



July 31, 1985

Prison Anger Reduction Programs Evaluation Development Project

N.E. Schafer & Allan R. Barnes

Suggested citation

Schafer, N.E.; & Barnes, Allan R. (1985). *Prison Anger Reduction Programs Evaluation Development Project*. Report prepared for the Alaska Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault. Anchorage: Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage.

Summary

This report describes efforts to develop Alaska-specific norms for the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), using the Megargee offender classification system, for use in program evaluations in Alaska correctional facilities, specifically for evaluation of three pilot anger reduction programs initiated at Alaska Department of Corrections institutions in late 1984/early 1985: (1) Women in Crisis (at Fairbanks Correctional Center); (2) M. E. N., Inc. (at Lemon Creek Correctional Center, Juneau); (3) Bering Sea Women's Group (at Nome Correctional Center). The report provides assessments of the three programs and the correctional centers where they were held and makes recommendations for completing the development of Alaska-specific MMPI-based norms and for the administration of the MMPI as pre- and post-test for measuring psychological changes — particularly in hostility/frustration levels — in participants in anger reduction programs.

PRISON ANGER REDUCTION PROGRAMS
EVALUATION DEVELOPMENT PROJECT



JUSTICE CENTER

University of Alaska, Anchorage
Anchorage, Alaska

PRISON ANGER REDUCTION PROGRAMS
EVALUATION DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

by

N. E. Schafer, Ph.D.
Allan R. Barnes, Ph.D.

Justice Center
School of Justice
University of Alaska, Anchorage

SOJ # 8507

This project was undertaken pursuant to a grant from The Alaska Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault.

July 1, 1985
(Revised July 31, 1985)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION I. HISTORY OF THE PROJECT	2
SECTION II. PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING	6
Table 1 - Megargee's Self-Imposed Questions	8
Table 2 - Capsule Characteristics of the Ten Types	11
Table 3 - Racial Breakdown of All Scored Answer Sheets	13
Table 4 - MMPI Testing Results Summary	14
Table 5 - Rejected MMPI Answer Sheets	15
Table 6 - Megargee Offender Classification Type By Racial Group - Initial Machine Scoring	17
SECTION III. SITE ASSESSMENT - FACILITIES	19
SECTION IV. SITE ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS	23
Chart I. Theoretical Domestic Violence Treatment Models	24
Nome	25
Fairbanks	26
Juneau	28
SECTION V. RECOMMENDATIONS	32
Form I - Client Intake	38
Form II - Client Progress	39
APPENDIX A Original Evaluation Proposal	
B Proposal Revision Agreement	
C Site Visits	
D Complete List of Scales for Megargee System	

Introduction

This report, submitted by the Justice Center to the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, constitutes a preliminary examination of three pilot programs in three Alaska correctional institutions. The initial plan was to conduct an extensive evaluation of the programs based on a 4-6 month data collection period. Because of delays in proposal submission, start-up time, and funding, a meeting was held to make revisions in the original evaluation proposal. This report reflects our progress on the new agreement and to provide a base for the future evaluation of program effectiveness.

The report is divided into five sections. Section I is a history of the project which details the original proposal and the agreed revisions in it. Section II reports the progress made in normalizing MMPI derived scales and typologies with respect to the inmates of the Alaska Department of Corrections, and, specifically, to the Native Alaskan inmate. In the third and fourth sections program sites are compared. Section III compares facilities in order to explore how differences among the institutions may require differences in program design or delivery, while Section IV discusses the three programs. Program goals and objectives, intake/referral procedures, treatment technologies, and problems and issues are described.

Section V is devoted to the development of rationales for ongoing evaluation and in it some data collection methods are proposed. Sample data collection instruments are suggested in this discussion.

SECTION I. HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

The Alaska Department of Corrections contracted with the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Abuse to initiate three pilot anger reduction programs at correctional institutions in the state. The Council invited grant proposals from local affiliates who wished to provide these programs. The local grants were submitted in September, 1984 and three were selected: Women in Crisis for Fairbanks Correctional Center (Fairbanks), M.E.N. Inc. for Lemon Creek Correctional Center (Juneau), and Bering Sea Women's Group for Nome Correctional Center (Nome).

The Department of Corrections contract stipulated that an independent evaluation of the programs be completed during the contract year. In December 1984 the School of Justice submitted a proposal to do the evaluation to the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (see Appendix A). The original proposal included:

- Administration of the MMPI as pre- and post-test for measuring the psychological changes in hostility/frustration levels in program participants.
- Arrange preliminary follow-up of participant behavior for three and six month intervals.
- Develop service delivery instruments through which program facilitators could chart group success and participant progress.

Assured that the Reimbursable Services Agreement would be

forthcoming Dr. Barnes made preliminary site visits in December to Fairbanks and Juneau. At this time both Women in Crisis (Fairbanks) and M.E.N. Inc. (Juneau) were still in a "start-up" phase. M.E.N. Inc. had just begun a small group series and Women in Crisis had met with six prisoners since starting a group in October. In Nome, which was not visited at that time, the Bering Sea Womens' group was expanding programming for an already existing and continuing batterers' program at the jail. Thus on January 7, 1985 only one of the three pilot programs was fully operational. Because the Fairbanks and Juneau programs were intended to last at least 12 weeks, the maximum period for participant follow-up would have been three months, an inadequate interval for even a preliminary assessment of behavioral change.

Although the Justice Center proposal was approved in January funding was delayed until March due to a state government spending freeze. Since data gathering for the program evaluation had to be completed before the end of the 1985 fiscal year, the proposal had to be revised. A meeting was held on March 22 with Barbara Miklos, Executive Director of the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, Susan Humphrey-Barnett, Director of Programs, Alaska Department of Correction, and Allan Barnes and Nancy Schafer of the School of Justice. It was decided at the meeting that the plan would be revised and steps would be taken by the evaluators to develop evaluation tools. Because the MMPI was an integral part of the original proposal it was suggested that norms for MMPI-based scales and typologies be established for an Alaska prison population. The establishment of such norms

would improve the Department's programming decisions and assure assignment of inmates to institutions where needed programs are available. This process would ultimately impact all programs, not just those delivered by the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Abuse.

Under the revised plan the School of Justice agreed to the following:

1. Establishing norms for MMPI-based scales, with emphasis on the Megargee offender classification system for use with Alaska population groups. With establishment of Alaska-specific norms the instrument and its derived scales could be used in evaluating programs in which psychological assessment was an important consideration.

With the cooperation and assistance of the Department of Corrections and of the facilities specified, the evaluators agreed to: administer the MMPI to 250 500 prisoners in regions selected for ethnic diversity Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Nome, and Palmer. The Justice Center agreed also to contract with E.I. Megargee for scoring of the answer sheets and to identify scales appropriate for program evaluations in Alaska correctional facilities.

2. Site Comparisons. The evaluators agreed also to assess differences and similarities among the program sites vis-a-vis institutional environment, program delivery, client assessment and referral, treatment modalities,

etc. Each facility differs from the others in terms of purpose, operation, and composition of the population. These differences require differing service delivery approaches and techniques, yet a valid evaluation system must be found which will focus on commonalities, and be "difference neutral."

3. Identification of evaluation factors. The School also began the identification of relevant factors to be included in a model instrument designed for long-term data collection.

The selected institutions were notified by memoranda from the program director's office of the impending MMPI testing process. Each superintendent was telephoned by the School of Justice. The liaison persons identified by the superintendents at each site were then contacted to arrange for testing. By mid-April preliminary testing schedules had been arranged and on-site testing began April 21 in Anchorage and was completed June 5.

Interviews with prison staff and with program facilitators were conducted prior to the funding date and between mid-March and June 30th.

The completion of these steps in a three month period was facilitated by the cooperation, courtesy and patience offered to the evaluation team. Both program staff and correctional center personnel were candid and cooperative. Institutional staff were enthusiastic about the anger reduction programs and sincerely interested in the test normalization process. We thank all involved for their assistance.

SECTION II. PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING

In lieu of only testing participants in the various anger reduction programs, an effort was made to build a base of psychological data sufficiently large such that future psychological testing could be interpreted with respect to Alaska's general inmate population. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) is a well-known and extensively used correctional psychological evaluation instrument and the basis for the Megargee inmate classification system. The MMPI and Megargee's MMPI-based classification system will be discussed in this section and our findings will be presented.

