





This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled


**CREATING NONVIOLENT NICHES WITHIN A  
MEDIUM SECURITY PRISON FOR WOMEN**

presented by

**LILA RUCKER**

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY** degree in **CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

  
Major professor

Date Aug 2, 1991



PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.  
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
<del>FEB 11 1995</del>	_____	_____
<del>FEB 03 1996</del>	_____	_____
<del>FEB 01 1997</del>	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

c:\circ\datedue.pm3-p.1

**CREATING NONVIOLENT NICHEs WITHIN A MEDIUM  
SECURITY PRISON FOR WOMEN**

**By**

**Lila Rucker**

**A DISSERTATION**

**Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**Department of Criminal Justice**

**1991**



## **ABSTRACT**

### **CREATING NONVIOLENT NICHES WITHIN A MEDIUM SECURITY PRISON FOR WOMEN**

**By**

**Lila Rucker**

This research project attempted to create a "niche-potential" within a medium security prison for women. The program as implemented consisted of participation in a three-day AVP workshop plus six weeks of follow-up sessions that afforded 11 participants repeated opportunities for nonviolent conflict resolution (AVP + Skills). A comparison group of 11 participants received a three-day AVP workshop plus six weeks of discussions regarding human sexuality (AVP + Sexuality). It was hypothesized that only the AVP + Skills group would: maintain the positive sense or "nicheness" which both groups would develop during their respective AVP workshops; reflect higher scores for trust, empathy, locus of control, and production of conflict resolution skills; have a better understanding of nonviolence; reflect better attendance in weekly follow-up sessions; and reflect fewer rules infractions.

As hypothesized, both groups did develop a sense of "nicheness." Contrary to the hypotheses, the AVP + Sexuality group fared better and ANOVA revealed no statistically significant difference on change scores for any of the variables. Experimental effects are related to penal and workshop normative structures and future research possibilities are discussed.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

**Learning to live nonviolently is a lifelong process. If there is anything that will test one's ability to do that, it is the writing of a dissertation. Many people have enabled me to complete the task intact. I am grateful above all to my husband, Marv Klavons, whose unending patience, support, fortitude and gentleness got me back in touch with the stars when I got fixated on statistics. Merry Morash provided diligent guidance, expertise, and stability. Elaine Donelson, Rosy Ekpenyong-Rowan, and Chris Vanderpool provided invaluable ideas and insights.**

**The participants in the project kept my life force flowing and Michigan AVP provided a safe womb in which I could grow. There was never a reference question that Mark Zussman could not or would not answer. Conna provided endless ears for me to scratch. Buhle and her little ones helped me play. Mirabai's pure spirit was, and continues to be, a beacon. Jan's strength lives in my soul. The Rucker-Ragsdale lineage sustains me. Dean and Mike caught me when I catapulted from Michigan and proved that there are, indeed, alternatives to violence in academia.**

**The Lakota Sioux have helped me to heal after the long journey.**

**Pat Peterson's editing skills and sense of humor got me across the finishing line.**

**It is done.**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>List of Tables</b> .....	<b>6</b>
-----------------------------	----------

### **CHAPTER ONE**

<b>Problem to be Studied</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Nature of the Program</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Goals and Objectives of the Program</b> .....	<b>5</b>

### **CHAPTER TWO**

<b>Literature Review</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Objective One: to create a growth-producing, nonviolent         niche-potential within a medium security prison         for women</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Objective Two: to facilitate the experience of empathy, trust,         cooperation and community among participants</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>Objective Three: to facilitate learning and utilization of perspective-taking         and conflict resolution skills</b> .....	<b>16</b>

### **CHAPTER THREE**

<b>Methodology</b> 23	
<b>Research Design</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Sample</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Equivalence</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>Treatment</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Facilitation</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Pretests and Posttests</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Evaluative Instruments</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>Personality Variables:</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Empathy</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Trust</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Locus of Control</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<b>Communication Skills Variables:</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>Openness and "I" Statements</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>Environmental Variable:</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Group Dynamics</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Conceptual Variable:</b> .....	<b>33</b>

