



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Master's Theses


Graduate College

8-1976

An Evaluation of the Kalamazoo County Jail Rehabilitation Program

Janice Eileen Grady

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses

 Part of the Criminology Commons, and the Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy Commons

Recommended Citation

Grady, Janice Eileen, "An Evaluation of the Kalamazoo County Jail Rehabilitation Program" (1976).
Master's Theses. 2342.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/2342

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**AN EVALUATION OF THE KALAMAZOO
COUNTY JAIL REHABILITATION PROGRAM**

by

Janice Eileen Grady

**A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Master of Arts**

**Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1976**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In carrying out this project, I received unending support and cooperation from many people, both professionally and in friends. Without this assistance, completion of this project would not have been possible, and so I would like to acknowledge: The Rehabilitation Staff of the Kalamazoo County Jail and Richard Bellingham, Professors Malcolm Robertson, Louise Kent and Chris Koronakos. A special thanks to James Secord, my Locus of Inspiration, who gave me the Self-Control to carry on, and finally to my typist, Susan Dickerman, whose "final touch" made all this readable.

Janice Eileen Grady

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

MASTERS THESIS

M-8827

GRADY, Janice Eileen
AN EVALUATION OF THE KALAMAZOO COUNTY
JAIL REHABILITATION PROGRAM.

Western Michigan University, M.A., 1976
Psychology, clinical

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Historical Background of Penal Ideologies	1
	Background of Evaluations of Rehabilitation	2
II	RESEARCH	6
	Locus of Control	6
	Self-Control	8
III	METHOD	11
	Sample	11
	Materials	11
	Measurement Variable	11
IV	PROCEDURE	17
	Scoring	18
	Reliability	18
	Control	19
	Additions	19
V	RESULTS	20
VI	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	26
VII	REFERENCES	29
VIII	APPENDIX	31
	Appendix A	32

INTRODUCTION

Historical Background of Penal Ideologies

In the past, inmates of our prison systems were treated under the philosophy of retribution; the inmate was incarcerated in order to pay for his offense against society. The criminal owed society for his wrong-doing and, therefore, he was in jail to be punished and to repent. The jail was a place to lock away criminals and keep them from harming the "outside" world.

As crime rates rose and jails became filled with second and third time offenders, a new approach of "cure the inmate" was implemented in corrections. Under this ideology, such techniques as Behavior Therapy, Psychosurgery, Aversion Therapy, Psychotherapy, and Drug Therapy were utilized (Dirk, 1974). However, recidivism rates still climbed and as evaluators stated, the programs were only serving to make the guards' jobs easier as their punitive ideologies were shaping institutional neurosis that made depersonalized passive, non-assertive inmates (Holland, 1974; Saunders, 1974).

As a result of Jenkins' (1974) longitudinal follow-up evaluation, the aim of rehabilitation in corrections became more pragmatic with the introduction of vocational training, educational training, problem-solving, etc. Jenkins urged that programs be geared to aiding the inmate in his specific deficit area in coping with the demands of outside functioning. His research distinguishes a common set of failings in inmates who are released from jail only to commit more offenses. Jenkins

found recidivists were often dropouts, unemployed, and lacked in vocational skills, interpersonal skills, decision-making, managing and budgeting skills.

Background of Evaluations of Rehabilitation

Since the ideology of rehabilitation has become widespread in corrections, with it has come the need for evaluation of rehabilitation programs. Martinson (1975) reviews evaluations on correction systems and has examined these studies by categorizing them according to a cross-section of independent and dependent variables as follows: recidivism, institutional adjustment, vocational adjustment, educational achievement, drug and alcohol re-addiction, imprisonment, parole, casework and individual counseling, skill development, individual psychotherapy, group methods, milieu therapy, partial physical custody, medical methods, leisure time activities. After rigorous assessment using empirical data and methodology analyses, Martinson states, "...there is little evidence in these studies that any prevailing mode of correctional treatment has a decisive effect in reducing the recidivism of convicted offenders." (1975, p. 8).