Several benefits were anticipated from the use of the Megargee system. First, Megargee could provide unique Alaska norms, given sufficient scoreable answer sheets, not only with respect to the classification system but also for the MMPI and 80 additional clinical scales, many of which are directly related to anger reduction efforts. Second, a wealth of psychological data about each inmate would be available to both the researchers and mental health practitioners and this data would provide a means of assessing psychological changes in the anger reduction program participants. And third, the MMPI upon which the Megargee system is based is relatively easy to administer in correctional settings and can be machine scored to provide the Megargee classification and the additional scores with a minimum of effort by the hard-pressed mental health professional at the various institutions, thus allowing its continued use once the UAA research team has completed its evaluation.

We now turn to a description of the Megargee MMPI-based inmate classification system. This is followed by a discussion of the results of our effort to establish unique Alaska norms.

In the early 1970s, Meyer and Megargee (1972) undertook to devise an MMPI-based taxonomy for offenders which would be more responsive to the increased need to provide greater treatment without the objections and shortcomings of previous classification systems. Megargee identified seven essential requirements for a taxonomic system: (1) sufficiently complete such that most offenders can be classified; (2) clear operational definitions such that there is a minimum amount of ambiguity surrounding each person classified; (3) reliable; (4) valid; (5) dynamic, such that changes in the individual will be reflected in the classification; (6) a treatment should be implied with each classification; and (7) economical in both cost and personnel.

In addition to a research program which would meet the requirements stated above, Megargee imposed seven additional questions (see Table 1), upon his efforts. The Federal Correctional Institution (FCI) in Tallahassee was the site of this project. At that time, FCI was a 500 bed medium level facility housing young adults.

The process began by selecting samples of profiles obtained from the inmates at the prison in an attempt to determine if naturally occurring subgroups would emerge. Eventually, after revision, and eliminating those groups with few members, ten such groups emerged. Those groups were identified as Able, Baker,

TABLE 1

MEGARGEE'S SELF-IMPOSED QUESTIONS

NO.	QUESTIONS
1.	Do the MMPI profiles of youthful offenders in a federal correctional institution fall into distinct groups or clusters?
2.	Are such groups reliable? That is, does one obtain the same basic groupings in different samples?
3.	Is it possible for a clinician to sort individual MMPI profiles into such groups reliably?
4.	Is it possible to define such groups operationally so that other clinicians, or even a computer program, can sort individual MMPI profiles validly?
5.	Assuming that an MMPI-based system can be derived and reliable classification is possible, do such groups differ significantly on non-MMPI variables, for example, in their life-styles, social history, behavior, and dynamics?
6.	If the groups do differ in their behavior, are there clear implications for treatment?
7.	Is such treatment effective? Does each group respond better to the prescribed treatment than to other treatment modes?
8.	Can a system derived on data collected on incarcerated youthful offenders in a federal institution be generalized to offenders in other settings who differ in age, sex and offense patterns?

From: Megargee and Bohn, 1979, pp. 82-83.

Charlie, Delta, Easy, Foxtrot, George, How, Item, and Jupiter. Megargee has resisted the use of descriptive labels in keeping with the empirical procedure used in constructing the groups. Thus, as the investigation of the differences between groups continues, the description of each group is allowed to develop unencumbered by perhaps misleading labels which may later prove to be false.

Once the distinct groups were identified, essential rules of group membership were developed, along with accessory rules which determined the degree of a profile's group membership (high, medium, low, or minimal). Thus, it is possible for one profile to best fit the essential rules for Group Easy at a medium level and another to best fit into Group George at a low level. The profiles can thus fall into one of three conditions: (1) singularly classified into one of the ten groups at one of the four levels, e.g., Group Baker at a medium level; (2) multiply classified as a tie between two or more groups at one of the four levels, e.g., Able and Foxtrot both at a high level (in these cases, the judgment of the clinician breaks the tie); (3) unclassifiable either due to failure of the profile to meet any of the essential rules for group classification, in which case they are clinically classified or due to an invalid (random, unscorable, etc.) profile. Those profiles with merely questionable validity are scored but their use is left to the judgment of the clinician. Computer programs based on these empirical rules can uniquely classify about 67% of the profiles in a sample.

Once a reliable and efficient method was developed for

classifying profiles into the ten subgroups, the next step was to determine if there were valid differences among the groups. Megargee collected a wide variety of data on inmates entering the federal prison. Each inmate was administered an extensive test battery, clinically interviewed, evaluated throughout his stay on numerous dimensions of his behavior, had his background checked and his social and family background evaluated. Even recidivism data was obtained. In all, over 1000 inmates were involved in the initial validity portion of the research. Of the 164 measures employed, 140 were able to distinguish among the groups (Zager, 1981, p. 6).

The final phase involved determining the treatment recommendations for each of the types. The treatment descriptions reflected the information obtained in the establishment of the characteristics of the groups and the differences among them. Even so, Megargee has stressed that the recommendations are only suggestions and that further research is needed.

Table 2 contains the condensed characteristics of the ten types. It should be noted that these major characteristics are those which describe and distinguish among the groups but that not all members of each group share all the characteristics of that group. Thus, the table should be read as "a majority of the men" or "most of the men" have the characteristics indicated.

The evaluation team administered MMPI's at five sites: Cook Inlet Pre-Trial facility in Anchorage, Palmer Correctional Center in Palmer, Nome Correctional Center, Fairbanks Correctional

Table 2 Capsule characteristics of the ten types

Name and proportion	MMPI characteristics		Observed modal characteristics	Management and treatment recommendations
	Elevation	Pattern		
Able (17%)	Moderate, peak score ca. 70 or less	Bimodal with peaks on 4 and 9	Charming, popular, impulsive, and manipulative. Middle class, achievement oriented, do well in institution but emerge relatively unaffected	Need change agent with sense of humor and structured setting to deal with their manipulative games and confront them with outcomes of their behavior
Baker (4%)	Moderate; Pd ca. 70; D ca. 65	Peaks on 4 and 2, slopes down to right	Inadequate, anxious, defensive, constricted and dogmatic; tends to abuse alcohol but not other drugs	Initial anxiety requires supportive help. Later many will benefit from alcohol treatment and educational programming. Need counseling to stop self-defeating patterns
Charlie (9%)	High; peak scale >80; several >70	Peaks on 8, 6, and 4; slopes up to right	Hostile, misanthropic, suspicious with extensive histories of maladjustment, crime, and drug and alcohol abuse. Alienated, aggressive, antagonistic and antisocial	Require secure setting and extensive programming. Consistency, fairness and perseverance needed to avoid further need of drugs and/or acting out when stressed
Delta (10%)	Moderate to high Pd at least 70, often 80 or 90	Unimodal; prominent Pd spike; others below 70	Amoral, hedonistic, egocentric; bright and manipulative. Poor relations with peers and authorities. Impulsive, sensation-seeking leads to frequent infractions	Often have extensive records requiring incarceration. Separate from weaker, more easily exploited inmates. Challenging and confronting needed but prognosis poor
Easy (7%)	Low. To scale below 80, often below 70	43 profile; slopes down to right	Bright, stable, well educated middle class, with good adjustment and resources. Underachievers who take easy path, but have good interpersonal relationships	Minimal needs for structure or treatment. Challenge them to take advantage of assets. Respond well to educational programming
Foxtrot (8%)	High. Top scale(s) over 80 and others over 70	Slopes up to right; 89 and 4 top three scales	Tough, street-wise, cynical, antisocial. Deprivation and deviance lead to extensive criminal histories, poor prison adjustment. Deficits in all areas	Require structure and strong change agent. Extensive changes needed; peer counseling and program with obvious contingencies required to make behavior more socialized
George (7%)	Moderate; D and Pd ca. 70	Like Baker but scales 1, 2 and 3 more elevated	Hardworking, submissive, anxious from deviant families. Learned criminal values; do their own time and take advantage of educational and vocational opportunities	Need to learn alternatives to crime as livelihood. Supportive treatment at outset, followed by rational-cooperative approach and education and vocational programming
How (13%)	Very high. Top scales >80 or 90	Elevated multi-modal profile. No particular code pattern	Unstable, agitated, disturbed, "mental health" cases. Function ineffectively in all areas and have extensive needs	Require further diagnosis and program aimed at overcoming mental-health problems. Warm but structured therapeutic environment with mental health resources needed
Item (19%)	Very low. Scales usually under 70	No particular pattern	Stable, effectively functioning well adjusted group with minimal problems, few authority conflicts	Basically normal group with minimal needs for structure, support or treatment beyond what dictated by legal situation
Jupiter (3%)	Moderate to high. Peak scales over 70	Slopes up to right with top scores on 8, 9, 7	Overcoming deprived background fairly well but have conflicts with staff and other inmates. Work hard and do better than expected after release	Change agent supportive of efforts to overcome deficits via educational and/or vocational programming. Counseling and tolerance for setbacks that occur

From: Megargee, E.I. (1984) Derivation, Validation and Application of an MMPI-Based System for Classifying Criminal Offenders. Med Law 3:109-118.

