



9150

(Not to be quoted without permission)

9.95.10

1.50



VIENNA STAFF TRAINING PROJECT  
FINAL REPORT

June 30, 1972

NCJRS

NOV 5 1972

A

Arthur L. Paddock  
and  
James D. McMillin  
Research Component\*  
Center for the Study of Crime,  
Delinquency, and Corrections  
Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

\* The Research Component is funded by Illinois Law Enforcement Commission Grant # ILEC-A-70-2-H awarded to the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections.

## VIENNA STAFF TRAINING PROJECT

### I. INTRODUCTION

As a result of expanded physical facilities and an increase in the inmate population, the custodial staff of Vienna State Penitentiary was significantly enlarged. With a new facility, inmates and an increased staff, the Vienna facility envisioned an institution where new forms of treatment would be carried on and where the entire staff would function as a treatment team. These two related contingencies necessitated training men to become correctional officers. In March of 1971 in conjunction with the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections, Shawnee College applied for and subsequently received a grant for an institutional training project under the auspices of the Manpower Development and Training Act. (Grant #MT-1 #71-48)

#### The Structure of the Staff Training Project

The operating assumptions of the staff training project were organized around two goals. These goals were at the abstract level, philosophical, and at a more concrete level, practical in nature. The philosophical level was constructed on the assumption that the proposed training goal would influence the new correctional officers to be helping agents with some empathy and understanding of the inmates, and further, would consider themselves as agents of rehabilitation. The practical level involved socializing the new correctional officer to the norms of the Department of Corrections. These norms include understanding department policies and procedures (e.g., taking counts, procedures regarding escapes, etc.).

By understanding the goals of the staff training project, one can better understand the structure of the project. To coordinate the training project, the grant provided for the hiring of an administrator-teacher to supervise the training sessions of six-week duration. The trainees spent their regular eight hour work day in the training sessions and were compensated at a rate of \$540 per month. Subjects covered included orientation to the institution, programs, staff and facilities, correctional theory and practice, problems of correction, correctional management; communication skills, counseling techniques, testing and diagnostic services, documents, records and reports, techniques of supervision and physical training.<sup>1</sup> Guest lectures, movies and graphic teaching aids were utilized by the administrator-teacher in an attempt to maximize exposure to the subject matter.

The initial four weeks of the six week period were intensive classroom training which encompassed most of the topics mentioned above and involved daily assignments for the trainees. The remaining two weeks were devoted to on-the-job training which required the cooperation of regular staff.

The project included three sessions with twenty, twenty-three, and twenty-two trainees, respectively.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix E for sample syllabus of one training session.

<sup>2</sup>In sessions two and three, two inmates were included in each group.

Role of Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections in Evaluation of the Training

The Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections accepted the task of evaluating the staff training project during the Spring of 1971. Specifically, the Research Component designed and carried the evaluation of the training project.<sup>3</sup>

Rationale for the Design of the Evaluation Project

The task of the evaluation of the staff training project was to determine whether the project achieved its goals. The goals were as mentioned above, both philosophical and practical in character. The central question was: "Did the staff training project effect change in the attitudes of the Correctional Officers Trainees?" In order to address this question a "before" and "after" technique was utilized. At the beginning, of each session, a battery of attitude measures directed to the central question posited above was administered. On the last day of each training session, a complimentary battery of measures was given. In this fashion, the change in attitudes of the correctional trainees was assessed.

To fully comprehend the evaluation of the Vienna Staff Training Project, the concept of attitude must be briefly addressed. Although many professionals disagree on the definition, they all agree that an attitude entails an "existing predisposition to respond to social objects, which,

---

<sup>3</sup>The Research Component is funded by ILEC grant #ILEC-A-70-2-H.

in interaction with situational variables guides and directs the overt behavior of the individual."<sup>4</sup> Therefore, each of the two scales utilized in the evaluation project reflects a specific measure of attitudes which are felt to be of major importance to the correctional officer: 1) Attitudes toward Prison Behavior (PB); and 2) Attitudes toward Punishment of Criminals (ATPC).

---

<sup>4</sup>Shaw, M.T. and J.M. Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, (New York, 1967), pp. 1-2.

## II. DESCRIPTION OF SCALES

### Attitude Toward Prison Behavior<sup>5</sup>

This scale is designed to show the extent to which group norms favor staff members showing interest, teaching, guiding, helping plan the future, and generally helping the inmate understand himself better. As such, a high score on this scale indicates that staff members take a non-coercive, minimally directive, but at the same time, non-laissez-faire approach to their dealings with inmates. (See Appendix D for sample scale.)

### Attitude Toward Punishment of Criminals<sup>6</sup>

The statements in this scale are concerned with the purpose of and appropriate use of punishment, as well as with the question of whether or not criminals should be punished. High scores indicate favorable attitudes toward the punishment of criminals. (See Appendix C for sample scale.)

---

<sup>5</sup>This attitude scale was developed by Richard M. Swanson. See "Social Influence and Resocialization in a Correctional Setting: The Measurement of Group Norms," Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, January, 1968.

<sup>6</sup>This attitude scale was developed by Wang and Thurstone. See Shaw, M.T., and J.M. Wright, Scales for Measurement of Attitudes. (New York, 1967), pp. 162-163.

### III. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

As noted above, the design of the evaluation of the training program is longitudinal in nature. That is, a "before" and "after" comparison across the same criterion is employed to ascertain the effect of the six-week training session.

To facilitate a better understanding of the data, mean scores for the two scales utilized in the evaluation of the training project are reported in the "before" ( $T_1$ ) and "after" ( $T_2$ ) situations. The rationale, here, is to assess the degree of change in the correctional trainees attitudes by comparing attitudes before the six-week training session ( $T_1$ ) with attitudes on the same measures at the end of the six-week training session ( $T_2$ ). Subsequent to these comparisons each scale is cross-tabulated with certain social characteristics.

#### Social Characteristics of the Correctional Trainees

Before presenting the data which address the evaluation of the training program, a description of the social background of the trainees is desirable. The questionnaire completed by the trainees contains a number of items which provide valuable information about their social characteristics (See Appendix A). For the purposes of the report, selected data is highlighted. Specifically, the mean age, time in community, and age at which the trainees entered correction work is discussed. For those characteristics which do not lend themselves to the computation of means, percents are reported. That is, marital status and educational attainment appear in a percentage format.



---

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

---

---

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

---

TABLE 1 indicates that the average age of the trainees is thirty-five years. It should be noted that the minimum (lowest age) is twenty years and maximum (highest age) is sixty years. It is also interesting that of the sixty-one trainees, they average twenty-four years in the community in which they reside.

TABLE 2 shows that the majority of the trainees are married and have received a high school diploma. Of this majority, 23% have continued their education at the college level.

Attitudes Toward Punishment of Criminals (ATPC)

TABLE 3 demonstrates a reduction in the mean ATPC score in the second testing session. Further, this change in mean scores is a significant one and toward a less punitive position.

---

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

---

Mean ATPC Scores Cross-Tabulated with Social Characteristics

The social characteristics employed in the cross-tabulation with ATPC are age, educational attainment, age when entered correctional work, attitudes toward self and attitude toward others. TABLE 4 shows the cross-tabulation of mean ATPC scores by the different age categories in the "before" and "after" testing session for the correctional trainees.