Robison and Smith (1971) examined several corrective studies and have a similar conclusion to their survey, "...there is no evidence to support any program's claim to superior rehabilitative efficacy." (1975, p. 8).

Adams (1975) presented the view that assessment of evaluation studies should go beyond the rigorous empirical data and methodology considerations of the above surveys and examine assessment in terms of

immediate impact on operations and long range effects as additions to criminal theory, etc.

As evidenced in the recent legislation requiring all Michigan correctional systems to embody a rehabilitation program in their operation, the significance of rehabilitation programs has been established. As such, the need for constructive evaluations of these programs also arises. In the past, rehabilitation evaluations have been of two basic types: 1) the pre- and post-testing of program-oriented variables, e.g., testing specific program training skills - an inmate's educational progress during the program; and 2) recidivism rates. Both of these approaches carry underlying assumptions which may weaken their value as evaluative tools.

Recidivism rates assume that all inmates who offend after release are convicted; this is not always true. Pre- and post-testing may not be evaluating the inmate's real learning, i.e., internalization, generalization and application of new responses, but rather his response to demand characteristics of testing.

To circumvent the above handicaps of past evaluations in correctional rehabilitation programs, the aim of this study was two-fold: 1) to evaluate a rehabilitation program by directly testing its "rehabilitating effects" on the inmate while he is still in jail. (Since the aim of all rehabilitation programs is to train the inmate to be able to survive, i.e., hold a job, stay out of jail, as a responsible member of society, the "rehabilitation effect" was viewed as a survival skill in a democratic society. Thus, this study evaluated rehabilitation

from a goal oriented, i.e., teaching survival skills, variable approach. And, 2) to evaluate the inmates' progress in an inconspicuous approach, i.e., the inmate is unaware that he is being tested, and to observe the inmate in a setting which provides behavior which is more natural (and hopefully more indicative of responses that will be generalized to his "street life").

This study has evaluated the rehabilitation program at the Kalamazoo County Jail. The program is based on the Carkuff concept of Human Resource Development. The model is a systematic skill acquisition approach. The major emphasis is to raise the individual's social-interpersonal level of functioning along with parallel gains in intellectual and physical development. The inmate is trained in five new responses: attending, responding, discriminating, communicating, and initiating, in an effort to give him insight into his emotional problems. These skills provide devices for exploration, which lead to an understanding that fosters accurate decision-making. In sum, this rehabilitation ideology views the failing of the inmate to be represented in the equation that states: "the quality and quantity of inmate skills are not equal to survival." (Devine, 1974, p. 3).

Regardless of the particular focus of any rehabilitation program, the overall goal of every rehabilitation program is identical; to change the inmate from a criminal to a law-abiding citizen. The requirement for all who seek to fulfill this role of a citizen living in a democracy is the ability to accept the responsibility of freedom. Since citizenship involves membership in a state, inherent in being

a citizen is living with other people. The ideology of democracy entails freedom for all living under its state. Essential to survival of such a concept is recognition that such a "group" freedom can only be practiced as a conditional freedom.

More specifically, each member is free to do as he desires as long as it does not infringe on the freedom of others. Thus, inherent in conditional freedom is the obligation to exercise one's freedom within one's personal boundaries. This means freedom only comes with its requirement skill of responsibility.

In more specific terms, this requirement is for effective and responsible freedom of choice which is contingent upon four basic factors: 1) awareness of existing alternatives, 2) awareness and respect for other's reactions to these alternatives, 3) awareness and respect for one's own reaction to the alternatives, and 4) a reflective rational basis for decision (Fagan, Long, and Stevens, 1975).

In order for the inmate to become a law-abiding citizen, i.e., responsible member in a democratic society, he must possess basically two essentials to the fulfillment of the role: 1) an understanding of what freedom means, and 2) the ability to control his behavior within the demands of a conditional freedom (responsibility = the ability to respond rather than react or withdraw).

This study was designed to evaluate the rehabilitation program at the Kalamazoo County Jail upon the above two elements delineated as requirements to an inmate's successful training to become a responsible citizen.