Nonviolence as a Concept .....	33
Analysis .....	34
Scale Identification and Refinement .....	34
Analysis of Variance .....	34
Content Analysis .....	34
Research Hypotheses: .....	35
Personality Variables .....	35
Communication Skills Variables .....	35
Group Dynamic Variable .....	35
Conceptual Variable .....	35
Behavioral Variables .....	35

## CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis .....	36
Demographics .....	36
Scale Identification and Refinement .....	39
Personality Variables: .....	39
Trust .....	39
Empathy .....	41
Locus of Control .....	43
Communication Skills Variables: .....	45
Conflict Resolution: Openness .....	45
Conflict Resolution: "I" Statements .....	46
Environmental Variable: .....	47
Group Dynamics .....	47
Summary of Scale Identification and Refinement .....	48
Experimental Effects .....	49
Analysis of Variance .....	49
Supplemental Information .....	51
Personality Variables .....	52
Trust .....	52
Empathy .....	60
Empathic Episode .....	61
Locus of Control .....	64
Communication Skills Variables 68	
"I" Statements 68	
Conceptual Variable: 70	
Nonviolence as a Concept 70	
Pretest Similarities .....	70
Relationship-Related Concepts .....	70
Negative Definitions .....	71
Control .....	72
Pretest Dissimilarities .....	72
Total Number of Responses .....	72
Self Improvement .....	72
Posttest Results .....	73
Relationship-Related Concepts .....	73
Negative Definitions .....	74
Control .....	74
Self Improvement .....	74

Belief in God .....	74
Summary of Nonviolence Conceptualization Findings .....	74
Group Dynamics .....	75
Sumamry of Group Dynamics Findings .....	78
Behavioral Variables: .....	79
Follow-up Session Attendance .....	79
Rules Infractions .....	80
Summary of Findings Regarding Experimental Effects .....	81
Explanation of Experimental Effects .....	84
The Nature of the Penal Environment .....	85
Inflexible Rule Enforcement .....	85
Faulty Communication: Coercion vs. Consensus .....	91
The Gum-Popping Episode .....	92
Further Evidence of Faulty Communication .....	95
Suspicion versus Trust .....	95
Links Between Suspicion and Inflexible Rule Enforcement .....	99
Summary .....	101
The Nature of the Project Environment .....	103
Content Materials of the Respective Follow-up Sessions .....	115
Other Factors That May Have Affected the Experiment .....	117
Design Issues .....	117
Human Sexuality Treatment Mode .....	117
Gender of Facilitator for Follow-up Sessions .....	117
Appropriateness and Number of Test Instruments .....	118
Staff Relationship to the Project .....	118
Demographic Differences .....	119
Summary .....	121

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

Discussion .....	123
Appendix A Description of Weekly AVP Sessions .....	129
Appendix B Evaluative Instruments .....	130
Bibliography .....	148

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE 1 Program Alternatives, Intermediate Outcome Variables and Behavioral Variables . . . . .	6
TABLE 2 Pretest Scores of Trust and Empathy by Treatment, Comparison of Means . . . . .	26
TABLE 3 Categories of Variables to be Examined . . . . .	28
TABLE 4 Demographics by Treatment . . . . .	37
TABLE 5 Factor and Reliability Analyses of Rotter's 25-item Trust Scale . . . . .	40
TABLE 6 Factor and Reliability Analyses of Eight-item Trust Sub-scale . . . . .	41
TABLE 7 Factor and Reliability Analyses of Mehrabian and Epstein 33-item Empathy Scale . . . . .	42
TABLE 8 Factor and Reliability Analyses of Nine-item Empathy Sub-scale . . . . .	43
TABLE 9 Factor and Reliability Analyses of Rotter's Eight-item Locus of Control (Internal ) Scale . . . . .	44
TABLE 10 Factor and Reliability Analyses of Rotter's Eight-item Locus of Control (Powerful Others) Scale . . . . .	44
TABLE 11 Factor and Reliability Analyses of Rotter's Eight-item Locus of Control (Chance) Scale . . . . .	44
TABLE 12 Factor and Reliability Analyses of Ten-item Communication Skills (Openness) Scale . . . . .	45
TABLE 13 Factor and Reliability Analyses of Three-item Communication Skills (Openness) Scale . . . . .	46
TABLE 14 Factor and Reliability Analyses of Six-item Communication Skills ("I" Statement) Scale . . . . .	46
TABLE 15 Factor and Reliability Analyses of 28-item Group Dynamics Scale . . . . .	47
TABLE 16 Summary of Reliability Analyses of the Various Variable Categories . . . . .	48