Generally, TABLE 4 indicates that the younger individuals began their training session with higher average scores on the ATPC scale. That is, they favored the punishment of criminals to a greater degree than the older men. However, it is important to note that the youngest group (up to 25 years) had the largest degree of change on the average. Further, all age categories changed significantly to a less punitive position on the punishment of criminals.

TABLE 4, also, indicates that those who had completed high school began the training session with the highest average ATPC score. Generally speaking, the more education a man has, the more probable it is that a change occurred in his attitude toward punishment of criminals. Since the attitude change is in a less punitive direction, one can say that on the average the more education a trainee has, the more likely he is to move toward attitudes which do not favor the punishment of criminals.

TABLE 4 also shows the cross-tabulation of mean ATPC scores at  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  by the age at which one entered correctional work. The 36-45 years group had the highest average ATPC score at  $T_1$ . Again the youngest group shows change in average ATPC score to a more significant degree than did the other groups.

Included in the questionnaire (Appendix B) were two sets of questions which concern themselves with attitudes toward self and attitudes toward others. The latter part of TABLE 4 reports the cross-tabulations of the mean scores of the attitudes toward punishment of criminals scale (ATPC) with these two sets of questions.

Those individuals who are classified as manifesting negative attitudes toward self and toward others began the training with a higher ATPC mean score than did those with a favorable attitude toward self and others. Those individuals which occupied the negative self, negative other categories respectively, manifest the greater magnitude of change in the mean ATPC scores at T<sub>2</sub>, but the difference is not great. Conversely, those individuals which occupy the high-self category changed least at T<sub>2</sub>.

Attitude Toward Prison Behavior Scale (PB)

The PB scale is composed of six subscales which can be understood best in continuum form:

Treatment Subscale (TS)	Inmate Self- Improvement (ISI)	Inmate Avoiding Trouble (IAT)	Inmate Opposi- tion (IO)	Custodial Subscale (CS)	Punitive Subscale (PS)
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------



One sees on the continuum above that the two subscales at the far left, TS and ISI, are treatment oriented, the two subscales in the middle, IAT and IO, are flexible, and the two subscales on the far right, CS and PS, are clearly punitive and custodial in nature. (For sample questions in each subscale see Appendix D, where each question is labelled by subscale). As such, a high score on any subscale indicates favorable attitudes toward the focal object of the particular subscale (e.g., a high score on the treatment scale (TS) is understood to manifest attitudes favoring treatment, etc.) Furthermore, the total PB scale can be interpreted in this manner. That is, one would expect the scores to decrease in magnitude

across the six subscales. Specifically, the scores obtained across the continuum from treatment to punishment should decrease.

The data is reported for the six subscales at T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub>. Following the procedure utilized in the previous section, certain social characteristics are cross-tabulated with each of the six subscales.

#### The PB Scale

Initially the data in the six subscales is presented.

---

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

---

TABLE 5 indicates the mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) scores at T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> for each of the six subscales. As expected, the highest mean scores appear at the treatment end of the continuum and the lowest scores at the punishment end. Theoretically, this is a desirable result in that a high score as such indicates favorable attitudes toward the particular focus of each subscale. Thus, a mean of about 30 on the treatment end and a mean of about 15 on the punishment end indicate quite conclusively, that at the beginning of each session, the trainee's orientation was primarily couched in the treatment end of the scale.

A closer look at TABLE 5 discloses another important result: specifically, the change in the mean scores from T<sub>1</sub> to T<sub>2</sub>. Theoretically, one would desire that all scores at the treatment end of the PB scale would increase while the scores at the punishment end decreased. TABLE 5 demonstrates that the scores reflecting the treatment orientation did not change

significantly. That is, the difference in the means can be attributed to chance. Conversely, the scores reflecting the punishment orientation, custody and punishment, did change significantly and in the desired direction. That is, the mean scores in the custody and punishment subscales are lower at T<sub>2</sub> than at T<sub>1</sub> which indicates that the training session's orientation toward instilling the treatment philosophy of the facility in the new trainees was somewhat successful. It is noted that the inmate opposition subscale changed in the un-predicted direction. But this change, although significant, is not as the aforementioned change in the custody and punishment subscales. Finally, the fact that the scores in the treatment end of the PB scale did not change significantly indicates that the trainees are being socialized away from a custody-punishment orientation. One would, of course, have desired a change in treatment orientation toward a more favorable treatment position as well.

The focus of the next six tables follows the pattern introduced in the presentation of the ATPC scale of cross-tabulating selected social characteristics with the scale or, in this case, the subscales.

TABLE 6 demonstrates the cross-tabulation of the treatment subscale by the categories of age, educational attainment, age at which the trainee entered corrections, and those questions which regard attitudes toward self and others. It is interesting

---

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

---

to note that the 26-35 year old group exhibits the highest treatment score at  $T_1$  followed by the under 25 year old group. At  $T_2$ , however, the positions are reversed. Although the change is not significant statistically, the implication might be drawn that the younger group has a higher capacity for change. This is supported more forcefully when one looks at the mean scores. The 26-35 year old group's mean treatment score changes in an undesired direction. That is, the ideal score at  $T_2$  should be higher than at  $T_1$ , whereas the under 25 year old group not only changed, but in the desirable direction.

The educational attainment categories present the same phenomenon. Those individuals in the completed high school category and below began their training with higher scores on the treatment subscale than did the college category. This in itself is unique in that one might expect that the more education a man has, the higher treatment orientation he would exhibit. Conversely, at  $T_2$  the college group is the only group which changes in a desirable direction. The implication might be that the more education a man has the more flexible he is and thus more likely he is to change in the direction of the facility's philosophical goal of a total treatment oriented institution.

The age at which the trainee enters correctional work presents an interesting difference in the treatment subscale. As indicated in TABLE 5, there are four categories of age. In general, all the individuals begin their training with rather

convergent attitudes toward treatment. However, at T<sub>2</sub> a considerable difference across the categories is indicated. Again the youngest group, under 25 years old, on the average finishes the training sessions with more favorable attitudes toward treatment. In the same vein the 36-45 year group also exhibits a marked change at T<sub>2</sub>. This change in both instances is in the desired direction. The critical issue here is that the middle age group although they exhibit a significant change from T<sub>1</sub> to T<sub>2</sub> the magnitude of change is not as great as the youngest group. This suggests that there may be critical age periods involved in the understanding of the disposition for change. Specifically, men under 25 and between 36-45 seem to be more malleable toward a benign orientation than do men in the other two categories. This might be interpreted to mean that these two age groups are the most susceptible to changing attitudes.

The last portion of TABLE 6 reports the mean scores across the questions which are concerned with attitudes toward "self" and "others." Although the "attitudes toward self" category is interesting, the importance lies in the "attitudes toward others" categories. Specifically, those individuals who fall in the less favorable "attitudes toward others" category. One expects that those individuals that hold less favorable attitudes toward others to have a rather difficult time dealing with treatment. Although not statistically significant, this seems to be the case. Roughly speaking, men with less favorable attitudes toward others do not exhibit change in a desirable direction, that is, in the direction consonant with the institution's goal of a total treatment philosophy.