RESEARCH

Locus of Control

In reviewing the literature (mainly the areas of internalization, socialization, and responsibility research), the author found the indices of Locus of Control and Self Control to be valid measures of the above established elements of responsible citizenry.

Internalization is derived from the research in the area of "Locus of Control". Locus of Control refers to one's belief as to the source of control in one's life. The external orientation holds the belief that one is at the mercy of his environment, luck, chance, fate, powerful others preordain what happens to a person in his life. One cannot predict the effect of behavior since powerful others control or because the world is too complex and confusing. The internal orientation holds the belief in personal control of the occurrence of or lack of occurrence of rewards in one's environment; one can influence and control the environment.

The I-E dimension is an important individual difference variable that was introduced by Rotter (1966) in a series of systematic social learning studies. Through the research of Rotter and his research associates, an I-E scale was developed to measure the degree of internality versus externality subjects display by their choices of belief statements of locus of control on a 29-item forced-choice test.

Follow-up research on I-E subjects has shown the following characteristics: internal inmates learned more than external inmates did about reformatory rules, parole rules and long-range economic

facts that would help one get along in the outside world (Seeman, 1963). Quit smoking studies (James, Woodruff, and Werner, 1965) demonstrate internals to have more control over themselves than external subjects. When asked to bet on their judgements, externals switched to majority opinion, while internals did not sway to conformity (Crowne and Liverant, 1963). Phares, Wilson and Klyver (1971) and Davis and Davis' (1973) studies indicate that internals assume greater responsibility for their own failure than do externals. Phares et al. (1968), Gore and Rotter (1963), Strickland (1965) showed that internals are more action-oriented, following threat and are more prone to take steps to improve themselves than externals. Phares (1971) found externals tend to reduce the reinforcing qualities of tasks on which they failed to a greater extent than do internals. This study, as well as Efran's (1963), Lipp et al. (1968), and Phares et al. (1968), elucidate the potential defensive function of the external orientation. Phares, Wilson and Klyver (1971) demonstrated that internals show a greater proclivity for the self-attribution of blame than externals do. The internals show a greater tendency to be less blaming of forces outside themselves following failure in a specific situation.

In summary, I-E research indicates that internal control is associated with self-assertiveness, activism, hopefulness, positive coping; the external orientation is associated with defeatism, helplessness, passivity, and depression (McGee, Crandall, 1968; Seeman and Liverant, 1962).

Overall, belief in internality of control is held to be a decisive element in the process of client change. Research indicates that the clients who improved in psychotherapy, sustained an increased belief in internal control (Felton and Briggs, 1972; Gillis and Jessor, 1970).

In examining the above research in the area of I-E, the author used Locus of Control as an index for the first variable (previously described as "understanding what freedom means") on the following grounds. In order for the inmate to gain the concept "conditional freedom of a democratic society", he must believe that he does have control over his environment, i.e., Locus of Control - self), a choice of actions in his behavior, and he must accept responsibility for his behavior. The above research indicates that such elements are embodied in an internal orientation, i.e., one who scores high on internal scale of the I-E index.

Self-Control

The second variable - the ability to control one's behavior within the demands of a conditional freedom, was delineated into two areas: 1) the requirement of a conditional freedom, and 2) responsibility. Conditional freedom requires that one is able to cope with the frustration of unfulfilled needs, i.e., living with others means that all will not always have their wants fulfilled. One must be able to determine when his needs can be fulfilled without infringing on the rights of others and when they cannot (decision-making). Responsibility requires the ability to respond, i.e., purposeful, intentional, reflexive

action rather than impulsive reaction or withdrawal.

In reviewing the literature, frustration tolerance (Bullock, 1972), decision-making (Reali and Hall, 1970), impulsivity versus reflexivity (Drake, 1970), intentionality and responsibility (Kohlberg, 1964), inhibition training (Dykman, Ackerman and Clements, 1971), the author found "self-control" to be the variable most representative of the skill embodying the previously delineated requirements to achieving Element 2 of this study, i.e., the ability to control one's behavior.