Center, and Lemon Creek Correctional Center in Juneau. The total available population at these sites was 1,027 but only 295 were tested (see Table 3). At CIPT, Fairbanks and Nome all prisoners were informed about the test by the testers; at Juneau volunteer test takers were recruited prior to the test by institutional staff. At Palmer, both procedures were tried.

Table 3 summarizes our findings about who actually volunteered to be tested. Except for Palmer, we tested approximately one-third of each institution. The percentage of white, black and Alaska Natives in our sample closely resembles that of the DOC percentages of 56%, 8% and 34% respectively, for those groups. Table 4 further breaks down these numbers to reveal the racial groupings of the Alaska Natives.

Additional inmates actually began the process of taking the MMPI but for one reason or another, the researchers rejected their answer sheets as invalid or unscorable and did not send them to be scored with the 295 described above. Table 5 reveals that almost 60% of the rejected answer sheets did not have at least one-fourth of the questions answered, indicating, perhaps, a quick change of mind in our volunteer group. Only 25 were rejected for not having quite enough scoreable items even though they had completed at least one-fourth of the test. Most of this group may have intended to finish but were called away or time ran out for testing. Interestingly, 67 (44%) of the 152 individuals who began the test at Fairbanks had their answer sheets rejected by the researchers prior to scoring.

TABLE 3

RACIAL BREAKDOWN OF ALL SCORED ANSWER SHEETS

<u>Race</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Alaska Natives</u>	<u>N</u>
White	161 ^a	Aleut	7
Black	21	Athabascan	16
Amer. Indian	9 ^b	Eskimo-Inupiat	30
Other	6 ^c	Eskimo-Yupik	21
Alaska Native	<u>98^d</u>	Haida	1
	295	Tlingit	19
		Other Alaska Natives	<u>4</u>
			98

^a includes 6 white females

^b includes 1 American Indian female

^c includes 1 female

^d includes 1 female Yupik and 1 female Tlingit

TABLE 4. MMPI TESTING RESULTS SUMMARY

Institution		Male N =	White ¹	Black	Asian	Amer. Ind. ²	Other	AK Native	Fem. N= ³	Grand Total ³
Fairbanks	250	79 (32%)	46	8	0	2	2	6	6	85
Nome	42	16 (38%)	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	16
Juneau	172	51 (30%)	21	0	0	2	1	27	4	55
CIPT	337	113 (34%)	73	12	0	4	1	23	0	113
Palmer	226	26 (11%)	15	1	0	0	0	10	0	26
GRAND TOTALS	1027	285 (28%)	155	21	0	8	4	82	10	295
Males/Race % tested		285	54%	7%	0	3%	1%	29%		

¹ includes Hispanic

² American Indian from Lower 48

³ females/totals including females

TABLE 5. REJECTED MMPI ANSWER SHEETS

Institution	Reason for Rejection					Total Scored Answer Sheets	Total Institut. Population
	Didn't Answer 500 items	Answered less than 140 items	Random	Other	Total rejected Ans. Shts.		
Fairbanks - 116	16	45	4	2	67	85	250
Nome - 117	0	0	0	0	0	16	42
Juneau - 118	1	0	3	0	4	55	172
CIPT - 124	8	5	0	1	14	113	337
Palmer - 125	0	0	0	0	0	26	226
GRAND TOTALS	25	50	7	3	85	295	1027

Overall, our volunteer group of test-takers appears to mirror the racial/ethnic composition of the DOC. The 295 scored answer sheets, however, represent only 17% of the total incarcerated DOC population. Given the highly voluntary nature of the testing, one can question the representativeness of the results with respect to the more recalcitrant, non-volunteering inmates who obviously make up a large percentage of DOC population.

Due to an inadequate number of answer sheets, we were unable to provide separate norms for Alaska. Therefore, the MMPI profiles, the additional scales, and the resulting classifications are based on the norms found in the Federal Bureau of Prisons (N=20,840 males, 4,040 females).

In Table 6 we see the comparisons between the Alaska Natives and all others in each of the Megargee types. The 52 "ties" represent the multiply-classed profiles. All of these can be singularly classified by someone familiar with the system into one of the ten types at the rate of about nine per hour. The 51 unclassified profiles represent somewhat more difficulty, but it is expected that at least 25 can be classified at a rate of five per hour. The percentage of ties and initially unclassifiable profiles found in our sample, 17.6% and 17.3% respectively, is almost identical to Megargee's own published results.

Also with respect to race, we found no statistically significant differences between Native and non-Natives on the Megargee offender type, on any of the traditional MMPI scales, or on any of the additional clinical scales. There were also no differ-

Table 6: Megargee Offender Classification Type
by Racial Group - Initial Machine Scoring

Class	Count		Racial Group		Row Total
	Row Col Tot	Pct Pct	Alaskan Native	Other	
Ties	0		16	36	52
			30.8	69.2	17.6
			16.3	18.3	
			5.4	12.2	
A	1.		10	26	36
			27.8	72.2	12.2
			10.2	13.2	
			3.4	8.8	
B	2.		1	3	4
			25.0	75.0	1.4
			1.0	1.5	
			.3	1.0	
C	3.		12	10	22
			54.5	45.5	7.5
			12.2	5.1	
			4.1	3.4	
D	4.		5	11	16
			31.3	68.8	5.4
			5.1	5.6	
			1.7	3.7	
E	5.		1	10	11
			9.1	90.9	3.7
			1.0	5.1	
			.3	3.4	
F	6.		7	10	17
			41.2	58.8	5.8
			7.1	5.1	
			2.4	3.4	
G	7.		5	13	18
			27.8	72.2	6.1
			5.1	6.6	
			1.7	4.4	
H	8.		7	5	12
			58.3	41.7	4.1
			7.1	2.5	
			2.4	1.7	
I	9.		14	35	49
			28.6	71.4	16.6
			14.3	17.8	
			4.7	11.9	
J	10.		3	4	7
			42.9	57.1	2.4
			3.1	2.0	
			1.0	1.4	
Unclassified	11.		17	34	51
			33.3	66.7	17.3
			17.3	17.3	
			5.8	11.5	
	Column Total		98	197	295
			33.2	66.8	100.0

ences which could be attributed to the differing institutions.

Some individuals expressed the concern that Native profiles would surely differ markedly from non-Native profiles and that this deviation would be interpreted in such a manner as to be unfair to the Natives who took the test. We suspect that the lack of any differences between Natives and non-Natives in our sample may be due, in part, to the highly volunteer nature of the testing process which may have biased the sample to an unknown degree. At this point we can only say that if differences exist, and we suspect they do, we have not uncovered them.

On June 11, 1985 the evaluation team met with Susan Humphrey-Barnett to discuss continuation of our efforts to establish Alaska norms for the MMPI-based scales and the offender classification system. The possibility of administering the MMPI to inmates at Hiland Mountain Correctional Center, and the feasibility of intake administration of the test to all newly convicted inmates were explored. The School of Justice agreed to assist the DOC in these efforts but no official procedure has been promulgated.

SECTION III. SITE ASSESSMENT - FACILITIES

In this section we examine the three correctional centers which are the sites of the pilot anger reduction programs - Fairbanks Correctional Center, Nome Correctional Center, and Lemon Creek Correctional Center in Juneau. Differences among the three facilities can require differences in service delivery methods and in treatment modalities. The purposes and functions of the facilities, and differences in population and space and scheduling limitations can all have an impact on program design and delivery.

Nome Correctional Center serves primarily as a jail while Fairbanks Correctional Center and Lemon Creek Correctional Centers have both jail and prison functions. As jails, all three facilities serve their geographical areas by receiving recently arrested offenders, holding accused prisoners until they post bond or until trial, and holding recently convicted offenders for sentencing. In addition to their pre-trial detention function all three house sentenced misdemeanants from their regions who are serving relatively short sentences. These are primarily local service functions. As booking and pre-trial holding facilities they accommodate law enforcement agencies and the courts. Sentenced misdemeanants are usually from the immediate geographical area and are doing "jail time" in their local facilities.