TABLE 7 demonstrates the cross-tabulation of the inmate self-help subscale across the same social characteristics used in TABLE 6.

---

TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

---

TABLE 7 indicates that in the age categories all groups on the average changed in an undesirable direction. One must remember, however, the changes are not significant ones and can, therefore, confidently be attributed to chance. The categories of age seem to indicate a pattern. The oldest group changed most on the average in the undesirable direction. This implication requires caution because the change is not significant.

In the education categories of TABLE 7 those occupying the lowest education category changed in the undesirable direction with the greatest magnitude. Again, this is only an implication or a non-significant trend. Nevertheless, a trend in the education categories, exists. In the "age when entered correction work" categories the oldest group manifests the most significant change, but the change is not in the preferred direction.

As in TABLE 6, the category which includes those individuals which hold less favorable attitudes toward "others" warrants discussion. These individuals do not only change in an undesirable direction, but they change significantly.



In sum, this table indicates that the older the man, the less education and the more unfavorable his attitudes toward others, the more unfavorable his attitudes toward inmates helping themselves.

TABLE 8 depicts the cross-tabulations of the social characteristics and the inmate avoiding trouble subscale. The data across the age category show that the middle-aged group (26-35 years) began the training sessions with a more favorable attitude toward the idea that inmates should avoid trouble. However, the difference among the age groups is very small. The mean scores at  $T_2$  change toward a position which does not favor "pulling time." However, this change is not significant. The categories of educational attainment in TABLE 8 show little difference in the scores at  $T_1$ ; however, the men in the lowest category (completed grammar school) begin their training with attitudes which favor the position that inmates should avoid trouble. Further, the completed grammar school and the completed high school categories are the only groups which change to a more positive position on "pulling time" after the training session.

The degree of change at  $T_2$  for the grammar school category is more significant than for the completed high school group. Although not statistically significant, the change in the grammar school category might suggest a trend whereas the completed high school category which is based on a substantially larger number of trainees (27 as opposed to 9) probably is not indicative of a trend.

When age entering correctional work is the focus, the data in TABLE 8 point out that only the "above 46 years" category favors a "pulling time" or "avoiding trouble" position after experiencing the training session. However, this change is not significant.

Finally, the last social characteristic variable in TABLE 8, which addresses attitudes toward self and others, indicates that those trainees which occupy the negative others category change significantly to a "non-pulling time position."

Theoretically, one expects the mean scores to decrease at  $T_2$  for the inmate avoiding trouble subscale because in a treatment atmosphere, trouble (both emotional and interpersonal) probably should not be avoided but confronted and a solution reached. In sum, TABLE 8 shows that the younger, more formally educated and the more "other" oriented a trainee is, the higher the likelihood that the trainee approaches the theoretically desired end, described above.

TABLE 9 represents the cross-tabulation between the inmate opposition subscale and the social characteristics across the age categories. The change at  $T_2$  in the mean scores is toward a position favoring inmate opposition. However, only in the 36 year and above category is the change a significant one.

A look at the educational attainment and age when entering correctional work variables reveals no significant change at  $T_2$ , although in both instances all changes are in an upward direction.

When compared, the attitudes toward self and others depict a significant change for those trainees who hold a favorable attitude toward self. Similarly, the "less favorable other" category changes significantly to a position of inmate opposition.

In every social characteristic variable the change at  $T_2$  is to a position favoring inmate opposition. This change for the most part is a non-significant one.

TABLES 10 and 11 which depict the cross-tabulations of the social characteristics and the custody and punishment subscales reveal a number of significant changes. The age categories in TABLE 10 show that men age 26-35 years manifest a change in attitude from a more custodial position to a less custodial one. This is also the case for those in the educational attainment categories.

#### IV. DISCUSSION

Generally, the data demonstrate that the training of new correctional officers at the Vienna facility was consonant with the intended goals of the institution. Specifically, the data suggest that the concept of treatment was effectively instilled in the trainees. The analysis of both research instruments lend support to this conclusion. The analysis of the ATPC scale demonstrates a significant change in the attitudes toward the punishment of criminals held by the trainees. This attitude change is to a less punitive position.

The analysis of the PB scale demonstrates that a significant change occurred in the attitudes held by the trainees in regard

to punishment and custody. The change was to a less punitive and/or custodial position. At the same time, the treatment end of the scale did not change significantly.

At another level of analysis the data reveal that the younger a man is and the higher his educational attainment, the greater the likelihood that his attitudes changed in a desirable direction; that is from a more custodial-punitive position toward a less custodial-punitive one.

TABLE 1

Means of Social Characteristics for Correctional Trainees (n-61)

<u>Social Characteristics</u>	<u>Mean</u>
Age	35 years old <sup>a</sup>
How long lived in community	24 years <sup>b</sup>
How old when entered corr. work	31 years old <sup>c</sup>

a = the age range is 40 years (60 years maximum and 20 years minimum)

b = the "lived in community" range is 59 years (60 years to one year)

c = the age when entered correctional work ranges from 60 years to 20 years.

TABLE 2

Percents of Social Characteristics for Correctional Trainees (N=61)

<u>Social Characteristics</u>	<u>Percents</u>	
Marital Status		
1. Married	50	(82%)
2. Single	9	(15%)
3. Other	2	(3%)
TOTAL	61	(100%)
Educational Attainment		
1. Completed Grammar School	10	(16%)
2. Some High School	10	(16%)
3. Completed High School	27	(44%)
4. Some College	14	(23%)
TOTAL	61	(99%)

TABLE 3

Mean's standard deviations, T scores and significance of ATPC

scores for correctional trainees before (T<sub>1</sub>) and after (T<sub>2</sub>)

six-week training session

	T <sub>1</sub> (Before)	T <sub>2</sub> (After)
$\bar{X}^a$	4.344	3.698
$\sigma'$	.781	.663
t score <sup>b</sup>	4.8425	
Significance	p < .0005	

a = High score indicates favorable attitude toward punishment of criminals.

b = t score is a significance test for the differences between means. The significance is the probability of the degree of change in the mean from T<sub>1</sub> to T<sub>2</sub>. The t score is one-tailed.

Table 4

$\bar{X}$ 's, SD's, t scores and Significance of the ATPC  
Subscale by Social Characteristics at T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> for C.T.S.