Fagen (1975) operationally defined self-control into eight cluster skills: selection, storage, sequencing and ordering, anticipating consequences, appreciating feelings, managing frustration, inhibition and delay, and relaxation. Fagen, Stevens and Long (1975) established these clusters by studying self-control through a literature review, shared reflection among teachers interviewed, and a process of classroom observation of disruptive behaviors of school children in both normal and special education classes. They tested these clusters in an experimental project in which teachers were trained in implementing the self-control curriculum that they had designed from their studies. A two-year follow-up of the project showed significant improvement in school adjustment, learning rates, and self-control of the children under the project curriculum. This study utilized Fagen's self-control sub-skills as measurement variables for Element 2 (the ability to control one's behavior).

The hypothesis of this study is that rehabilitation training of

the Kalamazoo County Jail effectively teaches inmates survival skills to enable them to be responsible citizens; specifically, inmates with rehabilitation training score more self-controlled and less externalized in their responses to tests across these control dimensions than inmates who have not received rehabilitation training.

METHOD

Sample

Subjects consisted of two groups of ten inmates. Sample I was composed of the first ten inmates to apply to the rehabilitation program during the two weeks prior to testing. Sample II was composed of the top ten inmates already enrolled in the rehabilitation program. These inmates had achieved the highest ratings on the program scoring system and had been enrolled in rehabilitation for the longest period of time. (Scoring system = all rehabilitation inmates were given daily points for their performance in rehabilitation classes throughout the week. As they accumulate specified amounts of points, they progress to higher levels.) Subjects were matched across age (range of 17 years to 37 years for both groups), race (five blacks and five whites), sex (all males) and offenses (range was armed robbery, drug, breaking and entering, bad checks). None of the inmates in Sample I had been through rehabilitation before testing.

Materials

The only materials utilized were pads of paper, pens, and a stop watch. Use of a tape recorder was cancelled to eliminate curiosity seen during pre-testing of observations of inmates' free play.

Measurement Variables

Variables:

1. Independent Variable - Training Effect

2. Dependent Variable - Control = a) Locus of Control
b) Self-Control

Defined:

1. Locus of Control - one's perception of the source of happenings
in one's life.

Locus of Control is divided into two kinds: internal and external.

- a. Internal Control

The belief that events are contingent upon one's own behavior, or that one has the power to influence situational outcomes. (Self-attribution of responsibility for one's own behavior.)

- b. External Control

Orientation that views what happens as a matter of fate, luck, or in the hands of some powerful outside force. (World too complex and confusing to control the environment - projection of responsibility for behavior.)

2. Self-Control - ability to inhibit or restrain behavior and the capacity to accept and express impulses through socially acceptable modes. Self-control entails two basic abilities:

- a. Control over internals - impulse control
- b. Control over externals - regulation of stimuli taken in.

Scoring:

1. Locus of Control - Measured by recording inmates' causal

statements, i.e., only statements that deal with attribution of responsibility - cause and effect.

Examples: "Sorry, nice pass. I wasn't fast enough." (Internal) versus "Your fault, bad pass." (External)

2. All inmates were administered Rotter's 29-item I-E Test. Scores were determined by the number of "E" responses divided by total responses.

3. Self-Control - measured by inmates' performance on five tasks presented in the Physical Education class. The five tasks were as follows:

a. Following Directions - defined as the ability to transmit verbal mand into behavior, as directed, completely and uninterrupted.

Task: Mand (given to all inmates before the Physical Education class)

"Tony wants you to start right away today, so take off your greens and run ten laps before you start shooting."

Scoring: All inmates scored either "U" (uncontrolled) versus "C" (controlled) according to the following scale:

Criteria: Once inmate steps onto court, he is given ten seconds to take off greens

and begin running laps immediately,
and complete all ten laps without
stopping to interact with another.

