problems before and after intervention.

41. Dimensions of health adjustmental problem has significant relationship with all the dimensions of adjustmental problems before intervention. Dimension of emotional adjustmental problem has significant relationship with the social adjustmental problem before intervention. Dimensions of self and home adjustmental problems have significant relationship with social adjustmental problems before intervention. Regarding the overall analysis of the score, it is understood that all the dimensions of adjustmental problems have significant relationship with again all the dimensions of adjustmental problems before intervention.

42. All the dimensions of adjustmental problems have significant relationship with again all the dimensions of adjustmental problems after intervention.
Findings related to significant association / difference / relationship with regard to their anxiety

1. There is a significant difference between the respondents with regard to anxiety before and after intervention.

2. Potential difference between the sex of the respondents and their level of anxiety was measured and the statistical result reveals the fact that gender has not been significantly associated with regard to their anxiety.

3. There is no significant difference between the respondents’ religion with regard to anxiety experienced by them before and after intervention.

4. There is no significant difference between the type of family of the respondents with regard to their anxiety both before and after intervention.

5. There is no significant difference between the native place of the respondents (Rural, Urban & Semiurban) with regard to their anxiety before and after intervention.

6. There is no significant difference between the mothers’ education of the respondents with regard to their anxiety either before or after intervention.

7. There is no significant difference between the children of lifers’ fathers education with regard to the anxiety either before after intervention.

8. There is no significant association between the respondents’ order of birth in their family (I born, II born, III born, IV born etc) and the anxiety experienced by them before and after intervention.

9. There is no significant difference between the first born and others in experiencing anxiety.

10. There is a significant correlation between the age and anxiety of the respondents before and after intervention which could be attributed to the reason that an increase in age generates less anxiety compared to the
younger age groups of the respondents. It is further noted that there is a significant correlation between the number of family members and anxiety after intervention.

11. There is no significant difference among the various types of castes belonging to the respondents with regard to their anxiety.

Findings related to significant association / difference / relationship with regard to the level of stress experienced by them

1. There is a significant difference between the respondents' stress level before and after intervention. The mean score reveals that the respondents perceived higher level of stress before intervention than after intervention.

2. There is no significant difference between the male and female respondents with regard to stress experienced by them both before and after intervention.

3. There is no significant difference between the respondents of Hindu and Christian religion with regard to stress experienced by them both before and after intervention. Stress has same impact on children of lifers irrespective of their religious thoughts.

4. There is no significant difference between the respondents who hail from joint family type and nuclear family type with regard to stress experienced by them before intervention.

5. There is a significant difference between the respondents who hail from joint family type and nuclear family type with regard to stress experienced by them. Further, the table reveals that the mean score of the respondents representing joint family perceived higher level stress than the respondents of nuclear family type.
6. There is no significant association between the respondents who hail from different background (Urban, Rural and Semiurban) with regard to stress experienced by them both before and after intervention.

7. There is no significant association between the respondents’ mothers’ education with regard to stress experienced by them both before and after intervention.

8. There exists no significant association between the respondents’ fathers’ education and stress experienced by them both before and after intervention.

9. There exists no significant association between the respondents birth order in the family with regard to stress experienced by them before and after intervention.

10. There is no significant relationship between the respondents’ various socio demographic characteristics like age, number of family members and siblings and stress experienced by them both before and after intervention.

11. There is no significant difference among the various communities of the respondents (Backward, Most backward and Others) and the stress experienced by them before and after intervention. Stress is experienced by all the children of lifers irrespective of their communities.

Findings related to significant association / difference / relationship with regard to the respondents’ feeling of alienation

1. There is a significant difference between the respondents with regard to their feeling of alienation before and after intervention. The mean score reveals the fact that the respondents’ feeling of alienation was high before intervention.
2. There is no significant difference between the male respondents and female respondents with regard to their feelings of alienation before intervention.

3. There is a significant difference between the girls and boys of life imprisoners and feelings of alienation experienced by them. This means that the mean score reveals that the girl children experience and perceive high level of alienation compared to males.

4. There is no significant difference between the respondents who belong to different religion and their feelings of alienation both before and after intervention. This means that religion has no influence on the feelings of alienation.

5. There is a significant association between the respondents who hail from various backgrounds (Rural, Urban and Semiurban) and their feelings of alienation before intervention. It means that the respondents’ alienation was high among rural respondents. But after intervention, there is no significant association between the respondents of various backgrounds and their feelings of alienation.

6. There is a significant difference between the respondents who hail from joint family type and nuclear family type and their feelings of alienation experienced by them before social workers intervention. Further, the mean score reveals the fact that the respondents of nuclear family suffered from high level of alienation.

7. There is no significant difference between the respondents who hail from joint and nuclear type of families and their hard feelings of mental estrangement experienced by them.

