

Socio-Economic Costs of Crime on Prisoners' Families: A Case Study of Southern Punjab

Asia Rasool¹, Saima Afzal²

¹PhD Scholar, Institute of Cultural Studies, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

²Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

Correspondence: saimaafzal@bzu.edu.pk²

ABSTRACT

Aim of the Study: The purpose of research work was on “Socio-Economic Cost of Crime: A Case Study of Southern Punjab”. Crime is committed by one person but whole family suffered because of that crime. Siblings, parents, patterns, children as well as the family members, relatives, neighbors and co-workers all suffered because of once imprisonment. The objectives of study were i) to study the social cost of crime paid by prisoners' families ii) to study the economic cost of crime paid by prisoners' families. Prisoners' families faced different behaviors of society.

Methodology: A survey was conducted through questionnaire on 362 respondents that were come to visit the jail to meet the family member who was in jail. Independent t-test and ANOVA was statistical test for measured the hypothesis of this research.

Findings: Major findings shows that stigmatization has great bad effect on families of prisoner and the duration of imprisonment had directly effect on economic cost.

Conclusion: The study concluded that a child's and family social, psychological and economic consequences of incarcerating a family member can be substantial. The family a prisoner leaves has been referred to as lost, forgotten, hidden, and invisible. The concerns, environmental issues, and needs of these families, along with the children's, spouses', parents, and grandparents, have only recently come to the forefront of the discussion. The expenses were astronomical both in terms of cost and duration for the offender and his/her family and for the criminal. For fear of being "stigmatized," family members may feel pressured to keep their friends and/or greater community members in the dark about the reasons why a member of the family is absent, adding to their already elevated stress levels.

Keyword: Social Cost, Economic Cost, Stigmatization, Families of Convicted Criminals.

Article History

Received:
May 14, 2026

Revised:
September 20, 2026

Accepted:
September 23, 2026

Online:
September 27, 2026

1. INTRODUCTION

An act or conduct that causes criminal consequences is considered a crime. Criminal behavior is defined to be any illegal act or behavior which causes harm to another human being and the state will always put an end to it (Anderson, 1999). Allen defines a crime as something "a crime is any human activity or function that harms others. The State needs to take action to end it. This mitigates the sentence's responsibility for the sentence. There is no crime-free society but if people and administrations would consider the resources that can be saved or better used in an ideal world of moral compliance, the focus will be in that direction. (Allen, 1996)

Crime is a wrongful act which is done intentionally, without excuse, without protection and which is subject to the punishment stipulated by the criminal law. Crime is an evil action against good and natural things. Various sorts of criminal costs are covered now. Indirect costs include foregone humanoid wealth, investment, profits and time, psychological costs, loss of productivity and other non-financial budgets. Straight costs are lawful, police, health, jail, safety and foster care costs (Buvinic & Morrison, 1999).

Crime has a significant detrimental influence on family structure and relationships. Females experienced several difficulties as a result of their husband's incarceration. Families bear the burden of jail, as do the prisoner's family, and families grow upset as the economic cost of incarceration rises. Families are obligated to assist and to undertake labor for the prisoner and the prisoner's property. Families, especially spouses and children, feel alone. Wives and partners share the load, but they face shame (Breen, 2008).

Families' penalty which they not doing. The negative impacts of safety and confinement on inmates and their relatives stay usually referred to as the 'secondary' or 'collateral' implications of arresting a person. It has an impact on the emotional, psychological, substantial financial, economic, cultural, and social expenses that inmates' families are frequently forced to bear. These expenditures are known as unseen punishment since society frequently abandons inmates' families (Mauer & Chesney-Lind, 2003).

Crime, whether violent or peaceful, imposes a range of consequences on people, families, and society. Fear of crime has societal consequences. Victim and criminal families are also affected, and society suffers the consequences, which include (1) economic expenses such as medical bills and property damage (2) non-monetary social costs include anxiety, agony, suffering, and a decline in quality of life (3), as well as lower productivity at work, home, and school (Miller et al., 1996).