Uncontrolled Response (Any of these)

- delays over ten seconds after enters court area (off steps)
- does not complete full mand
- stops running before completion and interrupts another by interacting

Controlled Response

- begins laps within ten second standard, completes ten laps without interruption for interaction

- b. Concentration - ability to maintain full attention to speaker, keeping eye contact and verbal silence until completion of his talk.

Task: Inmates told to listen up at center circle, while they are seated facing instructor; instructor gives directions (written out ahead of time - one minute in length); at same time another staff member is placed at the end of court and shoots baskets during instructor's talk.

Responses:

Criteria - full attending, eye contact, silence during entire talk.

Controlled: Inmates override temptation to distraction and maintains eye contact and silence during entire presentation.

Uncontrolled: Inmate breaks attention to speaker - turns head, breaks eye contact, motions to another, makes verbal comments.

- c. Inhibition and Delay - ability to postpone behavior to future response or to alternate response.

Task: While inmates are shooting baskets in free-play warm-up prior to class, they are told to "Stop shooting, put balls down and line up for exercises."

Responses:

Controlled: Inmate immediately stops shooting, puts ball away and proceeds to line up in ten seconds from end of mand.

Uncontrolled: Inmate takes another shot after mand, passes ball to another, doesn't line up within ten seconds after mand is given. (Any of these)

- d. Managing Frustration - ability to inhibit inappropriate behavior, i.e., "off task behavior", any behavior which interrupts smooth functioning to task at hand or delays immediate action to new task assigned, and to respond appropriately to one's role at hand.

Task: Inmates are told since they have had a poor percentage of passing, a new rule is being held. Only two bounces to a dribble are allowed. If violated, the ball is turned over to the other team and all players (of both teams) must immediately line up for a three-lap consequence.

Responses:

Uncontrolled: Inmate gripes; delays, lines up in more than

five second criterion.

Controlled: Lines up in five second criterion; no gripes or physical delays.

- e. Anticipating Consequences - ability to weigh alternatives and determine choice of action on reflexive basis, i.e., taking results of each action into consideration before choosing action.

Task: Inmates are told they each have a chance to take one shot from any location on the floor. If the shot is made, they will not have to run one of their laps; if missed, they must run five extra laps.

Responses:

Controlled: All percentage shots (five feet or less from the basket) taken, including lay-up shots

Uncontrolled: Shots over five feet in distance from the hoop.

PROCEDURE

Tests were run over a two-week period during 60 min. sessions which met three times weekly. The untrained group underwent two additional sessions prior to testing in order to establish them to the routine of the Physical Education class. Physical Education routine was as follows: inmates entered the gym, removed greens with gym clothes under them, free shooting for three min., floor exercises drill, ten laps and basketball scrimmage. One test of self-control was inconspicuously introduced into the routine of gym class each day in identical sequence for both groups. The sequence was as follows: Anticipating Consequences, Inhibition and Delay, Following Directions, Concentration and Managing Frustration. The criteria from these values of the Independent Variable (self-control) were established in accordance with Fagen's curriculum. Establishment of the frustration task was made at a prior date by evaluating two other groups of inmates (apart from the above samples) responses to a one-lap consequence for violation of the dribble rule used in frustration task and a five-lap consequence. This pre-test set the extremes and so a three-lap criterion was used for this study as a measure of stimulus to frustration at a medium point. All task criteria of this study were reviewed with the previous Physical Education teacher at the jail and were approved. All verbal statements of attribution of responsibility were recorded during the entire sessions throughout two weeks.

Scoring

There were two scorers, neither had had previous interactions with the Samples for two weeks prior to the study; both were interns at the jail; both carried scoring pads with the subjects' numbers listed vertically (numbers were used instead of names as ethical precaution to protect anonymity rights of the subjects). The operational definitions of controlled and uncontrolled response criteria were listed at the top of each cover page corresponding to each test needed for each day. Also a scoring space headed with "C" and "U" to be checked and explanation of violation if a "U" was scored were listed. (See Appendix A).