Social Characteristic	$\bar{X}_{T_1}$	$\sigma_{T_1}$	$\bar{X}_{T_2}$	$\sigma_{T_2}$	t scr.	df	sign.
<u>Age:</u>							
Up to 25	4.447	.981	3.697	.755	2.4809	31	n.s.
26-35 years	4.337	.740	3.661	.452	3.4021	36	p < .005
36 years to highest	4.273	.662	3.732	.771	2.5446	44	n.s.
<u>Educ. Attainment:</u>							
Compl. Grammar	4.095	.743	3.831	.660	.7975	16	n.s.
Some High School	4.040	.737	3.690	.873	.9687	18	n.s.
Compl. High School	4.652	.781	3.825	.664	4.1683	51	p < .0005
Some College	4.146	.693	3.342	.324	3.8784	24	p < .0005
<u>Age Entered Corr. Work:</u>							
Up to 25	4.426	.912	3.657	.682	3.4269	45	p < .005
26-35 years	4.144	.800	3.612	.451	2.3180	30	p < .025
36-45 years	4.691	.369	4.075	.823	2.1782	19	p < .025
46 years-highest	4.050	.590	3.512	.700	1.7030	15	n.s.
<u>Att. Toward Self:</u>							
Low	4.426	.689	3.650	.621	4.8228	64	p < .0005
High	4.235	.893	3.758	.720	2.1068	49	p < .025
<u>Att. Toward Others:</u>							
Low	4.482	.737	3.845	.663	3.5013	58	p < .005
High	4.202	.812	3.541	.638	3.4427	55	p < .005



Table 5

Mean's, Standard Deviations, t Scores and Significance  
of the Six Subscales in the Prison Behavior Scale  
at T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> for Correctional Trainees

SUBSCALE	n=61 X <sub>t1</sub>	o <sub>T1</sub>	$\bar{X}_{T2}$ n=56	o <sub>T2</sub>	t score	signif.
Treatment (TS)	30.016	2.900	29.839	2.762	+ .3509	n.s.
Inmate Self Improve- ment (ISI)	30.820	2.717	30.179	2.472	+1.3365	n.s.
Inmate Avoiding Trouble (IAT)	21.393	2.900	20.750	2.919	+1.1949	n.s.
Inmate Opposition (IO)	10.787	2.850	11.839	2.990	-1.9583	p .05
Custody (CS)	19.607	3.513	17.768	3.880	+2.6795	p .005
Punishment (PS)	15.557	2.896	14.071	2.485	+2.9869	p .005

Table 6

$\bar{X}$ 's, SD's, t Scores and Significance of the Treatment  
Subscale by Social Characteristics at T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> for C.T.S.

Social Character	$\bar{X}_{T_1}$	$\sigma_{T_1}$	$\bar{X}_{T_2}$	$\sigma_{T_2}$	t score	df	signif.
<u>Age:</u>							
Up to 25	30.056	2.437	30.500	2.794	-.4713	30	n.s.
26-35 years	30.158	2.734	29.947	2.635	.2422	36	n.s.
36 years to highest	29.875	2.924	29.348	2.870	.4409	45	n.s.
<u>Education Attainment:</u>							
Compl. Grammar	29.900	3.510	29.889	2.759	.0076	17	n.s.
Some High School	30.000	2.211	28.900	2.998	.9338	18	n.s.
Compl. High School	30.148	2.507	29.962	2.553	.2675	56	n.s.
Some College	29.857	2.958	30.364	3.202	-.4063	23	n.s.
<u>Age Entered Corr. Work:</u>							
Up to 25	29.880	2.522	30.095	2.755	-.5618	44	n.s.
26-35 years	30.875	2.446	29.812	2.639	-1.1818	30	n.s.
36-45 years	29.445	2.979	30.500	2.677	-.8467	19	n.s.
46 years-highest	29.556	3.245	28.556	3.127	.6657	16	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Self:</u>							
Low	29.914	2.726	29.613	2.679	-.4518	64	n.s.
High	30.154	2.679	30.120	2.891	-.0435	49	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Other:</u>							
Low	30.516	2.567	29.793	2.833	+1.0337	58	n.s.
High	29.500	2.751	29.889	2.736	-.5347	55	n.s.

Table 7

$\bar{X}$ 's, SD's, t Scores and Significance of the Inmate Self-Help  
Subscale by Social Characteristics at T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> for C.T.S.

Social Character	$\bar{X}_{T_1}$	$\sigma_{T_1}$	$\bar{X}_{T_2}$	$\sigma_{T_2}$	t score	df	sign.
<u>Age:</u>							
Up to 25	31.056	2.532	30.500	2.534	.6159	30	n.s.
26-35 years	31.053	2.223	30.632	2.290	.5750	36	n.s.
36 years to highest	30.458	3.230	29.609	2.572	.9990	45	n.s.
<u>Education Attainment:</u>							
Compl. Grammar	30.400	2.989	29.000	1.871	1.2364	17	n.s.
Some High School	30.700	4.111	29.600	2.797	.6996	18	n.s.
Compl. High School	30.556	2.309	30.500	2.319	.0880	51	n.s.
Some College	31.714	2.091	30.909	2.809	.7934	23	n.s.
<u>Age Entered Corr. Work:</u>							
Up to 25	30.920	2.448	30.429	2.336	.6947	44	n.s.
26-35 years	31.250	2.113	30.562	2.449	.8509	30	n.s.
36-45 years	30.545	4.204	30.800	2.440	.1718	19	n.s.
46 years-highest	30.111	2.421	28.222	2.279	+1.7045	16	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Self:</u>							
Low	30.543	2.769	30.129	2.232	.6719	64	n.s.
High	31.192	2.654	30.240	2.788	1.2481	49	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Others:</u>							
Low	30.820	2.840	30.000	2.220	+1.5250	58	n.s.
High	30.633	2.619	30.370	2.748	.3689	55	n.s.

Table 8 .

$\bar{X}$ 's, SD's, t Scores and Significance of the Inmate Causes Trouble Subscale by Social Characteristics at T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> for C.T.S.

Social Characteristic	$\bar{X}_{T_1}$	$\sigma_{T_1}$	$\bar{X}_{T_2}$	$\sigma_{T_2}$	t score	df	sign.
<u>Age:</u>							
Up to 25	21.444	2.975	20.214	2.636	1.2375	30	n.s.
26-35 years	22.105	2.895	21.105	2.998	1.0580	36	n.s.
36 years to highest	20.792	2.889	20.783	3.089	.0103	45	n.s.
<u>Educational Attainment:</u>							
Compl. Grammar	21.700	2.983	22.111	2.522	.3252	17	n.s.
Some High School	20.600	3.836	20.100	4.175	.2788	18	n.s.
Compl. High School	20.963	2.752	21.038	2.553	1.2693	51	n.s.
Some College	20.643	2.341	19.545	2.423	1.1476	23	n.s.
<u>Age Entered Corr. Work:</u>							
Up to 25	21.360	2.827	20.238	2.719	1.3691	44	n.s.
26-35 years	22.437	2.607	21.625	2.802	.8487	30	n.s.
36-45 years	20.455	2.945	19.700	3.713	.5129	19	n.s.
46 years to highest	20.728	3.420	21.556	2.351	.5624	16	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Self:</u>							
Low	20.886	2.125	20.452	2.567	.7427	64	n.s.
High	22.077	3.632	21.120	3.321	.9827	49	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Others:</u>							
Low	20.710	2.585	20.552	2.995	2.1811	58	p < .05
High	22.100	3.078	20.963	2.875	1.4417	55	n.s.

Table 9

$\bar{X}$ 's, SD's, t Scores and Significance of the Inmate Opposition  
Subscale by Social Characteristics at T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> for C.T.S.