Two of the institutions have prison functions as well. Both Fairbanks and Juneau house sentenced felons who may or may not be from the regions they serve. These are long-term prisoners who

may serve as much as 20 years. At the present time Lemon Creek is designated as the state's maximum security prison. It thus holds serious offenders who are serving long sentences. Fairbanks and Lemon Creek Correctional Centers are multipurpose correctional institutions which house many types of prisoners. Each type of prisoner poses problems.

Pre-trial prisoners present at least two areas of concerns. First, it is difficult to plan for their participation in sessions of any length since the duration of their stay is unknown. Second, there are issues of confidentiality, since information about them can be used at trials or at sentencing hearings.

Convicted misdemeanants have relatively short sentences and they may be released before a program is completed. Both pre-trial detainees and misdemeanants would be best served by "open" programs with ongoing sessions and variable attendance. Referral to community programs should be done for both these groups where possible.

Sentenced felons, prisoners with one year or more of time to serve, seem to form a pool of participants for stable membership in "closed" groups of several months duration. Such prisoners are rarely found in Nome but constitute more than half the total populations in both Fairbanks and Lemon Creek. While they seem to have ample time to participate, programs of more than three months duration should probably be avoided. These prisoners may be transferred to other institutions, be removed from the general

population, change custody classification or they may receive new job assignments or schedules which make regular attendance and/or program completion impossible. Therefore, "open" continuous enrollment programs have the widest applicability to all prisoner types.

In addition to differences in sentence length and type of inmate the three institutions have populations which differ ethnically and culturally. At Nome Correctional Center as many as 90% of the inmates are Alaska Natives. While large numbers of Natives are housed at both Fairbanks and Juneau, they seldom constitute as much as 40% of the total population. There are also variations in the Native groups. Though there are mixtures at all three facilities the majority of Natives in Juneau are Tlingit while the majority in Fairbanks are Inupiat or Athabascan. The remainder of the populations at Juneau and Fairbanks is largely white, or black. It is possible that cultural differences could and should be considered in program design and delivery.

The three correctional centers are also very different in size. The total population at Nome Correctional Center is less than 50, Juneau houses as many as 180 prisoners and Fairbanks may have 100 more than Juneau. Each institution has experienced crowding and each has limited program/activity space.

In Nome the dining room serves as an all-purpose room and all programs and activities take place there. The dining rooms in both Juneau and Fairbanks can be used but neither is suitable for

small group meetings and discussions. The available classrooms at these latter sites are small and some have limited seating, but they are more appropriate for meetings than other areas. Competition for limited space is strong but care should be taken to assure that programs are regularly scheduled in the same room as familiarity and continuity of surroundings can help groups cohere more quickly. Room changes require readjustments at each session.

At each Correctional Center administrators and prison staff have welcomed the institution of anger-reduction programs. They cooperate in making referrals and are willing to work out scheduling and space arrangements. It is best to have written agreements or contracts which specify referral processes, schedules, and space and to include in the agreement opportunities for meetings between staff and contract personnel to discuss problems, plans, client progress, etc. Relationships between Nome Correctional Center and the Bering Sea Women's Group predate the contract period and have been excellent. At the other sites very good relationships have been developed during the contract year. M.E.N., Inc. has developed a written agreement with Lemon Creek which specifies referral processes, access to records, scheduling, and space assignments. The designation of a single staff member to work with the facilitator has worked well in Nome. In Fairbanks a staff liaison is planned.

Both the Fairbanks and Juneau programs had to revise their original programs to accommodate the realities of working in correctional settings. These changes are discussed in the next section of the report.

SECTION IV. SITE ASSESSMENT - PROGRAMS

In this section the three pilot programs are compared. Each program will be separately described and differences and commonalities noted. In their proposals the three programs appeared to have distinct plans for delivering essentially similar services. During this start-up year the Nome Correctional Center program has increased services and modified the organization of ongoing service delivery. The programs at Fairbanks Correctional Center and at Lemon Creek Correctional Center have found it necessary to revise some portions of their programs and abandon others. For both the Women in Crisis and M.E.N. Inc. groups the first contract year has been a learning process in which programs have been modified for adaptation to a prison setting.

All three programs share a philosophical perspective on violence and on ways of intervening in violent relationships. The chart below, extrapolated from the literature on domestic violence programs, illustrates that certain practices are associated with specific philosophies. The practices of the pilot programs are closely tied to the learned behavior philosophy although their programs include cognitive restructuring. Each stresses education about family violence as a means of intervening in it, and emphasizes the learning of techniques and skills (sometimes tests are given). The subject matter is essentially the same at each site: communication skills, stress management/relaxation techniques, self-talk, assertiveness training, improved self-image. Group discussions, films, role-playing and exercises, form the base for the learning behavior in

all three programs.

The chart below illustrates that certain treatment practices are associated with the dominant philosophical perspective on violence. There is, of course, overlap in philosophy and in treatment technologies. An emphasis on one philosophy does not exclude belief in the others and no philosophical perspective limits the treatment practices which can be used. In all three pilot programs the emphasis is on the learning of skills and attitudes to help manage anger and control violence and the dominant philosophy is that violence is learned behavior. Many treatment programs which share this philosophy are involved in educational programs geared toward prevention of domestic violence.

CHART 1. THEORETICAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TREATMENT MODELS

Domestic Violence Treatment Models		PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE											
		Anger/violence is innate and instinctual				Anger/violence is unrealistic and neurotic response				Anger/violence is learned behavior			
		PROGRAM				PROGRAM				PROGRAM			
		grp	coup	ind	ed	grp	coup	ind	ed	grp	coup	ind	ed
PRINCIPAL PRACTICES	aggression reduction through periodic release	x	x										
	cognitive restructuring (rational emotive therapy)					x				x			
	anger management, negotiation strategy, problem solving skills												x

Nome Program

The Bering Sea Women's Group, which operates the anger reduction program at Nome Correctional Center, did not have "start-up" problems. The program at the jail preexisted the contract period and has been in operation since 1981. The additional funding made it possible to increase services.

The program is an "open recruitment" one. Any jail inmate may participate and, except for one court-mandated participant, all clients are self-referred. Screening for inappropriate clients is not done and even inmates with psychological problems may become members of the group. The goals of the program are to reduce anger and to teach alternatives to violence. The underlying philosophy is that the learning of the skills will reduce violence in all relationship including familial ones. Though there is no requirement that a history of abuse (as perpetrator or victim) be present for participation, in fact virtually all participants have such a history according to the facilitator.

Two groups are run each week. All new referrals attend three Tuesday orientation groups before being admitted to the regular Thursday anger reduction group. Both groups are "open" in the sense that there is no definitive cycle. Entry is open and inmates may begin participation at any point in the program.

The orientation sessions prepare new clients for entry into the ongoing group. This preparation usually takes three weekly meetings where inmates focus on understanding angry feelings and learning ways to control anger so it does not erupt into

violence.

The ongoing group continues this learning process and emphasizes skills in values clarification, communication, assertiveness, stress management, etc. There are group discussions, role-playing, films to induce learning and generate discussion¹ and exercises designed to evoke empathy and understanding.

There is a definite menu of skills and understandings which can be learned during participation, but the transient nature of the population at Nome Correctional Center means that few actually complete the full menu. The program facilitator estimated that six participants out of a total of 177 (since July 7, 1984) could be considered "graduates" of the program.

Fairbanks

The program offered by Women in Crisis at Fairbanks Correctional Center is modeled after a spouse abuse program used by Family Service groups in Madison, Wisconsin which emphasizes the importance of intake interviews and assessment.

¹ The films have a Native focus which helps to deal with cultural attitudes about family violence and sexual assault. "No Word for Rape" was filmed near Bethel and "Village to Village" also is an Alaska Native film.

The intake plan at Fairbanks was designed to have institutional personnel make referrals of appropriate candidates who would then be screened. Confusion about where to pick up mail impacted the referral process and this misunderstanding caused a delay in moving the program into full operation. About two hours is required for the intake interview at Fairbanks and since November about 50 inmates have been seen and counseled at intake. Child molesters and those with mental problems are excluded from group participation.