Some scales have been created for economic and financial studies of crime. Level one is designated as price lessons (only related package expenses (avoided package prices) remain completely evaluated in financial relations). Level two price efficacy lessons incorporate efficiency measures. Level three incomplete price advantage analyses (some or all program efficiency metrics are expressed in monetary terms). Level four has sufficient information to determine the sign of the cost-benefit equivalence; yet, something is missing. Level five full cost-benefit analyses, where all linked program efficiency metrics are provided in monetary terms (Sansfacon , 2004).

Some scales have been established for the economic and financial analysis of crime. Level one is labelled as cost studies. Level two cost-effectiveness studies, which incorporate efficiency measures but are not monetized. Level three partial cost-benefit analyses (with some or all program efficiency metrics presented in monetary terms). Level four has enough information to determine the sign of the cost-benefit equivalence; yet, something is missing. Level five full cost-benefit evaluations, including all linked program efficiency metrics provided in monetary terms (Roman & Farrell, 2002).

The following are some risk factors that emerge both before and after imprisonment:

Children's criminal activities grew, poverty concerns, alcohol and other drug intake rose, family violence increased. Child abuse or neglect prior to or as a contributing cause in jail has been shown to have a number of detrimental repercussions on children. This separation may have a different meaning because the children may already have been placed in foster care or have been separated in some way in the past,

and this separation, this time behind bars, may be viewed as another separation. When parents or caregivers are consistently unable to provide their children with stability, however, children are more likely to experience the negative effects of potentially future separation. Child and family risks as a result of the arrest and incarceration of the parent include further separation from the parent and possible siblings, inconsistent child care, uncertainty about the future, secrecy and deception about the arrest/incarceration, stigma, and problems with visitation (Wright & Seymour, 2000).

The impact of monetary sanctions in the criminal justice system on both convicts and their family members. The study revealed that sometimes relatives are involved in paying fines, fees, and legal financial obligations for their family members. These payments can cause a strain in a family finances, cause emotional distress in a family and cause conflict. The results are especially relevant to the current study as court costs and related monetary requirements may be an indirect punishment for the family member not directly engaged in the crime. Economically, a family might also be under pressure if it has to raise funds for legal-related issues, fines, court proceedings, transportation or other charges linked to a family member's criminal involvement in the criminal justice system in the context of Southern Punjab (Boches et al., 2022).

Father incarceration affects families' economic circumstances and their use of public assistance. The study points to the fact that incarceration can have a negative impact on the available resources in the household, while also adding costs associated with incarceration. Families may need to wire funds to a loved one in prison, shop for needed supplies, send money for phone calls, and use money to get to the prison. These extra costs may be an added strain on families already struggling financially. This can, therefore, aggravate material hardship and make the cost of imprisonment greater. The link between the economic impact of crime and family is significant in the present study because it illustrates the manner in which the impact of crime may be passed on from the offender to the family, especially if the criminal was a key provider of income for the household (Turney, 2015).

Social exclusion of families with fathers in prison was explored. Their study indicates that there are mechanisms by which imprisonment can lead to social exclusion, including single parenthood and financial difficulties. A father's imprisonment can lead to a decrease in family income, a shift in family roles, and fewer opportunities for families to engage in social and economic activities. Financial hardship can then also contribute to social disadvantage, which can make it harder for families to sustain social relationships or take advantage of opportunities. This directly relates to the present research since it provides an opportunity to consider the financial impact on crime, as well as the social issues of the families of offenders within their communities (Besemer & Dennison, 2018).

The social and psychological issues that families face when a family member is incarcerated and when a prisoner returns home. The study reveals that family members are forced to draw on their own resources for coping, with few formal supports of assistance. Financial stress, emotional stress and change in family roles trigger various coping mechanisms in families. These pressures are a substantial socio-economic and psychological burden on the families of individuals who are in a relationship with someone who is a part of the justice system, the authors write. This study is relevant to the present study because it highlights the impact of crime on the lives of the individuals involved in the crime and extends the impact to the spouse, parent, sibling, and other relatives involved in everyday life (Hood & Gaston, 2022).

The study conducted on families visiting relatives in prison in Kashmir revealed that there are various kinds of burdens on the families when they visit relatives in prison. These include financial pressure, long-distance travel, rigid prison rules and emotional issues. The results are especially relevant to research in South Asia because they illustrate the expenses incurred by families in the process of incarceration, including multiple trips and strained relationships within families. This can be used to propose that prison visits, travel costs and emotional costs of keeping in touch are significant factors of the socio-economic cost of crime in Southern Punjab (Nisa, 2025).