8. There exists no significant association between the respondents’ mothers’ educational status and their feelings of emotional detachment (alienation) before and after intervention. This means that the respondents’ mothers education has no influence on their feelings of alienation.
9. There exists no significant association between the respondents' fathers' educational status and their feelings of alienation both before intervention and after intervention.

10. There exists no significant association between the respondents' order of birth in their family and their strong feelings of alienation experienced by them before intervention and after intervention.

11. There exists a significant relationship between the respondents' age and feelings of alienation before intervention. After intervention, such significant relationship did not exist between the respondents' age and their state of being not involved (alienation).

12. There exists no significant relationship between the respondents' socio demographic characteristics like number of family members and siblings and their feelings of alienation experienced by them before intervention.

13. There is a significant relationship between the respondents number of family members and their feelings of alienation after intervention but no such significant relationship existed with the siblings of the respondents after intervention.

14. There is no significant difference among the various (backward, most backward and others) communities to which they belong to and their feelings of alienation experienced by them before and after intervention.

Findings related to significant association / difference / relationship with regard to the respondents' general well being

1. There is a significant difference between the respondents with regard to general well being before and after intervention. It is observed that the mean score of the respondents is higher after intervention which could be due to their meaningful participation and involvement in intervention programme.
2. There is no significant difference between the respondents’ sex and their general well being either before or after social workers’ intervention.

3. There is no significant difference between the respondents’ religion and their general well being.

4. There is no significant association between the native place of the respondents and their general well being either before or after intervention.

5. There is a significant difference between the type of family with regard to the general well being of the respondents before intervention. But after intervention, the researcher found no significant difference between the type of family such as joint and nuclear and their general well being.

6. There is no significant association between the respondents’ mothers’ educational level and their general well being before intervention. But, after intervention, it is found that these two factors namely mothers’ education and general well being were significantly associated.

7. There exists no significant association between the respondents fathers’ education and their general well being before and after intervention. It means that fathers’ education has not influenced the respondents’ general well being in any way.

8. There is no significant association between the birth order of the respondents ie (I born, II born, III born, IV born etc.,) and their general well being.

9. Dimension of general well being is not significantly correlated with the various socio – demographic factors such as age of the respondents, number of family members and siblings of the respondents both before and after social workers intervention.

10. There is no significant difference among the various communities of the respondents with regard to general well being. It is further observed that the mean score of the respondents whose caste was from other community
is higher than the others, which could be attributed to the reason that being unaware of their caste could have reduced their stigmatization in the society.

11. The factors of Adjustmental problems, anxiety, stress and feelings of alienation have significant relationship with the same factors before intervention.

12. Family environment factor has been insignificantly correlated with all the other factors such as adjustmental problems, anxiety, stress, alienation and general well being before intervention.

13. The variable of family environment, adjustmental problems, anxiety, stress, alienation, general well being have significant relationship with again all the variables after intervention except the family environment which is insignificant with the feelings of alienation.

Implication of the study

The careful analysis of the factual data in the present quasi experimental design indicates the overall impact of social worker's intervention on children of lifers in various dimensions of different variables. More than one third of the respondents have experienced (34.88%) positive, congenial family environment after intervention. Low adjustmental problems have been resulted in 26.29 percent of the respondents due to the impact of social worker's intervention. Level of anxiety has been considerably reduced in 23.48 percent of the respondents after intervention. Level of stress has been reduced in 21.41 percent of the respondents after intervention. Feeling of alienation has been reduced in 15.45 percent of the respondents and the respondents' general well being has been improved in 23.56 percent of the respondents.

Keeping in view the general conclusions drawn, the findings of the present study have a bearing for the researchers, planners, counsellors, social workers, psychiatrists, parents and teachers.
Based on the findings of the study, the following suggestions are proffered.

1. Children of lifers are disadvantaged. Mostly they are unstable. Effects of deprivation of familial care, more specifically inadequate mothering, insufficient parenting, separation of parents have been responsible for emotional disturbances in these children. Hence, it is strongly suggested that the parents of these children of lifers must be educated in prison to keep continuous contact with these children.

2. It is also recommended strongly that the criminal justice system, police force and other authorities concerned need to be just, caring and humane in helping children to meet their parents frequently. Our Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh also once stressed the fact that ‘There is a need to ensure that our police force and criminal justice system are responsible, sensitive, caring and human. Police force and criminal justice system need to be not just efficient or accountable but also responsive to the citizens’ needs (The Hindu, 2006).