Though the initial proposal called for orientation meetings and for closed three to six month sessions, the realities of institutional life required that this plan be abandoned. The transient nature of prison populations has made closed sessions impractical at this site. Sessions are held from 1 - 3 p.m. on Wednesdays and are open to all inmates. Drop-ins are permitted. The average meeting has seven people in attendance, but not all attend regularly due to competing activities at the prison.

The program has been revised so that a participant could learn all skills in eight to twelve weeks. Attention is given at each session to all of the skills and techniques needed to control anger and avoid violent episodes. Relaxation techniques, communication skills, and assertiveness training skills are practiced regularly. The sessions also include empathy, values clarification, problem solving, and learning and understanding about relationships. Films, exercises and role-playing are integrated into the program.

Since November 1 about 35 men have attended group meetings. The facilitator estimates that 8-10 of them have completed the full program.

Juneau

The M.E.N., Inc. program at Lemon Creek Correctional Center has made the greatest change in program focus. Originally patterned after the community programs operating in Juneau, the primary focus was on work with batterers and secondarily on victims who are at risk of becoming batterers. Since October they have placed less emphasis on marital relationships and more on reducing anger and violence in all relationships.

The screening/referral process was also modified. It originally called for identification of inmates with a history of spouse abuse and included a "safety-check" meeting with both the perpetrator and the victim present. Clients who were mentally ill or who "would not take responsibility for their behavior" were to be eliminated. This process has been revised and the safety check abandoned. Staff referrals and self-referrals are made and a two-hour intake interview is completed. Child molesters are refused and pretrial detainees are warned of possible confidentiality problems.

The M.E.N., Inc. program emphasizes self-monitoring of behavior. Originally, orientation sessions were planned around battering and an understanding of anger and violence. Clients were also to be instructed in maintaining an "anger log," the chief behavior monitoring device. The orientation process was not suc-

successful and it will be incorporated into the regular program structure in the future.

Plans for a structured "closed" program were also revised. The sessions are now ongoing and continuous. They teach anger management through skills in stress management, empathy training, assertiveness training, etc., and use films, role playing and group discussion. The anger log remains an important component of the program.

The program has processed 36 men for intake and has provided services to approximately 18 men in three three-month sessions. Because they issue certificates of completion to those who complete the program attendance has been an issue. Missed meetings can be made up but unexcused absences may result in termination. Though there are day and evening groups, competing activities have an impact on attendance. Future plans call for accommodation of schedule problems by alternating day and evening sessions.

For the Juneau program, as we saw in Fairbanks, the first year has been one of exploration and education, revision and redesign. The proposed program in Juneau for next year includes an "open" group and incorporates the orientation process into a structured closed group. They are seeking ways to make the learning process more relevant to institutional life and have incorporated a philosophy that anger and violence control in all situations will ultimately be translated into anger and violence control in the partner relationship. Their prior emphasis on

battering has been revised to include all kinds of family violence, as either perpetrator or victim.

The Bering Sea Women's Group program at Nome Correctional Center is the only program which deals specifically with Alaska Native issues. It is probably appropriate that they do so since participation by non-Natives is rare. Alaska Natives constitute a large proportion of participants in the Fairbanks and Lemon Creek programs, but since there is an ethnic mix the material used is more general.

One of the unique features about the M.E.N., Inc., program is self-monitoring of behavior and feelings. The anger log can also be used (voluntarily) to stimulate group discussion. This program is also the only one which awards a certificate for program completion. Though program facilitators have found that institutional realities make it difficult to certify that participants have completed the program, they remain committed to the certification process. In a prison setting such a certificate is more than an award, it is a reward. If a means can be found to chart client progress and to assess the individual's ability to use the skills related to anger/violence reduction certification should be available in all programs.

The institutional realities referred to above include the transient nature of the prison population both within the institution and into or out of it. For this reason all three programs are operating continuous sessions with open enrollment and have abandoned or revised plans for structured service delivery

cycles. Since client progress is an essential component of the program evaluation process means must be found for gathering common client information, tracking client progress, and monitoring service delivery.

At the present time none of the anger reduction programs is organized to collect the kind of information necessary for evaluation purposes. Each program submits to the Department of Corrections a monthly report which is an accounting of total client contacts and service hours. For program evaluation these totals must be broken into categories. Information is needed about inmates who refuse to participate, who are rejected, who exit early, etc. The next section of this report includes suggestions and recommendations for uniform data collection and a rationale for the process developed.

SECTION V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The diversity of the prison populations, the irregularity of attendance, and difficulties in follow-up of released participants all underscore the need for measures of program impact on the individual at exit from the program. A pre-test at intake and a post-test upon program exit can provide such measures.

The use of selected scales based on administration of the MMPI can provide a measure of changes in hostility and feelings of frustration which can provide an index of program impact. The additional scales are provided as part of Megargee's offender classification system (see Appendix C). From 80 scales we have identified approximately 20 as anger/violence related:

Experimental MMPI Scales Available*

SCALE NAME	AUTHOR(S)
Control	Cuadra
Dependency	Navran
Dominance	Gough, McClosky & Meehl
Prejudice	Gough
Anxiety (Factor)	Welsh
Hostility	Cook and Medley
Anxiety Reaction	Rosen
Alcoholism	Hoyt & Sedlacek
Admission of Symptoms	Little & Fisher
Denial of Symptoms	Little & Fisher
Anxiety (Factor)	Eichman
Ego-control	Block
Anxiety Index	Welsh
Authority Conflict	Wiggins
Family Problems	Wiggins
Manifest Hostility	Wiggins
Adjustment to Prison	Panton
Overcontrolled Hostility	Megargee, Cook & Mendelsohn
Alcoholism	MacAndrew
Drug Abuse	Panton & Brisson

* Criminal Justice Assessment Services, Inc.

The MMPI should be administered at intake and again at exit regardless of attendance or amount of program completed. Long-term MMPI data collection can be used in the future to identify minimum contact hours necessary for change to occur, and when correlated with other data could also rank the importance of different program components in individual change, thus providing guidance vis-a-vis program emphasis. Intake administration can also provide a comparison of those interviewed who choose not to participate with those who do. This information can be used to devise different pre-referral strategies and/or information dissemination methods.

Client intake information must be included in the evaluation process. The form developed by the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Abuse is designed for use in community groups and for either perpetrator or victim. An intake form specifically developed for the prison population should be used and should include spaces for abuse history gleaned from some of the interview instruments already used at the sites. Both Fairbanks and Lemon Creek use interview materials which are not the same, but which have similar content. Violence/anger histories could be taken from this material. Intake interviews are not formally completed at Nome Correctional Center and this has been considered in the intake form we suggest.

This form should not replace more detailed interview materials, but it need not include the extensive file notes which may be necessary for client counseling and support. The suggested form is coded for computer entry since its primary use

is to build information on the kinds of clients referred to the programs and the differences between those who participate and those who do not. If history has an impact on client success in the program such information will someday be useful in predicting client success. Correlations between history and program factors can provide guidance in future program design.

The form we include is a general model (Form 1). It should not be used without consultation with program providers. Their suggestions and recommendations should be incorporated in it. It seeks basic demographic data as well as basic prisoner data and both general and prison-related anger/violence information. It is important to know if the client's history of violence outside has continued during the period of institutionalization.

A client progress form is also essential to effective evaluation. While attendance (contact hours) is one quantitative measure of client involvement in the program more detail would be helpful. A chart of client progress should include his exposure to specific skills, the degree of learning which takes place, and an assessment of his participation level. Some of this information is subjective yet an ongoing evaluation of his progress can help to determine if the inmate has ulterior motives for attending and whether he is committed to the goal of anger reduction. This can also serve to explain differences between clients in behavioral or psychological/attitudinal outcomes (in MMPI scales).

If, at one site but not at the others, exit administration of

the MMPI showed reduction in anger/hostility scales of clients who completed only part of the program, contact hours might not explain the phenomenon. It would be useful to know which components of the program the client had completed so that those components could be stressed in early sessions at all sites.

A client progress form suitable at all sites is difficult to develop. The one we have drafted (Form II) should be more specific, yet variations between programs must be accommodated. If, under assertiveness training, one program teaches the "broken record" technique while another does not, assertiveness skills can still be quantified. If all sites use this technique, "broken record" should be on the form.

The progress chart we have drafted does not include specific skills but provides space for their inclusion. Checks indicate the number of times the individual is present when those skills are covered. It also calls for the facilitator to make a subjective assessment of mastery and to indicate in the appropriate column the date mastery was achieved.