In this study, researcher explored the experiences of children and caregivers who have been impacted by mothers' incarceration in Kashmir. The study came up with challenges relating to alternative care, education and stigma of incarceration. These results show that the effects of crime may be inter-generational, impacting on children who are not themselves offenders. If a mom is incarcerated, caretakers can be called on to take on more tasks, and the children can suffer from a disruption of their education and social life. This study is significant in the context of the southern part of Punjab as it shows the consequences of the imprisonment on the family level regarding child-care, education, social stigma, and family structure (Nisa & Eriksson, 2025).

The consequences of imprisonment for families should not simply be treated as an unintended “collateral consequence.” They believe in “sympiotic harms” meaning that individuals who are related to an offender are nonetheless impacted by the offender's imprisonment, even if they did not commit the offence. A family member can face financial, emotional, practical and social challenges due to the incarceration of the family member. The theoretical background you have mentioned is very relevant to your study as it is exactly about the effects of crime transmitted from the delinquent to innocent family members. It offers a solid theoretical framework for the analysis of the costs of courts, income loss, social stigma, family stress and other costs borne by the families of offenders in Southern Punjab (Condry & Minson, 2021).

The social implications of conviction and showed ways in which punishment can have effects beyond the sentence. The consequences are related to employment, housing, public assistance, family relationship, financial security and the social stigma. This can impact the offender's capacity to support financially the family and can put further strain on family finances. The study is relevant to the present study because the socio-economic consequence of crime can persist long after the punishment has been served, notably the difficulty in finding a job or sustaining an economy due to criminal records (Hoskins, 2018).

Economic conditions & social activities of prisoners' families. The study offers a valuable model to analyze the impact of incarceration on families of prisoners. It takes economic status of families and their social engagement into account, demonstrating how incarceration can impact families' functioning and relations to the broader social community. This has direct relevance of this current study, as the social and economic cost of crime should not just take into account the measurable economic impact of crime, but also less tangible social impacts such as social relationships, family interaction and social participation (Dzierżyńska-Breś, 2020).

1.1 Significance of the study

Offenders' family members are the ones who foot the bill for the price of delinquency in the current study. Having a family member in prison brings many social and economic problems. Many research studies have been conducted in many nations. There is a need to investigate many facets of criminals' re-entry into society. Therefore, this study aims to explore the phenomena of the criminal's family's acceptability in society and the interaction amongst the felonious and the world.

A significant number of criminals, both sexes included, originate from broken households due to fluctuating patterns in family structure and roles. It is plausible to conclude that a person with a greater level of integration with their family may have a more cheerful attitude on life, which may be associated with conforming behavior, and vice versa. Women's changing biological and criminal patterns are particularly troubling to social philosophers, social scientists, criminologists and others who deal with various aspects of society. A social and economic cost benefit analysis may be a key component in deciding how best to allocate funding to curtail crime activity. They can make policy makers and the general public more aware of the entire effects of crime on society and the possible benefits that could come from reducing crime. Estimates of the costs of specific crimes enable meaningful comparisons to be drawn between the cost and effectiveness of different crime prevention measures, which helps to inform decision making on the most effective policy measures. They can also aid in prioritization by directing scarce resources toward laws that, in addition to reducing crime, also minimize the harm that it causes.

Even though more attention is being paid to the economic toll of crime, not much research has dug into how these costs connect to the social and family dynamics that fuel violent behavior. This gap highlights the urgent need for deeper studies into the socio-economic and parental influences behind violence to create more well-rounded and budget-friendly prevention strategies.

2. METHODOLOGY

The present section describes the socio-economic cost of crime paid by families. The present study was conducted in south Punjab of Pakistan. Every district in south Punjab in which there were central jails.

2.1 Population

The present study was conducted on the population of all the families of criminals who were present in the jails of all South Punjab, Pakistan. The population in the study comprise all family members of prisoners who appointment these prisoners in jail. The present population in the jails found as followed.

Sr.	Selected Jails	Population
1	Central Jail Multan	1400
2	Central Jail Bahawalpur	1378
3	Central Jail of Dera Ghazi khan	1041

2.2 Sampling Procedure

The whole population represented by a true representative using a multistage sampling technique. At the first stage, the list of all jails in southern Punjab where family members and peer groups meet with prisoners was identified. Then randomly the household followers of the felonious were particular who come to visit them.