<b>TABLE 17 Analyses of Variance Change Scores by Treatment . . . . .</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>TABLE 18 Open Communication by Treatment – Comparison of Means . . . . .</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>TABLE 19 Analysis of Variance Posttest Score by Treatment . . . . .</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>TABLE 20 Rank Order of Pre and Posttest Trust Scores by Treatment . . . . .</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>TABLE 21 Adjective Names Chosen by Participants by Treatment . . . . .</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>TABLE 22 Rank Order of Pre and Posttest Empathy Scores by Treatment . . . . .</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>TABLE 23 Rank Order of AVP + Sexuality Group’s Pretest Locus of Control Scores by Scale Dimension . . . . .</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>TABLE 24 Rank Order of AVP + Skills Group’s Posttest Locus of Control Scores by Scale Dimension . . . . .</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>TABLE 25 Rank Order of AVP + Sexuality Group’s Posttest Locus of Control Scores by Scale Dimension . . . . .</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>TABLE 26 Summary of AVP + Skills Group’s Posttest Locus of Control Scores by Scale Dimension . . . . .</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>TABLE 27 Summary of AVP + Sexuality Pretest Scores by Rank Order . . . . .</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>TABLE 28 Summary of AVP + Skills Prettest Scores by Rank Order . . . . .</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>TABLE 29 Summary of AVP + Sexuality Posttest Scores by Rank Order . . . . .</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>TABLE 30 Summary of AVP + Skills Posttest Scores by Rank Order . . . . .</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>TABLE 31 Pre and Posttest Conceptualization of Nonviolence by Treatment . . .</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>TABLE 32 Group Dynamic Scores of AVP + Sexuality Following AVP Workshop by Rank Order of Scores . . . . .</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>TABLE 33 Group Dynamic Scores of AVP + Skills Group Following AVP Workshop by Rank Order of Scores . . . . .</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>TABLE 34 Group Dynamic Posttest Scores of AVP + Sexuality Group by Rank Order of Scores . . . . .</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>TABLE 35 Group Dynamic Posttest Scores of AVP + Skills Group by Rank Order of Scores . . . . .</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>TABLE 36 Weekly Attendance of Follow-up Sessions by Treatment . . . . .</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>TABLE 37 Rank Order of Total Weekly Sessions Attended by Treatment . . . . .</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>TABLE 38 Time Series Display of AVP + Sexuality Group’s Rules Infractions by Date of Testing . . . . .</b>	<b>81</b>

<b>TABLE 39 Time Series Display of AVP + Skills Group's Rules Infractions by Date of Testing</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>TABLE 40 Categorization of Prior Convictions for the AVP + Sexuality Group by Individual's Number of Reported Convictions</b>	<b>.120</b>
<b>TABLE 41 Categorization of Prior Convictions for the AVP + Skills Group by Individual's Number of Reported Convictions</b>	<b>.120</b>
<b>TABLE 42 Effect of Number of Prior Convictions on Mean Scores by Measurement</b>	<b>121</b>



## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **PROBLEM TO BE STUDIED**

Stressors inherent in prison life need not be destructive. In fact, using prison stress as a catalyst for growth opportunities constitutes a genuine correctional agenda (Johnson, 1987: 20). The task, Johnson suggests, is to create prison environments in which prisoners are free to focus their attention on the substantial challenge of rebuilding their lives (Johnson and Toch, 1982: 20) rather than on fighting for survival (Seymour, 1977: 205). In 1980 Megargee and Cadow conducted a three and one-half year follow-up study assessing the impact of life in a comparatively program-rich medium security prison for men. In that facility work, educational, treatment, and recreational options were offered in a relaxed atmosphere. The prisoners lived in open dorms with relatively free movement around the institution. Citing that study, Johnson (1987: 99) observed that "when given an accommodating correctional milieu, many offenders will make a bona fide effort to use the prison experience to improve themselves and hence to improve their chances for a decent life upon release." Indeed, Megargee and Cadow (1980: 36) reported that, of the 1,008 offenders released from the above-described program-rich milieu, 45 percent had no subsequent arrests, 71 percent had no subsequent convictions, and 72 percent had not been returned to prison for any reason.

Toch suggests that a minimum response to the sterile or destructive potentiality of prison environments should be the "exploration of all options for humanizing and enriching the milieu" (Toch, 1980: 18). The ideal response would be to "build growth-promoting communities in prison" (Toch, 1980: 18).

Building such growth-promoting, alternative communities within prisons is not all that farfetched. Research has indicated that prisons may best be perceived as "mosaics of smaller subsettings, which are not primarily differentiated by levels of material comforts or prisoner-attributed prestige, but which reflect varying emphases on sets of ecological dimensions" (Hagel-Seymour, 1982: 269). Based on a content analysis of interviews with 900 incarcerated individuals who were asked about their crises and problems, how these

events occurred and how they perceived and coped with them, Toch identified the following central ecological dimensions as being of paramount import:

- 1) freedom [from restrictions, circumscription of conduct];
- 2) safety [from physical violence];
- 3) privacy [from social and physical overstimulation];
- 4) structure [environmental stability and predictability];
- 5) support [programs and services that facilitate self-improvement];
- 6) emotional feedback [love, appreciation, caring]; and
- 7) activity [distraction, filling up time] (Toch, 1977: 16, as cited in Wright, 1985: 260).

These dimensions are so essential to human survival that it is not surprising that incarcerated individuals create certain subsettings, referred to by Seymour (1980) as "niches," in an effort to manage prison stress (Hagel-Seymour, 1982: 280). Varying in type from "carefully selected informal housing, programs and work assignments to supportive and creative oases" (Hagel-Seymour, 1982: 269), niches seem to be transactional in nature, involving both a "prisoner with imported skills, interests, and liabilities, and a prison setting that represents the self-assessed optimal solution to the problems and preferences of that prisoner" (Hagel-Seymour, 1982: 269). Hagel-Seymour (1982: 269) further posited that in the ameliorative transaction between prisoner and setting, "the setting provides "relief from fears and concerns rooted in situation-aggravated vulnerabilities," and thus gives the setting its essential quality and meaning as a niche.

Formal niches are institutionally maintained settings that are "most readily apparent in assignments of some prisoners with skewed safety concerns" (i.e., the maintenance of "special tiers for physically weak or socially immature, therapeutic communities, traditional protective units"). Informal niches are naturally occurring subenvironments within the prison in which "prisoners engage in a creative process by perceiving and then organizing elements of their surroundings into a passable way to live, the raw materials for the niche [being] largely available to all...[and are environments that] reduce the source of formal control and allow expression of resentment and/or avoidance of officers" (Hagel-Seymour, 1982: 275).