This form, too, should be redrafted in consultation with those who must use it. Paperwork is necessary, but efforts should be made to assure that it is not burdensome. Logs of clients seen and contact hours are already produced for the Department of Corrections monthly report. Duplicates should be included for evaluation purposes, but more precise instruments are needed. Behavioral follow-up of clients is planned and detailed information about the client and his involvement in the

program is essential to effective follow-up.

We recommend a meeting with all facilitators at the start of the program year to finalize instruments which are easy to use, have flexibility in regard to program content, and still provide the information essential for program (and client) evaluation. The agreed upon forms should be put into use immediately.

Data collection must begin as early in the contract year as possible. We recommend that intake forms be completed and MMPI's administered for all clients interviewed after August 1 of the 1986 fiscal year.

Intake forms and pre-test MMPI answer sheets should be forwarded to the evaluators at least monthly. Progress forms should be maintained regularly and should be submitted on the client's exit data along with post-test MMPI answer sheets so that any behavioral follow-up can be arranged. The post-test is especially important so every effort should be made to test all exiting clients regardless of their reasons for leaving the program.

Under ideal circumstances all necessary data will be collected and forwarded in a timely fashion. In a prison setting ideal circumstances are seldom to be found. A valid and useful program evaluation requires data quality and data quantity. The earlier the collection of data begins, the greater the likelihood that sufficient information will be available for reliable evaluation.

CLIENT INTAKE

NAME _____

Date _____
(1-6)

Institution _____
(7-9)
116 = Fbnks; 117 = Nome; 118 = Juneau

OBSIS# _____
(10-18)

Age _____ Sex _____
(19-20) (21)

Race _____
(22)
1=AK Native 5=Native American
2=Asian/Pacific Islander (Lower 48)
3=Black 6=White
4=Hispanic 7=Other
8=Unknown

Place of Birth _____
(23)

Community of Residence _____
(24)

Length of time in Alaska _____
(25-26) (00=<1 yr; 97=97+ yrs)

Current Status _____
(27-28) 11=unsentenced felon
12=unsentenced misdemeanor
21=sentenced felon
22=sentenced misdemeanor

Instant Offense/Charge _____
(29-33) (from code sheet)

Date Entered institution _____
(34-39)

Sentence Length in mos _____
(40-42)

HISTORY OF VIOLENCE

As a Child (check all that apply)

- _____ victim of physical abuse
(43)
- _____ victim of sexual abuse
(44)
- _____ victim of psychological abuse
(45)

Family Patterns (check all that apply)

- _____ parents engaged in battering
(46)
- _____ parents abused siblings
(47)
- _____ elder abuse in family
(48)

PRIOR RECORD

juvenile _____ yes _____ no
(63)

adult _____ # misdemeanors
(64-65)
_____ # felonies
(66-67)

SUBSTANCE ABUSE (check all that apply)

- _____ minor use of alcohol
(68)
- _____ minor use of narcotics
(69)
- _____ extensive use of alcohol
(70)
- _____ extensive use of narcotics
(71)
- _____ legal charges related to alcohol
(72)
- _____ legal charges related to narcotics
(73)
- _____ prior treatment for alcohol abuse
(74)
- _____ prior treatment for narcotics abuse
(75)

Client Patterns (check all that apply)

- _____ abused spouse/partner
(49)
- _____ abused children
(50)
- _____ violence toward friends/acquaintances
(51)
- _____ violence toward strangers
(52)
- _____ # of arrests for violent incidents
(53-54)
- _____ # of police calls to home
(55-56)
- _____ # of confrontations with staff last 3 mos
(57-58)
- _____ # of violent confrontations with inmates
(59-60) last 3 mos

- _____ prior treatment for violence
(61)
- _____ is violence associated with alcohol
(62)

REFERRAL

- _____ self _____ court
(76) (78)
- _____ staff _____ counselor/P.O.
(77) (79)

MMPI Administered (date) _____

(80) accepted _____ rejected _____

Comments _____

CLIENT PROGRESS

Name _____ OBSIS # _____

Institution _____
 (116=Fairbanks; 117=Nome; 118=Juneau)

Entry Date __/__/__ Exit Date: __/__/__ Reason for Exit:

MMPI _____ completed program

Program session: _____

_____ released

_____ transferred

_____ segregated

_____ schedule change

Counselor: _____

_____ competing activity

Certificate awarded _____

_____ dismissed

_____ other _____

Attendance:

Dates														
Rates*														

Dates														
Rates*														

Dates														
Rates*														

* Rate client's participation level (1=low, 5=high)

On the list below add specific skills stressed in your group. Check each time a skill is covered with this client present (exposure). When the client seems to have mastered the skill indicate date of mastery in the appropriate space.

SKILLS/KNOWLEDGE	EXPOSURE	MASTERY
Understanding anger/violence		
Conflict Resolution (time out)		
Relaxation (muscle exercise) (positive stressors)		
Assertiveness (broken record)		
Cognitive (thought stopping)		
Empathy		
Self-image		
Communication Feedback		

APPENDICES

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE EVALUATION PROJECT:
ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAMS
FOR ANGER REDUCTION IN
INCARCERATED ALASKAN PRISONERS

by

N. E. Schafer, PhD
Allan R. Barnes, PhD
Ray Williams, PhD

Justice Center
School of Justice
University of Alaska, Anchorage

SOJ # 85007

1. Introduction

Pilot anger reduction programs have been instituted by the Council on Domestic Violence at three correctional institutions in Alaska Nome, Juneau and Fairbanks. Evaluation of their effectiveness is important to the design, continuation and expansion of such programs. An evaluation of any anger reduction program has inherent problems since anger is normally an emotion which is difficult to measure or evaluate. For this project there is a further difficulty since the programs have as an ultimate goal the reduction of violence which some authorities claim is situational and only evoked in some persons by certain circumstances.

The evaluation proposed here is limited by the need for a report nine months from the program's start date of October 1, 1984. A more definitive evaluation would require a longer data collection period and a larger sample of participants than is anticipated in these early stages of the program. In addition, there appear to be basic differences in the content of the three programs.

Three sites have been chosen for the programs and each program differs from the others in a variety of ways: client pool, client selection, treatment technology, and length of client participation.

2. Statement of the Problem

The problem involves the the establishment of uniform methods of evaluating three anger reduction programs at three different

sites, each with a different clientele and each with some differences in method of operation. There are three evaluation objectives, each of which will require the cooperation of both program staff and the Department of Corrections.

- (1) assessment of changes in the psychological components of anger in individual participants;
- (2) development of a common method of assessing service delivery at the three sites which will neutralize program and client differences; and
- (3) measurement of behavioral change in individual participants.

The psychological dimensions of anger reduction are difficult to assess and will require pre- and post-program measurement with an instrument sensitive to the rather broad scope of the three programs.

Common measures of service delivery at the differing sites should include measures of duration and intensity but programs will vary in the degree to which clients are exposed to treatment.

An evaluation of behavioral change is the most desirable measure of program effectiveness, but it presents the most problems. Both community and institutional behavior will have to be relied upon as not all clients will have been released at the time of follow-up. The most pressing problem involves the program's time frame. Measures of behavioral change require follow-up for specific periods of time. A six month behavioral

follow-up is considered minimal: a one year follow-up is usually recommended. Since the evaluation report is due in June very few participants will fall into a six month follow-up category. The sample will therefore be too small for satisfactory evaluation.

A second problem is presented by site/client differences among the three programs. In some programs follow-up will involve measures of institutional behavior only; in others release follow-up will be necessary. Since different measures must be used for each of these groups there will be at least two subject pools identified for follow-up and neither pool, given the time-frame specified, will contain an adequate number of persons for analysis.

In light of the difficulties associated with evaluation of the current anger reduction programs, this project will not only assess these programs, it will also develop recommendations concerning methods which can be the basis for ongoing evaluative research that is policy-relevant to anger reduction programs in correctional settings.

3. Evaluation Methods

This evaluation project will use three dimensions in assessing the impact of the anger reduction programs in Fairbanks, Juneau and Nome. They are (1) psychological change in participants, (2) site-specific service delivery measures; and (3) behavioral change in participants.