2.3 Sampling Size

In 1967 the statistician, Taro Yamane, formulated the Taro Yamane method for sample size to determine the sample size for a given population. The researchers used the method of determination of the sample.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Here

N= total population= 3819

e= significance error= 0.05

n=sample size

$$n = \frac{3819}{1 + (3819 * (0.05)^2)}$$

n=362

This research, therefore, had a sample of about 362 families of criminals.

2.4 Pre-testing

Pre-testing was done on fifteen persons to find out the feasibility of using the interview schedule. A number of changes were considered key following pre testing. This was one way to try and make the interview schedule more manageable. The computer-generated validity of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire for pre-testing was 0.69 (Cronbach's Alpha).

2.5 Technique for Data Collection

In this study, the approach to collecting the quantitative data was through questioning of the respondents in prison. Three region wise selected jails were used for data collection.

2.6 Data Processing

Data processing was linked with data analysis and data collecting. It involves structuring the field observations into a system, and then coding the system in a way that enables quantitative analysis. The technical process of coding was used to classify data and assign them numbers or symbols according to the class to which they belong. The researchers condensed the information to a few categories for ease in describing the data and for statistical analysis.

2.7 Data Analysis

After data collection and processing, data was then fed in the computer and analyzed using SPSS program version 22. Data analysis makes use of the following statistical methods.

2.8 Percentage

Percentages are numbers that are the result of two frequency distributions being combined. To work out percentages, the following formula was used:

$$P = F/N$$

Where:

P = percentage.

F = Absolute frequency.

N = Total number of items

2.9 Independent sample t-test

The independent t-test is an inferential statistical test used to evaluate whether or not there is a statistically significant difference between two groups. If the means of two distinct groups are different then it is significant. An independent categorical variable that has two levels or groups and a continuous dependent variable must exist in order to run an independent t-test.

2.10 ANOVA (One Way)

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to determine if there are statistically significant differences among the means of three or more independent variables to find out if there are different groups.

3. RESULTS

Table 1: Demographic Profile of criminals

	Categories	Frequency	Percent
Age	19-28	155	42.8
	29-38	95	26.2
	39-48	47	13.0
	48-more	65	18.0
Gender of criminal	Male	341	94.2
	Female	21	5.8
Qualification of offender	Illiterate	141	39.0
	Primary	58	16.0
	Middle	49	13.5

	Matric	79	21.8
	B.A	21	5.8
	M.A	9	2.5
	Quran e Pak	5	1.4
Religion of offender	Muslim	362	100.0
	Non-Muslim	0	0.0
Marital status	Single	112	30.9
	Married	233	64.4
	Separated	9	2.5
	Divorced	8	2.2
	less than one years	156	43.1
Time span in jail	1-5 years	140	38.7
	6-10 years	40	11.0
	11-15 years	18	5.0
	16-20 years	8	2.2

Table 1 shows the demographic information of the respondents. The majority of the participants were married (233) and 112 were single offenders, 9 were separated and 8 were divorced convicts. The average period spent in jail by the 156 convicts is less than one year. An average of 16 years was spent in jail by the 140 respondents' offenders, but 80 of the offenders were in jail for sixteen to twenty years. 40% of the offenders served 6 –10 years in jail, and only 5% served 11 –15 years. Two per cent (2.2 per cent) of the convicts served 16 to 20 years in prison.

Table 2: Demographic Profile of offender's family

	Categories	Frequency	Percent
Family type of offender's family	Joint	229	63.3
	nuclear	131	36.2
	separate	2	.6
Family income of offender's family	less than 10-10000	40	11.0
	10001-20000	92	25.4
	20001-30000	79	21.8
	30001-40000	74	20.4
	40001-50000	22	6.1
	50001-above	55	15.2
Living area of offender's family	Rural area	266	73.5
	Urban Area	96	26.5
Family members of offender's family	1-5	134	37.0
	6-10	161	44.5
	11-15	49	13.5
	16-20	6	1.7
	21-above	12	3.3
Visits of offender's family in jail	Weekly	259	71.5
	after 15 days	31	8.6
	after a month	68	18.8
	Often	4	1.1

According to the data in the table 2, 63.3 percent of offenders' families are joint, 36.2% are nuclear, and just 6.6% live alone. The chart showed that the majority of inmates were from the lower class because 25% of offenders' families' incomes fell between 10001 and 20000. The perpetrators' family's 20% income ranged from 20001 to 40000. According to this data, only a small number of upper-class households commit crimes.