The program conceived for this project represents an attempt to create an habilitative, growth-producing, nonviolent “niche-potential” within a medium security prison. The term “niche-potential” is used specifically to imply that, as suggested above, it is incarcerated individuals who determine which subenvironments within prisons provide sufficient “relief from fears and concerns rooted in situation-aggravated vulnerabilities” (Hagel-Seymour, 1982: 269) to qualify them as niches. Therefore, it remains to be seen whether the program developed by this researcher will be viewed by incarcerated individuals as a subenvironment wherein they can “assert freedom, garner safety and find outlets for self-expression” (Hagel-Seymour, 1982: 268).

### **Nature of the Program**

The program as conceived for this project was based on an educational program that already exists within several medium and maximum security prisons in several states, the Alternatives to Violence Project Inc. (AVP) (Angell, 1988). The program was originally introduced into the New York state prison system 12 years ago by a group of volunteers. Therefore, AVP as a subenvironment is formal in the sense that it does not occur naturally within the prison. It is informal in the sense that it is not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections (DOC). Participation by any incarcerated individual is strictly voluntary and each participant must seek out the program. No part of the program is structured by the DOC, and none of the volunteers receive remuneration of any kind from the DOC.

The essential aspect of informal niches that AVP does have, and the dimension that sets it apart from formal niches, pertains to the issue of power. Informal niches are by definition those settings that are self-assessed by individuals as providing optimal solutions to problems (Hagel-Seymour, 1982). The primary actor responsible for the emergence of informal niches within prisons is the incarcerated individual who initiates the ameliorative transaction between self and setting. The individual must have the volitional power to act, initiate and respond, no matter how limited such power might be. Accordingly, the core

philosophy of AVP is one of empowerment; the goal is to “affirm the existence and legitimacy of personal power and to give participants the experience of shared power exercised cooperatively, responsibly and well” (AVP Basic Manual, 1985: A-1).

AVP’s conceptualization of power is somewhat different than that of others. Huston (1983: 189), reflecting the popular conceptualization of power, contends that the degree of power an individual possesses is reflected in the degree to which that individual can prevail over another; however, the AVP conceptualization of power is that it is the ability to create “win/win” situations and has nothing to do with the capacity to coerce others. The AVP concept is more in keeping with Peck’s (1978: 284) conceptualization of spiritual power, wherein decisions are made with maximum awareness. Raven (1965) developed a conceptualization of informational power wherein sufficient information is provided through clear and non-threatening communication, and Schaefer (1987: 42) perceives personal power as an individual’s “taking responsibility” and a life affirming “ability to respond to” rather than a life negating decision to “take control over.” AVP is based on the premise that there are certain individual and group dynamics that make it possible to transform hostility and destructiveness into cooperation and community (AVP Basic Manual, 1985: A-1).

In accordance with these views, then, the fundamental aim of the AVP program is to facilitate the empowerment of individuals through the creation of an environment in which positive actions conducive to cooperation and community (thus, contradictory to aggression and violence) are supported, encouraged, practiced, and commonplace.

The core emphases throughout the AVP program that facilitate empowerment are: 1) affirmation of self and other; 2) the development of trust, empathy, cooperation and community; and 3) the development of communication, perspective-taking, and conflict resolution skills. For purposes of this study, the terms “aggression” and “violence” refer to any behavior that results in either psychological or physical injury to oneself or another living creature or damage or destruction to property.

## **Goals and Objectives of the Program**

The format of AVP consists of two, three-day, intensive, experiential workshops. The basic workshop, which focuses on the core components described above, is usually followed some months later by an advanced workshop during which participants work on specific factors that contribute to violence (e.g., anger, fear, power, and stereotyping). Groups are typically comprised of 20 or fewer individuals and three or four facilitators, some of whom may be incarcerated individuals who have been trained in AVP principles.

The fundamental goal of the research project was to modify the above-described AVP program to create a viable growth-producing, nonviolent "niche potential" within a midwestern medium security prison for women. Modifications included omitting the second workshop and presenting weekly follow-up sessions so the participants could experience repeated opportunities for practicing nonviolent conflict resolution skills in an affirmative environment. The project was implemented as an experiment so comparisons could be drawn between the functioning of two treatment approaches.