Social Characteristic	$\bar{X}_{T_1}$	$\sigma_{T_1}$	$\bar{X}_{T_2}$	$\sigma_{T_2}$	t score	df	sign.
<u>Age:</u>							
Up to 25	11.333	3.125	12.071	2.165	.7879	30	n.s.
26-35 years	10.789	2.781	11.263	2.865	.5175	36	n.s.
36 years to highest	10.375	2.618	12.174	3.525	1.9799	45	p<.05
<u>Educational Attainment:</u>							
Compl. Grammar	10.900	2.079	12.200	1.834	1.1017	17	n.s.
Some High School	10.700	3.401	11.889	3.522	.9688	18	n.s.
Compl. High School	10.815	2.856	11.308	3.082	.6035	51	n.s.
Some College*	10.714	2.998	12.727	3.133	1.6252	23	n.s.
<u>Age Entered Corr. Work:</u>							
Up to 25	11.520	3.137	12.000	2.345	.5929	44	n.s.
26-35 years	10.375	2.473	11.187	2.713	.8848	30	n.s.
36-45 years	9.909	2.427	11.400	3.307	1.1682	19	n.s.
46 years to highest	10.556	2.744	13.111	4.314	1.4992	16	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Self:</u>							
Low	10.829	2.875	11.677	3.331	1.1002	64	n.s.
High	10.704	2.765	12.040	2.557	1.7563	49	p<.05
<u>Attitude Toward Others:</u>							
Low	10.194	2.786	11.483	2.862	1.7662	58	p<.05
High	11.400	2.737	12.222	3.130	1.0503	55	n.s.

Table 10

$\bar{X}$ 's, SD's, t Scores and Significance of the Custody  
Subscale by Social Characteristics at T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> for C.T.S.

Social Characteristic	$\bar{X}_{T_1}$	$\sigma_{T_1}$	$\bar{X}_{T_2}$	$\sigma_{T_2}$	t score	df	sign.
<u>Age:</u>							
Up to 25	19.889	3.661	17.643	4.199	1.5866	30	n.s.
26-35 years	21.158	3.420	18.053	3.764	2.6613	36	p < .01
36 years to highest	18.167	2.988	17.609	3.940	.5454	45	n.s.
<u>Educational Attainment:</u>							
Compl. Grammar	19.400	1.898	19.556	3.087	.1361	17	n.s.
Some High School	19.600	4.527	17.800	4.590	.8829	18	n.s.
Compl. High School	20.259	3.889	17.808	4.214	2.486	51	p < .01
Some College	18.500	2.794	16.182	2.483	2.1923	23	p < .025
<u>Age Entered Corr. Work:</u>							
Up to 25	20.280	3.323	17.810	3.750	2.3432	44	p < .025
26-35 years	20.125	4.145	18.187	3.970	.9413	30	n.s.
36-45 years	17.273	2.936	15.600	3.777	.7569	19	n.s.
46 years to highest	19.667	2.646	19.333	3.708	.2199	16	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Self:</u>							
Low	18.829	2.345	16.646	3.498	2.9402	64	p < .005
High	20.654	4.490	19.160	3.944	1.2638	49	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Others:</u>							
Low	19.065	3.587	17.724	4.017	1.3607	58	n.s.
High	20.167	3.405	17.815	3.803	2.4494	55	p < .01

Table 11

X's, SD's, t Scores and Significance of the Punishment  
Subscale by Social Characteristics at T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub> for C.T.S.

Social Characteristic	$\bar{X}_{T_1}$	$\sigma_{T_1}$	$X_{T_2}$	$\sigma_{T_2}$	t score	df	sign.
<u>Age:</u>							
Up to 25	15.722	3.643	13.857	2.282	1.8650	30	p < .05
26-35	16.474	2.569	14.158	2.141	3.0191	36	p < .005
36 years to highest	14.708	2.331	14.130	2.928	.7467	45	n.s.
<u>Educational Attainment:</u>							
Compl. Grammar	15.400	2.989	14.667	2.739	.5577	17	n.s.
Some High School	15.500	2.635	14.400	2.459	.9652	18	n.s.
Compl. High School	15.926	3.137	13.923	2.544	2.0522	51	p < .025
Some College	15.000	2.717	13.637	2.378	1.3368	23	n.s.
<u>Age Entered Corr. Work:</u>							
Up to 25	16.320	3.412	13.857	2.128	2.9843	44	p < .005
26-35 years	15.787	2.482	13.812	2.373	1.6018	30	n.s.
36-45 years	14.909	2.468	14.200	3.426	.5394	19	n.s.
46 years to highest	14.889	2.369	14.889	2.522	.0008	16	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Self:</u>							
Low	15.486	2.811	13.774	2.500	2.6193	64	p < .01
High	15.654	3.059	14.440	2.468	1.5628	49	n.s.
<u>Attitude Toward Others:</u>							
Low	15.161	2.518	13.793	2.320	2.1905	58	p < .025
High	15.967	3.232	14.370	2.662	2.044	55	p < .025

APPENDIX A

ABOUT YOURSELF

1. What is the official title and/or rank of your present position? \_\_\_\_\_
2. What is your marital status?  
 Single  
 Married  
 Separated or divorced  
 Widowed
3. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_
4. How many children do you have? \_\_\_\_\_
5. What was your father's principal occupation?  
(What did he do?) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. How long have you lived in the community where you now reside? \_\_\_\_\_
7. How many different towns or cities have you lived in during the last 5 years? \_\_\_\_\_
8. To what civic and/or fraternal organizations do you belong? (Check as many as apply to you.)  
 American Legion  
 Eagles Lodge  
 Elks Lodge  
 Chamber of Commerce  
 Junior Chamber of Commerce  
 Grange  
 Kiwanis  
 Lions Club  
 Moose Lodge  
 Rotary Club  
 Shriners  
 Veterans of Foreign Wars  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_



9. What kinds of volunteer (non-paid) work have you done in the community? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

10. How far have you gone in school?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Some grammar school
- \_\_\_\_\_ Completed grammar school
- \_\_\_\_\_ Some high school
- \_\_\_\_\_ Completed high school
- \_\_\_\_\_ Some college
- \_\_\_\_\_ Completed college

ABOUT YOUR JOB

1. How long have you been employed in correctional work?  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. What was your principal occupation before you entered your present field of work? (If you were not employed, but were in the military service, etc., please indicate this.) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Approximately how old were you when you got the idea of entering correctional work? \_\_\_\_\_

4. How important do you consider each of the following in your decision to enter your present field of work? (Circle the degree of importance in each case. VI means Very Important; I means Important; SI means Somewhat Important; NI means Not Important.)

VI I SI NI Parent, Brother, or Sister

VI I SI NI Relative

VI I SI NI Teacher

VI I SI NI Close friend or acquaintance

VI I SI NI Classes in school

VI I SI NI Occupation before entering correctional work

VI I SI NI Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

5. How attractive do you consider each of the following items to be for a person who is thinking of entering correctional work? (Circle the degree of attractiveness in each case. VA means Very Attractive; A means Attractive; SA means Somewhat Attractive; NA means Not Attractive.)