Most offenders were from rural areas, with 73.5 per cent of their families being from rural areas. Just 26.5 per cent of offenders were from metropolitan areas. The family members of 44.5 per cent of the offenders were between the ages of 6 and 10, suggesting that they shared a family unit. Visits to the jail on a weekly basis were arranged to talk with the family of the criminals. 71.5 percent of respondents went to the jail weekly. Due to restricted resources, 18.8 per cent said they went back a month later to visit a family member.

Table 3: Occupation

Occupation	Categories	Frequency	Percent
Occupation of the offenders	Govt Employee	24	6.6
	Unemployed	23	6.4
	Landlord	26	7.2
	Farmer	58	16.0
	Transporter/ Driver	30	8.3
	Businessman	45	12.4
	Laborer	113	31.2
	rickshaw driver/loader driver	19	5.2
	private job	24	6.6
Occupation of the offenders' families	Govt. Employee	27	7.5
	Unemployed	13	3.6
	Landlord	44	12.2
	Farmer	67	18.5
	Transporter/ Driver	17	4.7
	Businessman	48	13.3
	Laborer	132	36.5
	rickshaw driver/loader driver	14	3.8

According to the table 3, 31.2 % perpetrators were workers, while 36.5 percent of the offenders' families were workers.16 percent of offenders were agriculturalists, and their family occupation was agricultural. Businessmen accounted for 18.5 per cent offenders and 13.3 per cent of them were family-owned companies. 8.3% were transporters/drivers, whereas 4.7% were landlords. Government employees' own family members made up 7.5%, and the 6.6% consisted of employees of the government.

Table 5: Distance of offenders' homes from jail

Categories	Frequency	Percent
Less than 20 km	79	21.8
21-60 km	121	33.4
61-100km	74	20.4
101-140 km	28	7.7
141-180 km	16	4.4
181-220 km	14	3.9
261-300 km	6	1.7
more than 301 km	24	6.6
Total	362	100.0

Results of the table 5 shows that detachment of 21.8% criminals' house was 20 km from jail, Only 1.7 percent of respondents traveled between 261 km and 300 km, while 6.6 percent traveled more than 300 km.

3.1 Hypotheses Testing

H1: Depending on the type of crime, offenders' families had varying mean levels of social group engagement.

H2: Depending on the sort of crime, offenders' families deal with social groups at varying mean levels.

H3: Depending on the type of offense, the average number of invitations from social groups for various events varies for the families of offenders.

Table 6: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Level of interaction	Between Groups	270.284	9	30.032		
	Within Groups	2177.023	352	6.185	4.856	.000
	Total	2447.307	361			
Level of dealing	Between Groups	243.329	9	27.037		
	Within Groups	1880.185	352	5.341	5.062	.000
	Total	2123.514	361			
Level of invitations from others	Between Groups	148.489	9	16.499		
	Within Groups	2338.751	352	6.644	2.483	.009
	Total	2487.240	361			

The consequences show in table 6 that the mean figure of engagement, dealing and offer for various admittance of each social group differ significantly according to the type of offence committed by the offender for his/her family. It is clear that the nature of the crime has an impact on all aspects of the offenders' families' lives. Significant (high intensity) crimes have a detrimental effect on families of the offenders. Murder is taken very seriously, but rape is a much worse crime. This renders rape offenders' "monsters" and their families "contaminated," leading to a general condemnation of family members. This results in demonization of the person and the family of the rapist, who is then deemed "contaminated" and whose family is also.

H4: Depending on the sort of crime, the average degree to which offenders' families share personal issues with social groups varies.

H5: Depending on the type of crime, offenders' families have varying mean levels of participation in social organizations and decision-making.

H6: Depending on the type of crime, offenders' families have varying mean levels of satisfaction with their interactions with social organization.