Under self-control scoring, examples of attribution of responsibility statements, e.g., I'm sorry, bad pass, my fault, were provided. Under the space adjacent to each subject was recording space for individual's verbal statements which were later re-written without the subjects' numbers and categorized by an independent scorer (knowledgeable of the I-E index) as internal or external attribution.

Reliability

Two kinds of reliability were used: IOR and Type II. IOR was taken by outside scorers (jail personnel) who intermittently gave spot check recordings of data and compared them to the regular scorer's sheets later. Type II was the comparison of total agreements between two scorers divided by disagreements plus agreements, multiplied by 100.

Control

To provide control for the study, the following procedures were carried out. Scorers established themselves as a natural part of the setting by playing basketball with both groups prior to testing. Their presence was explained as co-trainers in Physical Education and the scoring was explained as statistic-taking of basketball play. (This was a normal procedure in the past.) The point system, which normally awarded evaluations to inmates' behavior during Physical Education play, was eliminated a week prior to testing with the explanation that Physical Education class was for their own physical fitness, and so from then on they would be on their own in class. All data taken were scored on pre-established criteria set prior to testing, i.e., Self-Control taken from Fagen's curriculum and Locus of Control from Rotter's index). Both groups of inmates were volunteers to the rehabilitation program. Sample I only differed from Sample II in that their training was withheld until testing for this study was completed.

Additions

Since at the end of the two week period, three inmates had not made any verbal causal statements during testing, the Rotter's 29-item I-E index test was administered to both groups for a back-up score for Locus of Control. Both groups were given the test with instructions at the top of the test, and the test was explained as a survey for a student's sociology class. (Again names were transferred into numbers to preserve anonymity).

RESULTS

Since the interest in this study was a group comparison of trained versus untrained inmates, tests of significance were used to analyze the data. The data for Self-Control tests were nominal, and thus a non-parametric test of significance with a correction factor - Yates for Chi-Square - was used to allow for the small sizes. The Median and Extension of Means test showed a significant difference between groups at a .02 level of significance with one degree of freedom. The obtained Chi-Square value was 5.2. Untrained inmates scored a total of 34 uncontrolled out of 50 possible responses, compared to the trained inmates who had 17 out of 50. Scores of individual subtests for each group are shown in Table 1.

Since both dimensions of the Locus of Control variable - written and verbal scores - were ratio data (percentage of external comments divided by the total causal statements), and again the sample size was small, the T-test was used to analyze these data. A difference in means between groups was found on both dimensions - verbal \bar{X}_1 (untrained) = .64 versus \bar{X}_2 (trained) = .36 and written \bar{X}_1 = 9.2 versus \bar{X}_2 = 6.7. However, the difference was not statistically significant. The T obtained was 1.98 with 15 degrees of freedom and .06 probability for verbal scores, and 1.69 with 18 degrees of freedom and .10 probability value for the written score. Individual Locus of Control scores can be found in Table 2.

Correlation Coefficients were obtained on all three variables.

Table 1: Group Scores on Self-Control Sub-Test.

TABLE 1

GROUP SCORES ON SELF-CONTROL SUB-TEST

	Anticipating Consequences	Inhibition and Delay	Concentration	Following Directions	Managing Frustration
<u>Controlled</u>					
Untrained	0	7	1	1	7
Trained	9	6	4	9	5
<u>Uncontrolled</u>					
Untrained	10	3	9	9	3
Trained	1	4	6	1	5

Table 2: Individual Locus of Control Scores.

TABLE 2
 INDIVIDUAL LOCUS
 OF CONTROL SCORES

<u>Subjects</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	Written Scores									
Untrained	13	17	10	5	9	6	10	11	6	5
Trained	4	11	6	6	2	7	7	9	9	6
	Verbal Scores									
Untrained	.71	0	1.0	.20	.50	1.0	0	.33	.40	1.0
Trained	.33	.32	.57	.75	.38	0	-1.0	1.0	.50	.43

N.B. Scores were calculated in terms of externality, i.e., the number of external responses divided by total responses. Subjects scoring zero made no verbal comments during testing. Subjects scoring -1.0 made all "Internal" statements.