- VA A SA NA Salary
- VA A SA NA Workload
- VA A SA NA Public support
- VA A SA NA Promotional or advancement opportunities
- VA A SA NA Feeling of accomplishment
- VA A SA NA Prestige in relation to other jobs
- VA A SA NA Good co-workers
- VA A SA NA Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

6. Based on your experience, do you think that you now have enough education for the kind of work you do?

- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes
- \_\_\_\_\_ No

7. If you wanted more education that might advance you in your field of work, how important would each of the following things be as an obstacle in obtaining such education? (Circle the degree of importance in each case. VI means Very Important; I means Important; SI means Somewhat Important; NI means Not Important.)

- VI I SI NI Expense involved
- VI I SI NI My age
- VI I SI NI My family
- VI I SI NI Problem of obtaining leave of absence
- VI I SI NI No suitable course of study
- VI I SI NI No special advantage to me
- VI I SI NI Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8. In the past month how many articles have you read in magazines or journals related to your work? \_\_\_\_\_
9. Rate the prestige (desirability) of each of the following occupations by circling the number that represents your personal estimation of the prestige of each occupation. (The number 1 should be given to the occupation having the lowest prestige, and the number 10 should be given to the occupation having the highest prestige. You may give the same rating to more than one of the occupations, if they appear to be exactly equal.)

Social worker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Garbage Collector	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Major league baseball player	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
U.S. Supreme Court justice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Unskilled construction worker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Prison correction officer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Clergyman	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Policeman	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Coal miner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Barber	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

10. Taking into consideration all the things about your job (work), how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with it?

\_\_\_\_\_ Very satisfied  
\_\_\_\_\_ Satisfied  
\_\_\_\_\_ Dissatisfied  
\_\_\_\_\_ Very dissatisfied

APPENDIX B

This is a study of some of your attitudes about yourself. Of course, there is no right answer for any statement. The best answer is what you feel is true of yourself.

Put the number which represents how you feel about yourself in the space next to each statement. The numbers and the feeling they correspond to are shown below.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true of myself	Slightly true of myself	About halfway true of myself	Mostly true of myself	True of myself

Remember, the best answer is the one which applies to you.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. I don't question my worth as a person, even if I think others do.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. I can be comfortable with all varieties of people--from the highest to the lowest.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. I can become so absorbed in the work I'm doing that it doesn't bother me not to have any intimate friends.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. I don't approve of spending time and energy in doing things for other people. I believe in looking to my family and myself more and letting others shift for themselves.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. When people say nice things about me, I find it difficult to believe they really mean it. I think maybe they're kidding me or just aren't being sincere.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. If there is any criticism or anyone says anything about me, I just can't take it.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. I don't say much at social affairs because I'm afraid that people will criticize me or laugh if I say the wrong thing.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. I realize that I'm not living very effectively but I just don't believe that I've got it in me to use my energies in better ways.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. I don't approve of doing favors for people. If you're too agreeable they'll take advantage of you.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. I look on most of the feelings and impulses I have toward people as being quite natural and acceptable.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Something inside me just won't let me be satisfied with any job I've done--if it turns out well, I get a very smug feeling that this is beneath me, I shouldn't be satisfied with this, this isn't a fair test.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. I feel different from other people. I'd like to have the feeling of security that comes from knowing I'm not too different from others.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. I'm afraid for people that I like to find out what I'm really like, for fear they'd be disappointed in me.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. I am frequently bothered by feelings of inferiority.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. Because of other people, I haven't been able to achieve as much as I should have.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. I am quite shy and self-conscious in social situations.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. I usually ignore the feelings of others when I'm accomplishing some important end.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. I seem to have a real inner strength in handling things. I'm on a pretty solid foundation and it makes me pretty sure of myself.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. There's no sense in compromising. When people have values I don't like, I just don't care to have much to do with them.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. The person you marry may not be perfect, but I believe in trying to get him (or her) to change along desirable lines.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. I see no objection to stepping on other people's toes a little if it'll help get me what I want in life.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. I feel self-conscious when I'm with people who have a superior position to mine in business or at school.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. I try to get people to do what I want them to do, in one way or another.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26. I often tell people what they should do when they're having trouble in making a decision.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27. I enjoy myself most when I'm alone, away from other people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 28. I think I'm neurotic or something.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 29. I feel neither above nor below the people I meet.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30. Sometimes people misunderstand me when I try to keep them from making mistakes that could have an important effect on their lives.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 31. Very often I don't try to be friendly with people because I think they won't like me.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 32. There are very few times when I compliment people for their talents or jobs they've done.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 33. I enjoy doing little favors for people even if I don't know them well.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 34. I feel that I'm a person of worth, on an equal plane with others.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 35. I can't avoid feeling guilty about the way I feel toward certain people in my life.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 36. I prefer to be alone rather than have close friendships with any of the people around me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 37. I'm not afraid of meeting new people. I feel that I'm a worthwhile person and there's no reason why they should dislike me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 38. I sort of only half-believe in myself.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 39. I seldom worry about other people. I'm really pretty self-centered.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 40. I'm very sensitive. People say things and I have a tendency to think they're criticizing me or insulting me in some way and later when I think of it, they may not have meant anything like that at all.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 41. I think I have certain abilities and other people say so too, but I wonder if I'm not giving them an importance way beyond what they deserve.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 42. I feel confident that I can do something about the problems that may arise in the future.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 43. I believe that people should get credit for their accomplishments, but I very seldom come across work that deserves praise.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 44. When someone asks for advice about some personal problem, I'm most likely to say, "It's up to you to decide," rather than tell him what he should do.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 45. I guess I put on a show to impress people. I know I'm not the person I pretend to be.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 46. I feel that for the most part one has to fight his way through life. That means that people who stand in the way will be hurt.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 47. I can't help feeling superior to most of the people I know.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 48. I do not worry or condemn myself if other people pass judgment against me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 49. I don't hesitate to urge people to live by the same high set of values which I have for myself.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 50. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 51. I don't feel very normal, but I want to feel normal.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 52. When I'm in a group I usually don't say much for fear of saying the wrong thing.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 53. I have a tendency to sidestep my problems.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 54. If people are weak and inefficient I'm inclined to take advantage of them. I believe you must be strong to achieve your goals.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 55. I'm easily irritated by people who argue with me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 56. When I'm dealing with younger persons, I expect them to do what I tell them.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 57. I don't see much point to doing things for others unless they can do you some good later on.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 58. Even when people do think well of me, I feel sort of guilty because I know I must be fooling them--that if I were really to be myself, they wouldn't think well of me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 59. I feel that I'm on the same level as other people and that helps to establish good relations with them.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 60. If someone I know is having difficulty in working things out for himself, I like to tell him what to do.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 61. I feel that people are apt to react differently to me than they would normally react to other people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 62. I live too much by other people's standards.



- \_\_\_\_\_ 63. When I have to address a group, I get self-conscious and have difficulty saying things well.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 64. If I didn't always have such hard luck, I'd accomplish much more than I have.

## APPENDIX C

This section concerns attitudes toward punishment of criminals. On the following page you will find a number of statements expressing different attitudes toward punishment of criminals.

Put a plus sign (+) if you agree with the statement.  
Make no mark if you disagree with the statement.