3. ‘Stable families are foundation of strong nations’ - Dennis Leap. We understand that the stable traditional families are the backbone of any strong nation. History shows that when family life-husband, wife, children, falls apart, so does the nation (Trumpet 2004). Hence it is also recommended that families must be strengthened by evolving suitable policies and programmes such as
   a. Concrete welfare measures-free education until a child wants to pursue education at a higher level and not only till 14 years of age.
   b. Ensuring employment opportunities at a large scale for either of the parents.
   c. Emotion building programmes.
d. Addressing the familial issues seriously such as dowry, divorce, which are predisposing factors in causing agony and ill feeling routing towards criminality.

4. It is suggested that the state and central government may concentrate on total rehabilitation of children of lifers and evolve effective programmes for them. Not only physical, educational and economic rehabilitation, psychological rehabilitation also must be undertaken side by side with the professional team of social workers, psychiatrists, psychologists and teachers.

5. By pursuing a sound rehabilitation programme, the government can instil in the minds of these victims a sense of security and well being as they grow up.

6. Social workers may be appointed in all schools, service organizations run by government and exclusively in criminal justice system, i.e., as soon as the offenders are taken to prison, the children may be properly looked after and dealt with professionally. Instead of neglecting and abandoning them or institutionalizing them, they may be given foster care programme with families as it is done in some western countries.

7. Government can take initiative in establishing special shelter homes for the welfare of children of lifers if there is no caretaker.

8. Feelings of anxiety produces physical reactions such as palpitations, tremors, sweating, diarrhea, muscle tension. Sometimes a full blown panic attack ensues; sometimes, the reactions are much more wild. Hence it is strongly recommended that suitable anxiety reduction programmers must be prepared and implemented for the children of lifers.

9. There is a need for curative, preventive and promotive measures dealing with the general well being among the children of lifers. What is required is an active implementation of National Mental Health Policy including a
probe into the sorry state of the existing condition viz., reorientation of
the professional orientation from institution based and individual centered
care to family oriented home care in a majority of cases.

10. It is suggested that the children of lifers’ and their caregivers’ needs could
be focussed when making decisions regarding the incarcerated parent.

11. Attempts could be made to humanize the visiting conditions within the
limitation of security arrangement.

12. What we need at present is liberal policies, wider services / specialized
concentration on the children of lifers. Special committees consisting of
members drawn from various social service organizations and public
services could be constituted to identify cases of neglect and offer suitable
remedies. This will, to a very large extent, bring down the number of
problems to be solved.

13. It is suggested that action could be taken to eliminate the transfer of
stigma and shame of incarceration to the children.

14. Special attention needs to be given to building a reliable data base related
to victimization of children of lifers with great sensitivity to gender bias.

Theoretical Base
This present quasi-experimental study is grounded in three
complementary theoretical approaches.

1. Sutherland’s differential association theory
2. John Moulby’s attachment theory
3. Edwin Lemerts’ labeling theory

Each of these theoretical approaches favours its own particular
perspective on the nature of reality. These theories sometimes overlap but
otherwise are positioned as distinct approaches.
According to Sutherland, criminal behaviour is learned in interaction with other person in a process of communication. It is reflected in the present study since the respondents have friends with the children of other convicts and their friendship is indeed in depth (Table No. 7, 9, 10 and 11). This threatens our feeling that there may be possibilities for transmitting delinquent values and learning deviant behaviour.

Regarding the theory of attachment, it is briefly understood that a child needs to experience a warm, intimate and continuous relationship with the mother. It is also reflected in the present study that some children of lifers have lost their mothers and some respondents’ mothers are in prison. When researcher approached the respondents for intervention, the deep affection towards their mothers (Table No. 14, 16, 17, 18 and 19) could easily be perceived.

Edwin Lemert’s labeling theory suggests that once a label is attached to a person, a deviant or criminal career has been set in motion. It may be true because the children of lifers, at present, undergo stressful situations, often feel that they are alienated and dwell in anxiety. Further, they have also shown adjustmental problems. If these children are not protected right now, they have possibilities of being labeled as ‘Criminals’ children’, which may eventually place them at a higher risk of becoming victims of delinquency and criminality.

**Social Work Intervention**

Intervention has always been the essence of social work. While assessing the impact of social worker’s intervention in the present study, it is understood that social worker’s intervention has certainly played a significant role in influencing their understanding of family environment positively. It has also reduced their adjustmental problems, anxiety, stress and feeling of alienation. Further, the intervention has increased the respondents’ general well being.
To achieve a greater percent of impact on children of lifer, social workers have to play a vital role in schools, institutions, correctional settings etc.

Social workers in institutions could be appointed to respond effectively by applying the methods of social work. They could also perform the roles of case worker, group workers, counsellor, therapist, parent liaison, advocate, behavior specialist, mental health consultant, multi-disciplinary team member and system change specialists to intervene with anxiety, stress, feelings of alienation and adjustmental problems of the children of lifers.