1. Psychological Changes

Changes in the psychological dimensions of anger in prisoners receiving treatment will be assessed through a special use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), i.e., the Megargee classification system (see Appendix A). The MMPI is well-known and frequently used in the field of corrections as an assessment device. When appropriately scored, it yields a variety of previously validated indices relevant to anger reduction evaluation. The MMPI can be administered in a group setting requiring only an appropriate testing environment, the test booklet, answer sheet, soft lead pencil and a responsible individual to read the instructions and proctor the inmates' test-taking behavior. Inmates with a sixth grade reading level can normally complete the test in 1 - 1 1/2 hours.

The MMPI will be administered in a group setting to all inmates considered for participation in the various anger reduction programs prior to their actual selection and participation and again immediately after completing the program. The Department of Corrections' staff will be responsible for administering the pre-test MMPI to those prisoners identified by Domestic Violence Program personnel prior to the actual screening process. Program personnel will also advise the staff when individual clients complete the program and the post-test will be arranged by Corrections and administered by Program personnel. Insofar as possible, all individuals entering and leaving the program will complete the MMPI.

In addition, for control purposes, the MMPI will also be administered to a group of prisoners who have not been exposed to the treatment modality. This testing will also be performed by correctional staff under the supervision of the Principal Investigator.

The MMPI answer sheets will be provided to the Research Team for scoring by the Megargee-Terry Scoring Service. The resulting data will provide each inmate's score on a number of anger/hostility indices and his classification within the system developed by Megargee. Reductions in anger/hostility will be determined by quantifying and comparing the pre-test and post-test score/classification changes within relevant anger/hostility indices.

2. Service Delivery

A client audit form will be provided by the Research Team. It will be used by the program personnel to indicate attendance, contact hours and participation levels. Anger reduction program facilitators will also rate each client (participating prisoner) on the benefit the client seems to have received from participation in the treatment process. Forms will then be coded, processed and summarized by the Research Team. To ensure confidentiality, prisoner numbers rather than names will be used in data collection and these will be replaced by case numbers for data processing purposes. No individual identifiers (names or numbers) will appear in the Evaluation Report. These confidentiality features of the evaluation also appear in the voluntary participation agreement required by the University when human

subjects are involved (see Appendix B).

3. Behavioral Dimensions

Evaluation of behavioral change requires an assessment of both pre- and post-program behavior of prisoner clients. Ideally, the length and setting of both pre-program and post-program assessment should be comparable; i.e., institutional behavior for the six months prior to program participation should be compared to institutional behavior during the six months following completion of the program. Because of client and site differences, it is unlikely that any participants will fit this methodological ideal. Client histories will be varied and will include behavior in a mix of settings (both institutional and community) for different lengths of time. As a result, behavioral measures will differ for three types of clients:

(1) Group I (Incarcerated) will consist of those who were incarcerated prior to program entry and remained incarcerated after completion of the program. Their behavior will be evaluated by the Research Team by use of pre- and post-program institutional personnel and discipline reports made available by the Department of Corrections.

For this category of client a similar group of prisoners will be selected to serve as a control group in determining if there are natural changes in behavior during the period of incarceration.

(2) Group C (Community) will consist of short-term prisoners who spent most of the pre-program period in the community and who

are released shortly after program completion. Their pre-program behavior will be assessed by use of official records including arrest and police reports and post-program assessment will include both police and parole reports.

(3) Group M (Mixed) will include those who have both incarceration/community histories and who are in both settings during the follow-up period.

Three, six, and 12 month intervals will be used in evaluating behavioral dimensions. Although six month measures are considered minimally acceptable for evaluating behavioral change, the difficulty of matching pre- and post-program experiences as well as the short program evaluation period will limit the number of clients suitable for follow-up. Therefore, we will include three month measures in the first evaluation of behavioral dimensions.

Pre-program behavioral measures will, insofar as possible, be collected during the program screening process from client histories which will be available to the screeners. Because of the previously discussed client differences at the three sites, the follow-up methods will vary and will be limited by the existence of any established post-incarceration supervision, by court-ordered conditions, and by the nature of the agency engaged in continued client service. The Research Team will develop the specifics related to follow-up data collection and analysis for each program.

4. Redesign Recommendations

The implementation of this evaluation project will provide the Council's staff and the Research Team with experience and knowledge concerning evaluation problems, data availability and deficiencies, and administrative needs for assessing the impact of anger reduction treatment programs in correctional settings and for policy development. The Research Team proposes to work with the Council staff in reevaluating the situation and developing recommendations concerning a system and methods that can be instituted for continuous or periodic evaluation of anger reduction treatment programs in a correctional setting. Such evaluations can be used in both policy development and administration.

5. Responsibilities

The completion of this evaluation project requires cooperative efforts by the Justice Center of the University of Alaska, Anchorage School of Justice, the Council on Domestic Violence staff, and the Department of Corrections. The following is a summary of the primary responsibilities of each of these groups:

A. The Justice Center will:

- (1) provide Research Staff salaries for the project out of its regular funding
- (2) supply testing and evaluation materials;
- (3) train personnel in the use of the materials;
- (4) process and interpret test scores;
- (5) process and interpret data;
- (6) conduct site observations;

- (7) arrange post-incarceration follow-up;
- (8) complete a preliminary evaluation report in June of 1985; and
- (9) complete a report with recommendations for reorganizing the evaluation system for future use by June 30, 1985.

B. The program facilitators will

- (1) oversee administration of MMPI;
- (2) complete service delivery forms regularly and accurately; and
- (3) forward completed materials to Justice Center in a timely manner:
 - MMPI score sheets upon completion of test
 - service delivery forms for each six week session.

C. The Department of Corrections will

- (1) provide facilities and arrange for administering the MMPI;
- (2) provide information for institutional behavioral measures; and
- (3) provide release information in anticipation of community follow-up.

6. Products

The Justice Center Research Team will provide the Council on Domestic Violence with the following products prior to June 30, 1985:

- ° A comprehensive report on the findings concerning the nature and impact of each of the anger reduction programs performed in Fairbanks, Juneau and Nome.
- ° A report containing recommendations for an evaluation system for assessing future anger reduction programs conducted in correctional settings.
- ° One work session involving Council staff and personnel for reviewing the Research Team findings and discussing the interpretations.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, ANCHORAGE

Johna Brownell for

David L. Outcalt, Chancellor

12/20/84

Date

CHART I

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY

ACTIVITY	Month					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Project Preparation	X X					
Research Team Staff Training Sessions	X X					
Administer MMPI	X X X				X X X	
Collect Behavioral Data		X X	X		X X X	
Treatment Sessions		X X X X	X X X X	X X X X		
Complete Audit Forms		X X X X	X X X X	X X X X	X	
Program Observation		X	X	X		
Process and Assess Data					X X X	X
Prepare Reports					X X	X X
Work Session						X

Derivation, Validation and Application of an MMPI-Based System for Classifying Criminal Offenders

Edwin I. Megargee

Psychology Department, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306, USA

Note: This article has been removed from the archived copy of this report for reasons of copyright. The complete article can be downloaded from HeinOnline:

Megargee, Edwin I. (1984). "Derivation, Validation and Application of an MMPI-Based System for Classifying Criminal Offenders." *Medicine & Law* 3: 109–118. (<https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/mlv3&i=115>).

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT

Program to be evaluated: _____

Location : _____

Evaluators : N. Schafer, Ph.D.

A. Barnes, Ph.D.

R. Williams, Ph.D.

School of Justice
UAA
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

1. I agree to participate in the evaluation of the above program.
2. My participation in the evaluation is totally voluntary and will not affect my attendance in the actual program nor the terms or conditions of my incarceration.
3. My role in the evaluation includes a pre (before) and post (after) test to assess my ability to control my feelings, and an official records check.
4. I understand that all test scores and other information obtained about me will be held in strictest confidence by the evaluators and will not be released without my written permission.
5. Data will be grouped and no identifiers (names, numbers, etc.) will be used in the final report.
6. I can withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation in the evaluation of the above program at any time.

I have read the above statements and agree to participate.

_____ Date

_____ Signature of Participant

The following Justice Center professional personnel will contribute their time and expertise to this project:

Allan R. Barnes is assistant professor in the School of Justice, University of Alaska, Anchorage and earned his Ph.D. at Florida State University. His research interests include: crime prevention techniques and policy, treatment and corrections, and evaluation.

N.E. Schafer is assistant professor in the School of Justice. She has published in the areas of prison and jail issues and policies.