Try to indicate either agreement or disagreement for each statement. If you simply cannot decide about a statement you may mark it with a question mark.

This is not an examination. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. This is simply a study of people's attitudes toward the punishment of criminals. Please indicate your own convictions by a plus mark (+) when you agree.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. A person should be imprisoned only for serious offenses.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. It is wrong for society to make any of its members suffer.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Hard prison life will keep men from committing crime.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Some criminals do not benefit from punishment.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Most prisons are schools of crime.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. We should not consider the comfort of a prisoner.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. A criminal will go straight only when he finds that prison life is hard.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. No punishment can reduce crime.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Prison influence is degenerating.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Only habitual criminals should be punished.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. We should employ corporal punishment in dealing with all criminals.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. I have no opinion about the treatment of crime.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Punishment of criminals is a disgrace to civilized society.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Solitary confinement will make the criminal penitent.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. It is advantageous to society to spare certain criminals.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. Only humane treatment can cure criminals.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. Harsh imprisonment merely embitters a criminal.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. No leniency should be shown to convicts.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. Many petty offenders become dangerous criminals after a prison term.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. Failure to punish the criminal encourages crime.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. Only by extreme brutal punishment can we cure the criminal.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. The more severely a man is punished, the greater criminal he becomes.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. A criminal should be punished first and then reformed.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. One way to deter men from crime is to make them suffer.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. Punishment is wasteful of human life.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26. A bread and water diet in prison will cure the criminal.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 27. Brutal treatment of a criminal makes him more dangerous.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 28. A jail sentence will cure many criminals of further offenses.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 29. Prison inmates should be put in irons.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 30. We should consider the individual in treating crime.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 31. Even the most vicious criminal should not be harmed.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 32. It is fair for society to punish those who offend against it.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 33. Humane treatment inspires the criminal to be good.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 34. Some punishment is necessary in dealing with the criminal.

APPENDIX D.

We are going to give you a number of examples of how people act in certain situations in an institution like this one. Different people feel very differently about these examples. We would like to know how you feel about someone doing these things: whether you feel he

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

do them. Please circle, under each statement, the answer which best shows how you feel about what people should or should not do in an institution like this.

Here is one example just for practice:

a) An inmate watches TV as much as he can.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

We would like you to circle the answer which shows how you feel things should be, not how they are. If you feel an inmate absolutely should watch TV as much as he can, then circle ABSOLUTELY SHOULD. If you feel an inmate absolutely should not watch TV as much as he can, then circle ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT. If you feel somewhere in between, then circle SHOULD or MAY OR MAY NOT or SHOULD NOT, depending on which answer shows best just how you feel. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these examples and remember to answer the questions the way you think things should be, not the way they are. We are interested in your opinion, in just how you feel things should or should not be.

Turn the page and read each example carefully; then circle the answer which best shows how you feel about each one.

SUBSCALE

- IO 1. An inmate causes as much trouble as he can.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- TS 2. Staff members help an inmate if he gets in trouble.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IAT 3. A guy minds his own business in here.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- CS 4. Staff members only concern themselves with keeping the inmates from causing them trouble.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- PS 5. Staff members treat an inmate as if he is here to pay off his debt to society.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- ISI 6. A guy tries to learn as much as he can from his school-work.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IO 7. An old inmate gives the new guys wrong information so they will get into trouble.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- TS 8. Staff members try to help an inmate take a new look at his life.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IAT 9. A guy tries to get along by keeping his mouth shut around the staff.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

CS 10. Staff members act like their main job is to keep things running smoothly.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

PS 11. Staff members push an inmate till he breaks.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

ISI 12. A guy really tries to learn something in work release that will be of use to him later.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

IO 13. A guy lies to an officer if he can get away with it.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

TS 14. Staff members try to understand an inmate's problems.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

IAT 15. A guy does only what he is told.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

CS 16. Staff members act as if their main job is preventing escapes.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

PS 17. Staff members are rough with inmates to show them who's boss.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

ISI 18. A guy who's been around for a while tries to make a new inmate feel more comfortable here.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

IO 19. A guy goofs off while he's in school.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

- TS 20. Staff members take a personal interest in the inmates here.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IAT 21. An inmate's main concern is to stay out of trouble.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- CS 22. Staff members see an inmate as someone to be controlled.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- PS 23. Staff members see to it that a guy has a hard time here to make up for what he did on the outside.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- ISI 24. A guy does the best work he can when he's on a work detail.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IO 25. A guy tries to team up with a guy who will help him fight the program.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- TS 26. Staff members help an inmate to plan his future on the outside.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IAT 27. A guy figures the best way to get along is by keeping his cool.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- CS 28. Staff members think about the inmates as little as necessary.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT



**CONTINUED**

**1 OF 2**

- PS 29. Staff members remind an inmate that he is in here to pay for his crime.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- ISI 30. A guy tries to figure out how to get along with other guys while he is in here.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IO 31. A guy works it out so he can con the staff.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- TS 32. Staff members try to teach an inmate skills that will help on the streets.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IAT 33. A guy keeps to himself as much as possible.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- CS 34. Staff members supervise inmates to make sure no one gets out of line.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- PS 35. Staff members send an inmate to segregation even for little things.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- ISI 36. A guy does his best to cooperate when he's assigned to work with another guy.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IO 37. An inmate tries to get around as many of the rules as possible.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

- TS 39. Staff members try to help an inmate understand why he is here.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IAT 39. A guy acts like his stay here is just a matter of waiting out time.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- CS 40. Staff members never give a guy a break.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- PS 41. Staff members jump on a guy the minute he gets out of line.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- ISI 42. A guy spends a lot of time thinking while he's in here about how to get along on the outside.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IO 43. A guy fouls up on purpose when he goes on work release.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- TS 44. Staff members take time to help a guy learn how to get along with others around here.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- IAT 45. A guy in here thinks only of doing his own time.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- CS 46. Staff members only get to know the troublemakers.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT
- PS 47. Staff members treat inmates as if they deserve to be punished.
- ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT

- ISI 48. An inmate talks over his problems with a staff member.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT
- IO 49. An inmate tries to get back at a staff member for giving  
him a hard time.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT
- TS 50. Staff members try to show a guy where he went wrong  
so he won't make the same mistakes again.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT
- IAT 51. A guy tries to steer clear of the staff.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT
- CS 52. The staff leaves an inmate alone unless the inmate  
causes trouble.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT
- PS 53. Staff members act like they're here to punish a guy  
for what he did.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT
- ISI 54. An inmate trusts most of the staff members around here.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT
- IO 55. A guy does whatever he can get away with once he knows  
the ropes.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT
- TS 56. Staff members work hard to teach an inmate how to get  
the most out of his stay here.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT
- IAT 57. An inmate tries to find the easiest job he can.  
ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT

CS 58. The staff's main worry is keeping things quiet around here.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT

PS 59. Staff members make it hard on him if an inmate breaks a rule.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT

ISI 60. A guy tries to learn how to get along with authority while he is in here.