It is suggested that social workers in institutions through direct methods of social work such as case work should intervene with stress, anxiety, feeling of alienation and adjustmental problems of the children of lifers through effective counseling methods - psychodynamic, brief focal counseling, supportive counseling, grief counseling and individual counseling.

Social worker can also apply behaviour modification therapies and cognitive therapies.

Medical and psychiatric social worker (clinical social workers) could be appointed to assess the children's mental health status and to intervene effectively with mental health psychopathological issues by the appropriate modes of psychotherapies and psychoanalysis.

Group work can be used to intervene with the group of children of lifers with similar problems like adjustmental problems, anxiety, stress, feelings of alienation and low general well being. Group psychotherapy, training groups (T groups), sensitive groups and psychodrama techniques could be applied with the help of other professional workers such as psychiatrists and psychologists.
It is also suggested that recreational programmes can be organized at large.

It is suggested that through community organization methods, the needs and problems can be identified. Family based programmes could be organized to improve the parent-child relationships.

Social worker can also work in liaison with prison authorities to enable them to strengthen parent-child relationships.

Parents in prison could be met along with children and special ‘family meets’ could be organized to alleviate their feeling of alienation and stress.

Social worker could undertake minor and major projects on children of lifers’ lifestyle problems and their anticipations in order to improve their living conditions.

It is further suggested that through the method of social action, social workers can highlight and bringforth the hidden problems of these innocent children so that childrens’ rights could be preserved.

Suggestion for Future Studies

It is suggested that the following research studies could be undertaken in future on children of lifers.

1. The present study confines only to the institutionalized children in only one organization in Tamilnadu. It is suggested that a similar study in other institutions can be conducted.

2. A similar study can be undertaken with children of lifers who are not institutionalized in order to test the impact of social worker’s intervention.
3. The present study observes that the children of lifers have stress, anxiety, adjustmental problems, feeling of alienation and poor family environment. It is suggested that the intervention process can be a lengthy one i.e. long term intervention and its impact on the children can be studied in depth.

4. A comparative study can be undertaken on the problems of children of lifers in rural and urban areas.

5. A professional team consisting of a group of psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers can be involved in intervention programme and then the impact can be assessed to achieve maximum result.

6. A study can be undertaken to find out the level of depression, insecurity feeling, psychopathology and feeling of deprivation in children of lifers.

7. As there are few research materials on this topic, any researcher can be motivated to think and do an in-depth study on this pathetic group of children.

8. Parents of children of lifers especially children who miss their fathers can be probed in detail.

9. Specific research can be undertaken to deal with girl children of lifers.

10. The future investigators can also probe into the participation contribution of teachers and caretakers towards the life of children of imprisoners.

Summary of the present study

The present quasi-experimental study is conducted with children of lifers in Bethel Agricultural Fellowship Organization in Salem and Tirunelveli Districts, Tamilnadu, South India with a view to understand the socio-demographic characteristics, parents' details, academic difficulties, future dreams of the children, family environment, adjustmental problems, personality of the children, anxiety, stress, feeling of alienation and their general well being (positive mental health). Relevant tools for collecting the data were adopted to
study the above mentioned variables. 130 respondents were included for the present study. To analyze the impact of social workers intervention on children of lifers, standardized tools were used in this study namely:

1. Family environment scale - Moss & Moss (1986)
2. Adjustmental problem inventory - Ramamurthy (1968)
3. Personality inventory - Sridevi Ammal (1977)
4. Taylor’s manifest anxiety state inventory - Taylors (1935)
6. The alienation scale - Afzal Kureshi and Meenakshi Dutt (1979)

It also encompasses a review of literature on the same and related topics and gives a systematic narrative account on them. The study also portrays the research methodology adopted as well as the layout of the study. The data collected were systematically processed, analysed and presented in the form of tables and diagrams to draw meaningful inferences. In the present study, the researcher has also applied various statistical test such as chi-square test, students ‘Z’ test, one way analysis of variance (F test) and Karl Pearsons coefficient of correlation test to arrive at meaningful conclusions.

**The major findings of the study are summarized below**

The overall impact of social worker’s intervention on children of lifers in various dimensions of different factors are listed below in percentages:

1. Family environment - 34.88%
2. Adjustmental problems - 26.29%
3. Anxiety - 23.48%
4. Stress - 21.41%
5. Alienation - 15.45%
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6. General well being - 23.56%
7. Personality - 11/65

Based on the findings, theoretical base, impact and its implications, social work perspective such as the effective rehabilitation programmes, improving the parents-child relationship by helping them to make frequent visits, providing education for more congenial family environment, improving their adjustments, specialized programme to reduce their anxiety, stress, appointing more number of social workers in criminal justice system, establishing counseling centers, strengthening family foster care programmes, family counseling, coping skills are given in detail.