Raymond E. Williams is a research instructor in the School of Justice, University of Alaska, Anchorage. Specializing in social psychology and research methods, his published research has focused on the relative effectiveness of different persuasive communication strategies designed to promote socially responsible attitudes toward the consumption of alcohol.

PROPOSED BUDGET

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE EVALUATION PROJECT
SOJ # 85007

Personal Services

Secretary

(\$13.62/hr x 1.183 leave
x 40 hrs) \$ 645
26.6% Staff Benefits 172

Data Entry

(8.50/hr x 25 hrs) 213
7.8% Staff Benefits 17

Travel

Nome: 2 trips x 2 people 2,000
Per Diem: 1 night x 2 people 180

Fairbanks: 2 trips x 2 people 850
Per Diem: 1 night x 2 people 180

Juneau: 2 trips x 2 people 1,400
Per Diem: 1 night x 2 people 160

Contractual

MMPI Scoring
(500 x \$1.50) 750

Telephone/Postage 1,300

Xeroxing 250

Supplies 300

Indirect

60.2% S/W/L 517

\$8,934

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA, ANCHORAGE

3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, Alaska 99508
(907) 786-1810

SCHOOL OF JUSTICE

June 7, 1985

Ms. Barbara Miklos
Executive Director
Council on Domestic Violence
and Sexual Assault
Pouch N
Juneau, AK 99811

Dear Barbara:

This letter is to comply with your request for specific activities and potential products based upon the change in our original agreement. Since the proposal was not funded until March a preliminary evaluation of program effectiveness was not possible. As we agreed at our meeting of March 22, 1985 the School has completed some of the following tasks and is in the process of preparing material for inclusion in a report due June 30.

1. Validation of Megargee's MMPI-based classification scales for use with Alaska population groups. When norms are established the instrument can be used as a pre-post test for future program evaluation.
 - administer MMPI to 250 - 500 incarcerated prisoners in specified regions: Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Palmer, Nome.
 - submit these to Megargee for scoring; and
 - identify appropriate scales for use in Alaska correctional facilities for program evaluation.
2. Visits to program sites.
 - administer MMPI;
 - assess institutional environment;
 - interview facilitators; and
 - observe groups where possible.
3. Identify differences and commonalities among the three program sites vis-a-vis service delivery, facilities, treatment modalities.
4. Identify factors for use in evaluating program structure and treatment.

Ms. Barbara Miklos
June 7, 1985
Page 2

These activities will provide a preliminary basis for full (one year minimum) program evaluation. A report will be submitted, due June 30, 1985 which summarizes the above activities and identifies factors and materials necessary for the full evaluation.

Sincerely,



Nancy E. Schafer
Assistant Professor of Justice

NES:pb

SITE VISITS

Dec. 27/28 '84	Fairbanks	Allan Barnes
	Tour Correctional Center, meet with Inez Larsen (conclude program is still in start-up phase)	
Jan 3, 1985	Lemon Creek	Allan Barnes
	Tour Correctional Center, meet with Debbie VanOver at her office) (conclude program not yet fully operational)	
March 19	Fairbanks	Nancy Schafer
	Tour Correctional Center, meet with Inez Larsen, Boy Collier, and Probation Officers. (Program has resolved earlier referral difficulties. Plans for closed program to begin in April.)	
April 25	Cook Inlet PreTrial	Allan Barnes, Ray Williams
	Meeting and tour	
April 29	Cook Inlet PreTrial	Barnes, Schafer, Williams
	Meeting	
May 1 - 3	Cook Inlet PreTrial	Barnes, Williams
	MMPI administration	
May 6-8	Fairbanks	Schafer, Williams
May 14-15	Palmer	Barnes
	MMPI administration	
May 15-17	Lemon Creek	Schafer, Williams
	MMPI administration	
May 20-23	Cook Inlet PreTrial	Margaret Phillips
	MMPI administration (individuals)	
May 23-24	Nome	Barnes, Williams
	MMPI administration Discussions with Probation Officer Glenn Martin	
June 5	Palmer	Barnes, Williams, Phillips
	MMPI administration	

CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSESSMENT SERVICES, INC.

Experimental MMPI Scales Available

SYMBOL	SCALE NAME	AUTHOR(S)
Mp	Positive Malingerling	Cofer, Chance & Judson
Ds	Dissimulation	Gough
Cn	Control	Cuadra
Dy	Dependency	Navran
Do	Dominance	Gough, McClosky & Meehl
Re	Social Responsibility	Gough, McClosky & Meehl
D-0	Depression, Obvious	Harmon & Wiener
D-S	Depression, Subtle	Harmon & Wiener
Hy-0	Hysteria, Obvious	Harmon & Wiener
Hy-S	Hysteria, Subtle	Harmon & Wiener
Pd-0	Psycho. Dev., Obvious	Harmon & Wiener
Pd-S	Psycho. Dev., Subtle	Harmon & Wiener
Pa-0	Paranoia, Obvious	Harmon & Wiener
Pa-S	Paranoia, Subtle	Harmon & Wiener
Ma-0	Hypomania, Obvious	Harmon & Wiener
Ma-S	Hypomania, Subtle	Harmon & Wiener
Pr	Predjudice	Gough
St	Social Status	Gough
Es	Ego-Strength	Barron
A	Anxiety (Factor)	Welsh
R	Repression (Factor)	Welsh
Ne	Neuroticism	Winne
Sx	Schizophrenia Correction	Welsh & Gough
Sk	Schizo./Conduct Disorder Diff.	Harding, Holz & Kawakami
Rp	Role Playing	McClelland
Ex	Extraversion	Giedt & Downing
Ho	Hostility	Cook & Medley
Pv	Pharisaic Virtue	Cook & Medley
At	Manifest Anxiety	Taylor
Sd	Social Desirability	Edwards
Ac	Acquiescence	Lushene
Tt	Defensiveness	Hanley

SYMBOL	SCALE NAME	AUTHOR(S)
Cr	Conversion Reaction	Rosen
Pz	Paranoid Schizophrenia	Rosen
Dr	Depressive Reaction	Rosen
Sm	Somatization Reaction	Rosen
Ar	Anxiety Reaction	Rosen
Hm	Homosexuality	Panton
Ah	Alcoholism	Hoyt & Sedlacek
Ca	Caudality	Williams
Lb	Low Back Pain	Hanuik
Wa	Work Attitude	Tydlaska & Mengel
Nc	Choice of Nursing	Beaver
Ta	Teacher Attitude	Cohn
Ps	Electroshock Prognosis	Feldman
Pe	Pedophilia	Toobert, Bartelme & Jones
Ad	Admission of Symptoms	Little & Fisher
Dn	Denial of Symptoms	Little & Fisher
Un	Underachiever	McQuary & Truax
Nd	Neurodermatitis	Allerhand, Gough & Grais
Sf	Self-Sufficiency	Wolff
FI	Facilitation-Inhibition	Ullmann
IP	Index of Psychopathology	Sines & Silver
NP	Psychiatric	Eichman
I	Anxiety (Factor)	Eichman
II	Repression (Factor)	Eichman
III	Somatization (Factor)	Eichman
IV	Unconventionality (Factor)	Eichman
ER-S	Ego-resiliency, Subtle	Block
Er-O	Ego-resiliency, Obvious	Block
EC-5	Ego-Control	Block
F-K	Validity Index	Gough
AI	Anxiety Index	Welsh
IR	Internalization Ratio	Welsh
SOC	Social Maladjustment	Wiggins
DEP	Depression	Wiggins
FEM	Feminine Interests	Wiggins
MOR	Poor Morale	Wiggins

SYMBOL	SCALE NAME	AUTHOR(S)
REL	Religious Fundamentalism	Wiggins
AUT	Authority Conflict	Wiggins
PSY	Psychoticism	Wiggins
ORG	Organic Symptoms	Wiggins
FAM	Family Problems	Wiggins
HOS	Manifest Hostility	Wiggins
PHO	Phobias	Wiggins
HYP	Hypomania	Wiggins
HEA	Poor Health	Wiggins
R-S	Repression-Sensitization	Byrne
HA	Headache Proneness	Archibald
Dq	Delinquency	Hathaway & Monachesi
Ap	Adjustment to Prison	Panton
Ec	Escape from Prison	Panton
O-H	Overcontrolled Hostility	Megargee, Cook & Mendelsohn
MAC	Alcoholism	MacAndrew
DaS	Drug Abuse	Panton & Brisson