Project objectives that stemmed from this fundamental goal were as follows:

1. to create a growth-producing, nonviolent niche-potential within a medium security prison for women to facilitate the empowerment of participants;
2. to facilitate the experience of empathy, trust, cooperation and community among participants; and
3. to facilitate participants' learning and utilization of communication, perspective-taking, and conflict resolution skills.

The time frame for the modified program was based on Rest's (1986) meta-analysis of 55 moral education programs, which has demonstrated that, while short-duration programs (zero to three weeks) are ineffective, medium-duration programs (four to 12 weeks) are no less effective than long-duration programs (13 to 18 weeks). (See Appendix A for a description of the weekly session agendas.)

Theoretical and empirical evidence supporting the inclusion of these several components in a nonviolent niche-potential are provided in Chapter Two.

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review provides the basis for predicting links between program alternatives and intermediate outcomes and intermediate outcomes and behavior. Specific variables of interest that comprise each component are reflected in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Program alternatives, intermediate outcome variables, and behavioral variables.

Program Alternatives	Intermediate Outcome Variables	Behavioral Variables
AVP + Skills AVP + Sexuality	Perception of group dynamics in program  Empathy Trust Locus of Control Conflict Resolution Skills – “Openness” Conflict Resolution Skills – “I” statements  Understanding of nonviolence as concept	Rules infractions Attendance in six-week follow-up session

For purposes of clarity, the literature review is organized around the program objectives delineated in Chapter One, page 5.

**Objective One:** to create a growth-producing, nonviolent niche-potential within a medium security prison for women in order to facilitate the empowerment of participants.

As suggested in Table 1, the task of this project was to determine how each of the two treatment programs (AVP + Skills and AVP + Sexuality) affected each of the intermediate

variables, and, in turn, how the intermediate variables, considered singly or in combinations, affected behavior.

In an exploratory study of transactional classification, Wright (1986) reviewed correctional literature as it relates to the effects of imprisonment on the individual. He identified three primary factors that contribute to prison adjustment: an individual's social and cultural background, experiences and personality (Bukstel and Killmann, 1980), the physical and social milieu of the prison (Bukstel and Killmann, 1980; Moos, 1975; Wright, 1979), and the possibility that there is an interaction between individual and environmental factors (Toch, 1977: 1981). Drawing from the work of Coulton (1981), Wright (1986:328) suggests that individuals adjust better to certain environments than others and that:

Person-environment fit refers to the degree of congruance between people's needs, capabilities, and aspirations along with the resources, demands, and opportunities characteristic of the environment. Whether or not there is harmony between person-environment (p-e fit) depends on the individual's capacity for adapting and coping and the flexibility and sufficiency of resources that are available in the environment. The literature has demonstrated the connections among life change, disruptions in p-e fit, physical illness and psychological disturbance.

People who lack effective coping skills or constantly face stressful events and harsh and barren environments may experience a chronic absence of fit vis-à-vis the environment that surrounds them (Coulton, 1981: 21).

Wright (1986) also examined various interactions among individual and environmental factors to determine those that play a role in determining adjustment. He demonstrated empirical support for the hypothesis that the congruence of individual characteristics and the environment are, indeed, important in determining outcome. Using an ex post facto design and analyzing data from 942 inmates from ten prison sites, he identified the four contextual variables that appeared to be the most important in distinguishing between environments: social stimulation, safety, support, and structure. Wright (1986:326) concluded that strategies that foster these environmental characteristics can reduce individual deterioration in functional ability.

The term "adjustment" has a political connotation and implies a volitional power to act, initiate, and respond. In the instance of "adjustment to prison," then, such a perception

implies that the individual decides to "come to resolution" or "find harmony" with the prison setting rather than to "conform to" or accept that setting without question. Whereas the former implies the recognition and gratification of the mutual needs, capabilities and aspirations alluded to above, ("mutual" being the key word), the latter implies the subordination of one party's needs, capabilities and/or aspirations to those of another or others.