H7: Depending on the type of crime, the average degree of stigmatization varies for offenders' family.

Table 7: ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Share personal problems	Between Groups	159.293	9	17.699		
	Within Groups	2815.613	352	7.999	2.213	.021
	Total	2974.906	361			
Participate in decision making	Between Groups	172.223	9	19.136		
	Within Groups	2864.697	352	8.138	2.351	.014
	Total	3036.920	361			
Level of satisfaction	Between Groups	172.850	9	19.206	2.141	.026

Level of stigmatization	Within Groups	3157.636	352	8.971	8.520	.000
	Total	3330.486	361			
	Between Groups	672.605	9	74.734		
	Within Groups	3087.538	352	8.771		
	Total	3760.144	361			

There are multiple challenges that must be addressed by criminal's families. One of these is to be excluded and isolated from the mainstream. From the above table 7, it is also observed that the offender's families had to avoid some aspects of social life including not talking about their problems, not seeking advice in decision making etc. These things make people feel unwanted, leave them feeling their social life is not satisfactory and thus feel excluded. This study identified that the nature of the crime the offender had committed affected the level of stigmatization, satisfaction, decision involvement and sharing of private concerns. Those who lose relatives to rape and murder are more to be shamed, than those who lose due to thievery and crime.

H8: The mean level of interaction with social groups is different for different family types of offender's family

H9: The mean level of dealing with social groups is different for different family types of offender's family

H10: The mean level of sharing personal problems with social groups is different for different family types of offender's family

H11: The mean level of participation in decision making along with social groups is different for different family types of offenders' family

H12: The mean level of satisfaction with social groups is different for different family types of offender's family

H13: The mean level of stigmatization form social groups is different for different family types of offender's family

H8: The average degree of social group engagement varies depending on the type of offender's family.

H9: The average degree of social group interaction varies depending on the type of offender's family.

H10: The average degree of disclosing personal issues to social groups varies depending on the type of offender's family.

H11: The average degree of involvement in social groups and decision-making varies according on the type of offender's family.

H12: The average degree of satisfaction with social groups varies depending on the type of offender's family.

H13: The average degree of social group stigmatization varies depending on the type of offender's family.

H14: The average number of invitations from social groups varies depending on the type of offender's family.

Table 8: Group Statistics

	Family type of offender's family	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Level of interaction	Joint	229	13.0393	2.36444	.15625
	Nuclear	131	11.7786	2.81286	.24576
Level of dealing	Joint	229	13.3493	2.08383	.13770

Level of problem sharing	Nuclear	131	12.5878	2.87929	.25156
	Joint	229	10.4891	2.84329	.18789
Level of decision participation	Nuclear	131	10.2137	2.92734	.25576
	Joint	229	10.8166	2.85336	.18856
Level of satisfaction	Nuclear	131	10.2290	2.97571	.25999
	Joint	229	9.1354	3.00643	.19867
Level of stigmatization	Nuclear	131	9.9237	3.05996	.26735
	Joint	229	7.3013	3.10363	.20509
Level of invitation from others	Nuclear	131	8.3053	3.35787	.29338
	Joint	229	11.0349	2.52680	.16698
	Nuclear	131	10.5191	2.78278	.24313

Table 8 presents group statistics comparing offenders from joint and nuclear families across various dimensions. Respondents from joint families reported higher mean levels of interaction, dealing, problem sharing, decision participation, and invitations from others. Conversely, nuclear-family respondents demonstrated higher mean levels of satisfaction and stigmatization, indicating differences in familial and social experiences.

Table 9: Independent Sample T-test

		t	df	Sig
Level of interaction	Equal variances assumed	4.537	358	.000
Level of dealing	Equal variances assumed	2.893	358	.004
Level of problem sharing	Equal variances assumed	.875	358	.382
Level of decision participation	Equal variances assumed	1.851	358	.065
Level of satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	-2.378	358	.018
Level of stigmatization	Equal variances assumed	-2.866	358	.004
Level of invitation from others	Equal variances assumed	1.796	358	.073

Table 9 shows that other members of the family provide moral support to the joint family. The nuclear families have to suffer alone. The type of family in which offenders live is also related to the degree of contact with their social groups, level of dealings, level of contentment and level of stigmatization as seen in the above table. While expressing their issues, participation in decision making, and the number of invites to social events were unaffected by family type (see table 9).