The values were Self-Control:Verbal scores = $-.2178$ (thus, an inverse relationship - the more controlled an inmate scored, the less external he also scored), and Self-Control:Written scores = $-.3958$ (also an inverse relationship), and Written:Verbal scores = $.1562$. None of these values were statistically significant.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings of this study definitely support the author's hypothesis that rehabilitation inmates would score more controlled than untrained inmates as evidenced by the large difference (twice as many uncontrolled responses scored by untrained as by rehabilitation inmates) between groups at the .02 level of significance. Thus, results of this study indicate that the rehabilitation program has successfully trained the inmate in the Self-Control variable tested in this study.

In the area of Locus of Control, the hypothesis was supported, as a difference between the groups was found and the Correlation data between the Self-Control and Locus of Control variables did show an inverse relationship, i.e., as an inmate's self-control score increased, his externalization score decreased. However, these differences were significant at weak levels of .06 and .10 and correlations of $-.21$ and $-.39$, and so not considered to be evidence of strong differences between groups. Perhaps a future direction of emphasis for the rehabilitation program would be increasing the emphasis on showing the inmate how to accept responsibility for his own behavior and making him more aware of the personal control he has over the direction of his life, i.e., focus more efforts on Locus of Control dimensions.

Possible means of implementing an increased emphasis on Locus of Control dimensions in a rehabilitation program are: 1) on a cognitive level inmates are given demonstrations on Locus of Control

theories and their implications and inmate discussions on their personal explorations of the topic. Menton (1960, p. 111) discusses "Anomie and Delinquency" (found in Cloward and Ohlin's book, Delinquency and Opportunity), which could also provide theoretical insight toward motivating the inmate in accepting responsibility for his own behavior. And, 2) at the behavioral level, the following steps could be taken: have inmates monitor their own attribution of responsibility statements and score them as "I" or "E" at the end of the day; make a point system for behavior which holds contingencies that specifically deal with consequating inmates' attempts to accept responsibility for their behavior; implement Gestalt techniques of having inmates' "own" their verbal statements, e.g., "I'm in jail and I accept responsibility for it."; have inmates read court cases and decide on verdicts for offenders and provide rationale for their decisions.

A closer examination of inmates' Self-Control and Verbal scores shows a divergence from past I-E research. The relationship between inmates' verbal I-E responses and written responses is very weak (.156 Correlation Coefficient). Moreover, some inmates held inverse relationships between their scores. For example, one Maximum Security inmate (who was not included in this study but was tested) scored .086% external on Rotter's I-E scale and 100% external on Verbal responses. Other such scores of inmates of this study were: 21% E on Written:100% E on Verbal, 26% E on Written:100% E on Verbal, 26% E on Written:75% E on Verbal. Since this may indicate that the inmates were responding to demand characteristics of

the Written test, the author advises that future research not rely totally on written responses on the I-E index as Locus of Control indicators.

Subjective observations during the study showed a distinction to the author in the area of peer pressure between groups. The trained group often offered positive peer pressure in the sense that they offered encouragement to one another to "play good ball", "dribble only two times", "teamwork", etc., while the untrained group often griped, threatened and pressured one another not to conform. For example, during the Following Directions task when inmates were told to run ten laps, these inmates ridiculed those inmates who did attempt to run laps in the teacher's absence as they were instructed. During the Anticipating Consequences task, when inmates were given choice of any shot on the floor, inmates ridiculed anyone who attempted to take a shot less than ten feet, even though they admitted both hating to pay the penalty of missing and knowing they would have to. During the dribbling rule of Managing Frustration these inmates threatened one another for violation. On the other hand, trained inmates sent their complaints to the Physical Education teacher. Future research could examine this area by running the Self-Control test on inmates in individual settings rather than group settings. Other areas of research would be Resistance to Temptation studies; a study using women; monitoring cells for I-E statements in unstructured situations; and a comparison of verbal statements to I-E scores in free situations.