Continuing this line of thought, the dual assumption of obedience and control, the cornerstone of correctional policy, is implicit in the notion of subordination. In questioning the efficacy of such policy, however, Braswell and his colleagues (Braswell et al., 1985: 160) have emphasized that, while obedience in prison may seem the simplest way to maintain a smooth-running facility, it is not always in the best interests of incarcerated individuals, staff members, or the community to which most inmates eventually return. On the contrary, they (1985: 160) point out the deleterious effects of obedience by suggesting:

while generalized obedience is necessary to some extent both in and out of prison (e.g., performing job assignments), if relied upon too extensively it may create a sense of dependence and hopelessness for the individual. Since obedience is essentially a process of responding to external systems and cues, it can result in a person simply "doing as he or she is told."

Braswell et al., conclude, therefore, that undue emphasis on obedience is counterproductive because inmates, even though they may conform to the highly regimented and restrictive environment of the prison setting, may, in fact, be unable to sustain law-abiding behavior when released and confronted with relationships that offer criminal opportunities and enticements. Indeed, the researchers surmise that it is only when individuals are able to develop internalized values and cognitive skills that they are able to reason independently and ask why as well as how.

The correctional preoccupation with control is even less productive than the emphasis on obedience. Indeed, as alluded to earlier, Schaefer (1987: 42; Fromm, 1956: 23) warns that there is a tendency in our culture to confuse the very different concepts of "control" and "responsibility." "Taking responsibility," particularly with reference to relationships between individuals, has taken on the distorted connotation of an ability to



“control” or “prevail over” (Schaef, 1987: 42). However, the literal meaning of the concept is “response ability” or “the ability to respond to” (Fromm, 1956: 22-23). Within the context of correctional policy, the distorted connotation has resulted in a commitment to personal control rather than personal power or empowerment, thus impeding the dynamic exchange between incarcerated individual and penal environment and inhibiting the facilitation of the internalized values to which Braswell et al. (1985) allude.

To be sure, in keeping with Piaget's postulations regarding cognitive structural development (Stewart, 1975: 52), blind conformity and/or obedience to another and coerced control by another are both antithetical to the development and/or facilitation of internalized values. As Arbuthnot and Faust (1981: 82) suggest, an individual's ability to internalize values and, thus, reason morally, is advanced only through repeated opportunities for independent and dynamic interaction with their environment (i.e., practice in making decisions in real-life roles).

Indeed, research indicates that individuals who are internally oriented and believe that behaviors and consequences are contingent are more apt to be more active in attempting to exert control and master their environments (MacKenzie and Goodstein, 1986; Seeman, 1963; Seeman and Evans, 1962; Wright, Holman, Steel and Silverstein, 1980) than individuals who are more externally oriented and do not perceive a high correspondence between behaviors and subsequent events and who do not expect to control events (MacKenzie and Goodstein, 1986: 209).

Although results from past research are inconclusive vis-à-vis factors that contribute to the development of individuals' expectations or lack of expectations that they can substantially and positively impact their own lives, important related factors include consistent and nurturing home environments and parenting that is not controlling (Levenson, 1987: 27). Because the development of internalized values continues throughout adulthood (Rest, 1986: 177), it would seem that characteristics of penal environments (that become “home” to many individuals) may either impede or facilitate that development.

To be sure, Higgins et al., (1984) have shown that the ability of individuals to draw from their internal bank of values to make sound judgments of moral responsibility is

dependent not only upon their respective developmental levels of moral reasoning but also upon the moral features of the situation in which they are functioning. Deutsch (Lindskold et al., 1986: 99) alluded to this in his distinction between competitive and cooperative environments, the former inducing "threat, coercion, deception, suspicion, rigidity, and faulty communication" and the latter inducing "perceived similarity, trust, open communication, flexibility, concern for the other, emphasis on mutual interests, and attraction between the parties." Not surprisingly, then, the characteristic atmospheres or normative structures that prisons tend to develop may either stimulate or retard the development of incarcerated individuals' internalized values and, thus, moral growth (Jennings and Kohlberg, 1983: 35; Kohlberg, 1970, 1976, 1981; Reimer and Power, 1978).