3.2 One Way Analysis of variance

Hypothesis No. 15: The cost of crime paid by a family increase with the severity of the offense.

The findings of table 10 showed that every kind of crime has a substantial financial cost that is borne by the families. According to the One-Way analysis of variance, depending on the type of offense, there are significant differences in the expense of traveling to see the offender and paying for legal representation. Furthermore, compared to other family crimes, terrorism has the biggest economic cost, according to the post hoc Duncan test results. However, the post Hoc Duncan test showed that the cost of obtaining a lawyer did not significantly differ depending on the type of offense. However, a non-parametric test (Post Hoc Duncan) revealed that a murder case was the one in which the lawyers spent the most money. Overall, the evidence supported the hypothesis. The cost of crime to the family increases with the severity of the crime.

Table 10: ANOVA

Statement		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What is the travelling cost during one visit in jail?	Between Groups	91.838	9	10.204	5.059	.000
	Within Groups	709.944	352	2.017		
	Total	801.782	361			
What is the total expense of one visit?	Between Groups	52.626	9	5.847	4.654	.000
	Within Groups	442.250	352	1.256		
	Total	494.876	361			
How much does the offender's family pay to the lawyer?	Between Groups	68.667	9	7.630	3.184	.001
	Within Groups	843.388	352	2.396		
	Total	912.055	361			

4. DISCUSSION

Most offenders' relatives reported that having a family member imprisoned affected them psychologically. It became a source of psychological stress since family acceptability was extremely low in society, making it difficult for society to accept the prisoners' families as regular citizens. People omit the prisoner's family from their baradari's (The findings demonstrated the protective factors that have prevented criminal involvement among peer groups, including personal and family values, knowledge and understanding, economic prospects, parents help, counseling and mentorship, and legal repercussions. The criminal's family structure was a significant factor, where the criminal was in incarcerated or moved freely in society (Asongwed, 2025).

Stigmatization negatively impacted the majority of offender families. Families and relatives invited approximately fifty people to their family occasions. Families of criminals gladly engage in many events, functions, and daily activities. The crime and jail had a significant impact on the socialization of criminals' offspring and siblings. The majority of respondents stated that criminal families experienced increasing dangers after being imprisoned (Breen, 2008).

5. CONCLUSION

The main objectives of the study were to determine the social and economic problems faced by the families of prisoners. The criminal families were also stigmatized and had financial problems. These issues extended beyond the social and economic difficulties already experienced by the family, and included the length of the jail sentence. In this study, it is recommended that the incarceration of a family member can have a serious social, psychological, and economical effect on the children and the family member. To examine the effects of specific life experiences (e.g., incarceration) on individuals across time, quantitative data should be used. Research was really challenging because prisoner families is a neglected population. This research could help to illuminate the importance of connecting inmates to their families, and the best kind and amount of contact. Most of the time, multiple risk factors are present in the child's world, culture, and family, and each has only a small amount of risk for the child and family.

A prisoner's family is said to be lost, forgotten, hidden and invisible. These families and their concerns, environmental issues and needs have only recently come into the spotlight when it comes to children, spouses, parents and grandparents. The expenses were very high and for a long duration, both for the offender and to the criminal. This may cause family members to hide the cause of the family member's absence from his or her friends and others in the larger community so as to avoid possible stigmatization, thus increasing their stress levels.

After a member of the family is imprisoned, they are likely to feel stigmatized. According to the study, the family is struggling financially, socially, and emotionally. When a family member is imprisoned, the family may be forced to leave their home in order to be closer to the prisoner or to avoid social stigmatization. A relationship's captivity may be emotionally and physically damaging. A sense of loss and hopelessness can be increased for prisoners' partners by a loss of money, social isolation, communication difficulties, relationship erosion, and added parental obligations. Families' financial burdens linked with imprisonment are well documented. These families' experiences have nearly always featured extreme financial problems.