ABSOLUTELY SHOULD MAY OR MAY NOT SHOULD NOT ABSOLUTELY  
SHOULD SHOULD NOT

## APPENDIX E

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING  
PHASE I  
GROUP III  
FIRST WEEK  
July 19-23, 1971

MONDAY	8:00	Introduction	Bob Phelps
	9:30	Welcome	Warden Housewright
	10:15	Tour of facility	Sgt. Bob Briddick
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Vienna's policies, pro- cedures and organiza- tion	Asst. Warden Beisner Asst. Warden Hood Capt. Rushing Lt. Bowen Counselor John Reynolds Sgt. Joe Passerini
TUESDAY	8:00	Pre-test	Chip Paddock
	11:00	Report Writing	Don Cunningham
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Report Writing	Don Cunningham
WED.	8:00	Movies	
	10:00	The Criminal Justice System	George Kiefer
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	The Criminal Justice System	George Kiefer
THURS.	7:00	Work assignments	
FRIDAY	8:00	Rap Session re: previous day	
	9:00	Judo	Darrel Conley
	11:00	Parole Practices	Ed Knowles
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	The law and corrections	J. Lewis Wingate

July 19-23, 1971

Reading assignment for week:

ACA Manual, chapter 19, p. 313,  
"Administrative Organization of an Institution."  
"Vienna Five Year Plan"  
"The New Facility"

Movies for the week:

"Dehumanization and the Total Institution."  
"Doomed"  
"The Cry for Help"  
"A Place in the Sun"

A daily report is required. Trainees will be quizzed weekly on all class work and reading assignments.

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING  
 PHASE I  
 GROUP III  
 SECOND WEEK  
 July 26-30, 1971

MONDAY			
	8:00	Rap session re: previ- vious week	
	9:00	Movie	
	10:00	Criminal Behavior	Dr. Stan Brodsky
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Criminal Behavior	Dr. Stan Brodsky
TUESDAY			
	8:00	Rap session re: prob- lems at Vienna	
	8:45	Weekly quiz and movies	
	10:00	Rehabilitation	Dr. John Grenfell
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Rehabilitation	Dr. John Grenfell
WED.			
	8:00	Communications Labor- atory	S.I.U. Edwardsville Staff
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Communications Labor- atory	S.I.U. Edwardsville Staff
THURS.			
	8:00	Communications Labor- atory	S.I.U. Edwardsville Staff
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Communications Labor- atory	S.I.U. Edwardsville Staff
Friday			
	8:00	Communications Labor- atory	S.I.U. Edwardsville Staff
	12:00	Communications Outing Dixon Springs State Park	S.I.U. Edwardsville Staff



July 26-30, 1971

Reading Assignment for week:

ACA Manual, chapter 22, p. 366,

"Custody and Security."

Vienna "Narrative Report"

Three (3) memos from Warden Housewright re: housing,  
food service, and count.

Movies for the week:

"The Odds Against"

"The Price of Life"

"Revolving Door"

A daily report is required. Trainees will be quizzed weekly on  
all class work and reading assignments.

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING  
 PHASE I  
 GROUP III  
 THIRD WEEK  
 August 2-6, 1971

MONDAY	8:00	Drugs and alcohol	S.I.U. Edwardsville Staff
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Drugs and alcohol	S.I.U. Edwardsville Staff
TUESDAY	8:00	Drugs and alcohol	S.I.U. Edwardsville Staff
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Drugs and alcohol	S.I.U. Edwardsville Staff
WED.	8:00	Weekly quiz	
	9:00	Human Relations	Jack Porche
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Human Relations	Jack Porche
THURS.	8:00	Rap session	
	8:45	Movies	
	10:00	History and Development of Corrections	Dr. Tom Eynon
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	History and Development of Corrections	Dr. Tom Eynon
Friday	2:45	Work assignments	

Reading assignment for week:

ACA Manual, chapter 24, p. 401  
 Booklet, "New Horizons in Corrections"

Movies for the week:

"Emotions and Crime"  
 "Criminal and How to Neutralize Him"  
 "The Criminal"  
 "Brakes and Misbehavior"

A daily report is required. Trainees will be quizzed weekly on all class work and reading assignments.

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING  
PHASE I  
GROUP III  
FOURTH WEEK  
August 9-13, 1971

MONDAY	8:00	Rap sessions re: work assignments of past week	
	9:15	Movie - Weekly quiz	
	10:00	Correctional Environment	George Killinger
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Correctional Environment	George Killinger
TUESDAY			
	6:45	Work assignments and job interviews	
WED.			
	8:00	First Aid	Trp. Sam Hiller
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	First Aid	Trp. Sam Hiller
THURS.			
	8:00	First Aid	Trp. Sam Hiller
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	First Aid	Trp. Sam Hiller
FRIDAY			
	8:00	First Aid	Trp. Sam Hiller
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	First Aid	Trp. Sam Hiller

Reading assignment for week:

ACA Manual, chapter 21, p. 351,  
"Classification"  
First Aid Book

Movies for the week:

"True Criminal"  
"Sexuality and Crime"  
"IQ and Crime"  
"Types of Inmates"

A daily report is required. Trainees will be quizzed weekly on all class work and reading assignments.

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER TRAINING  
 PHASE I  
 GROUP III  
 FIFTH WEEK  
 August 16-20, 1971

MONDAY	<u>10:45</u>	Report on Sunday, August 15, 1971, at 10:45 <u>p.m.</u> for assign- ment on the 11-7 shift.	
TUESDAY	8:00	Weekly quiz	
	8:45	Rap session re: work assignment	
	9:15	Movie	
	10:00	Race and minority rela- tions	Paul Denise
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Race and minority rela- tions	Paul Denise
WED.	8:45	Marion Penitentiary tour	Tom Keohane and Staff
	12:00	Lunch - Price \$.70	
	1:00	Marion Penitentiary tour T.A. workshop	Tom Keohane Dr. Groder
	2:30	Rap session	Warden Pickett Capt. Stewart
THURS.	8:00	Hospital insurance pres- entation - four insur- ance companies	
	10:00	Department of Personnel State of Illinois	Maurice Cohen & Staff
	12:00	Lunch	
	1:00	Supervision - Department Personnel	Maurice Cohen & Staff
Friday	2:45	Work Assignment	

August 16-20, 1971

Reading assignment for week:

ACA Manual, Chapter 33, p. 541

"Inmate Activities and Privileges"

Reprint - "The Heroin Plague: What Can Be Done"

Movies for the week:

"Roots of Criminality"

"Custodial Procedures"

"Control of Inmates"

"Attitude in Supervision"

A daily report is required. Trainees will be quizzed weekly on all class work and reading assignments.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
DIVISION OF THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY  
5708 SOUTH ELLIS AVENUE  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637

MEMORANDUM

TO : [Name]

FROM : [Name]

SUBJECT: [Subject]

[Main body of text, including a list of items or data points]

[Additional text or notes]

August 23-27, 1971

Reading assignment for week:

ACA Manual, Chapter 27, p. 444, "Food Service"

Movies for the week:

"Inmate Training - Part I"

"Inmate Training - Part II"

"Pre-release"

"reception"

A daily report is required. Trainees will be quizzed weekly on all class work and reading assignments.

**END**

*7-10-1911*