REFERENCES

- Adams, S. Evaluative Research in Corrections: Prescriptive Package. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1975.
- Bullock, L. and Brown, R. Behavioral dimensions of emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 740-741.
- Cloward, R. A. and Ohlin, L. E. Delinquency and Opportunity. Glenco, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.
- Devine, J., Steinberg, H. and Bellingham, R. Kalamazoo County Jail Rehabilitation Program. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Kalamazoo County Sheriff's Department, 1974.
- Dirks, S. Aversion therapy: Its potential for use in the corrective setting. Law Review, in press.
- Drake, D. Perceptual correlates of impulsive and reflective behavior. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 2, 240-246.
- Dykman, R., Ackerman, P., Clements, S. and Peters, J. Specific learning disabilities: An attentional deficit syndrome. Progress in Learning Disabilities, 1971, 59-63.
- Fagen, S., Long, N. and Stevens, D. Teaching Children Self-Control: Preventing Emotional and Learning Problems in the Elementary School. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co., 1975.
- Felton, G. and Briggs, B. Teaching internalization behavior to collegiate low achievers in group psychotherapy. Psychotherapy, 1972, 9, 281-283.
- Ferguson, G. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, Third Edition. United States of America: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1971.
- Gillis, J. and Jessor, R. Effects of brief psychotherapy of belief in internal control: An explanatory study. Psychotherapy, 1970, 7, 135-137.
- Gore, P. and Rotter, J. A personality correlate of social action. Journal of Psychotherapy, 1963, 31, 58-64.
- Holland, J. Behavior Modification for Prisoners, Patients, and Other People as a Prescription for the Planned Society. (Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association), University of Pittsburgh, 1974.

- Jenkins, T. Post-Prisoner Analysis of Criminal Behavior and Longitudinal Follow-Up: Evaluation of Institutional Treatment. Rehabilitation Research Foundation, Manpower Office of Research and Development: Washington, D.C., 1974 (ERIC Document #ED 089 127).
- Kohlberg, L. Development of moral character and moral ideology. Review of Child Development Research, 1964, 1, 383-341.
- Lasielle, J. and Phares, E. Internal-External Control Responsibility to Others Needing Assistance. (Paper presented at the 46th Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychology Association), 1974.
- Lefcourt, H. Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 206-220.
- Martinson, R., Lipton, D. and Willis, J. The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatments Evaluation Studies. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.
- Phares, E. Internal-external control and reduction of reinforcement value after failure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, No. 3, 386-390.
- Phares, E., Ritchie, D., and Davis, W. Internal-external control and reaction to threat. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 10, 402-405.
- Phares, E., Wilson, K. and Klyver, N. Internal-external control and the attribution of blame under neutral and distractive conditions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 8, No. 3, 285-288.
- Reali, N. and Hall, V. Effect of success and failure on the reflective and impulsive child. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 2, 240-246.
- Rotter, J. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, No. 1, #609.
- Saunders, A. Behavior Therapy in Prisons: Walden II or Clockwork Orange. November, 1974 (ERIC Document #EDO 101 254).
- Seeman, M. Alienation and social learning in a reformatory. American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 69, 270-284.
- Singrey, P. Criminal Justice Research. Washington, D.C.: Evaluations of Criminal Justice Program, 1973.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE SCORING SHEET

Following Directions

Begin running with 10 seconds after entering court, complete 10 laps without delay or interruption to interact with another.

Subjects

1.	<u>"Sorry my fault. I forced the shot."</u>	C <input type="checkbox"/>	U <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>only ran 8 laps</i>
2.	_____	C <input type="checkbox"/>	U <input type="checkbox"/>	
3.	_____	C <input type="checkbox"/>	U <input type="checkbox"/>	
4.	_____	C <input type="checkbox"/>	U <input type="checkbox"/>	
5.	_____	C <input type="checkbox"/>	U <input type="checkbox"/>	

Attribution of Responsibility - any causal statements which refer to responsibility for action: "Sorry, my fault, I forced the shot." or "Bad pass, your fault, you threw it behind me."