5.1 Suggestions/ Recommendations

- Prison Service can facilitate offenders having positive contact with families and mitigate negative impact of imprisonment on families
- Families often limited their interactions with people in prison because of the costs of maintaining the relationship. The most obvious conclusion is that families who persist in their support of a prisoner run the risk of undermining their own social and financial status to support the prisoner and maintain the family connection. Families are always forced to either accept what's happening in their lives outside the jail, or accept the connection with someone in jail.
- Prisoners' wives might experience difficulties because of limited knowledge about prison policies, such as visiting and contact policies. Keeping in touch may be challenging due to many factors like long booking counter lines, low visiting hours, mobility, and the cost and distance of the trip.
- Families frequently think their family members in jail aren't even criminals. Families need to understand and do everything possible to not give the wrong person any items of value.
- The government should create a policy on what actions criminals must take in prison to gain the skills they need and how much they make, and give that money to the families of the criminals. To prevent any financial hardship on criminals' families due to one family member leaving.

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of Interest

Authors declared NO conflict of interest.

Funding Source

The authors received NO funding to conduct this study.

ORCID iDs

Asia Rasool¹  <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2486-6992>
Saima Afzal²  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1995-3592>

REFERENCES

- Allen, R. C. (1996). Socioeconomic conditions and property crime: A comprehensive review and test of the professional literature. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 55(3), 293-308.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1536-7150.1996.tb02311.x>

- Anderson, D. A. (1999). The aggregate burden of crime. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 42(2), 611-642. <https://doi.org/10.1086/467436>
- Besemer, K. L., & Dennison, S. M. (2018). Social exclusion in families affected by paternal imprisonment. *Journal of Criminology*, 51(2), 221-238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865817701530>
- Boches, D. J., Martin, B. T., Giuffre, A., Sanchez, A., Sutherland, A. L., & Shannon, S. K. (2022). Monetary sanctions and symbiotic harms. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 8(2), 98-115. <https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2022.8.2.05>
- Breen, J. (2008). Prisoners' families and the ripple effects of imprisonment. *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 97(385), 59-71. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25660536>
- Buvinic, M., Morrison, A., & Shifter, M. (1999). Violence in Latin America and the Caribbean: A framework for action. <https://doi.org/10.18235/0008938>
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Mauer, M. (2003). *Invisible punishment: The collateral consequences of mass imprisonment*. The New Press.
- Condry, R., & Minson, S. (2021). Conceptualizing the effects of imprisonment on families: Collateral consequences, secondary punishment, or symbiotic harms? *Theoretical Criminology*, 25(4), 540-558. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480619897078>
- Dzierżyńska-Breś, S. (2020). The economic situation and social interactions of prisoners' families. *Interdyscyplinarne Konteksty Pedagogiki Specjalnej*(29), 193-210. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ikps.2020.29.09>
- Hood, B. J., & Gaston, S. (2022). How families respond to the collateral consequences of incarceration and prisoner reentry. *Family Relations*, 71(3), 1175-1190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12616>
- Hoskins, Z. (2018). Criminalization and the collateral consequences of conviction. *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, 12(4), 625-639. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11572-017-9449-2>
- Mauer, M., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2002). *Invisible punishment*. New York: The New Press.
- Miller, T. R. (1996). *Victim costs and consequences: A new look*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of ...
- Nisa, R. u. (2025). Double jeopardy for families of prisoners in Kashmir: A focus on prison visiting experiences. *Probation Journal*, 72(3), 298-316. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02645505241247651>
- Nisa, R. u., & Eriksson, A. (2025). Children of women prisoners in Kashmir: Consequences of structural and social invisibility. *Journal of Criminology*, 58(3), 389-406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26338076251315175>
- Roman, J., & Farrell, G. (2002). Cost-benefit analysis for crime prevention: opportunity costs, routine savings and crime externalities. <https://isv.org.uk/>
- Sansfacon, D. (2004). Handle with care: Cost-benefit studies and crime prevention. European Seminar on Costs and the Distribution of Costs of Crime and Disorder and Crime Prevention, Helsinki. https://eucpn.org/sites/default/files/document/files/21._a_guide_on_how_to_determine_costs_and_benefits_of_crime_prevention.pdf
- Turney, K. (2015). Paternal incarceration and children's food insecurity: A consideration of variation and mechanisms. *Social Service Review*, 89(2), 335-367. <https://doi.org/10.1086/681704>
- Wright, L., & Seymour, C. (2000). *Working with children and families separated by incarceration: A handbook for child welfare agencies*. Child Welfare League of Amer.