Rucker (1986) demonstrated this tendency empirically when she analyzed interview responses of male youths who were incarcerated in an adolescent detention facility. Participants were required to resolve two sets of real-life dilemmas that were centered around the issues of rules, communication, caring, and feeling accepted by others. Dilemmas were written so that one set was situated within a detention facility setting and the other set was situated outside the facility. A comparison between the mean scores for the two sets of practical dilemmas revealed a statistically significant difference, with lower moral reasoning utilized in the resolution of detention facility dilemmas.

The implications of Rucker's (1986) findings vis-à-vis this project are important. If, indeed, the normative structure and value system within a prison reflected that the most important reason for not breaking rules in that facility was a primitive preoccupation with punishment and blind obedience rather than some higher value orientation (say to fairness, goodness, mutual obligations, or principles of human rights and responsibilities), then the ability of incarcerated individuals to learn and practice higher value orientations is impeded.

Research has demonstrated a moderate correlation (in the .3 range) between the ability to reason morally and the ability to act morally (Blasi, 1980; Rest, 1986: 135; Thoma, 1985).

As Arbuthnot and Faust (1981) suggest, a dynamic and free exchange between in-

dividuals and their environments is central to the development of internalized values, and, if, as Braswell et al. (1985) suggest, undue emphasis on obedience impedes the development of internalized values, then correctional policies that facilitate internalized values and, thus, empowerment, must be considered seriously. Within the parameters of such a policy, adjustment to prison would have connotations of mutuality (to come into harmony with) rather than coercion (to conform to).

**Objective Two:** to facilitate the experience of empathy, trust, cooperation and community among participants

### **Empathy**

Toch (1975), in his challenge for incarcerated individuals to go beyond issues of survival and endurance in their attempts to adjust to imprisonment, recognizes that it is essential for individuals to develop relationships within the confines of prison. He also suggests that incarcerated individuals must be willing to meet problems head-on and solve them without exploiting, deceiving or doing violence to others and that prisoners must be willing to assist those who are in need (Toch, 1975).

Fundamental to each of these behaviors, however, is the requisite ability to empathize with another human being: to comprehend the affective or cognitive status of another (Borke, 1971; Deutsch and Madle, 1975; Hogan, 1969; Kohut, 1971). According to Rogers (1975: 4), having empathy:

means entering the private perceptual world of the other and becoming thoroughly at home in it. It involves being sensitive, moment to moment, to the changing felt meanings which flow in this other person, to the fear or rage or tenderness or confusion or whatever, that he is experiencing. It means temporarily living in his life, moving about in it delicately without making judgements .... It includes communicating your sensings of his world as you look with fresh and unfrightened eyes at elements of which the individual is fearful. It means frequently checking with him as to the accuracy of your sensings, and being guided by the responses you receive.

By pointing to the possible meanings in the flow of his experiencing, you help the person to focus on this useful type of referent, to experience the meanings more fully, and to move forward in the experiencing.

Rogers (1975) also concludes that empathy dissolves alienation. For the moment, at least, recipients find themselves a connected part of the human race (Rogers, 1975: 6). Jung has said that schizophrenics cease to be schizophrenic when they meet someone who understands them; the recipient feels that someone values, cares for, and accepts the person that he/she is (Rogers, 1975: 6). Laing (1965: 139) and Buber (Rogers, 1975: 7) both suggest that an individual's sense of identity is dependent upon the existence of another by whom one is known and by whom their existence was confirmed. Aspy (1972), in recounting studies ranging from schizophrenic patients to pupils in ordinary classrooms, from clients of a counseling center to teachers in training, and from neurotics in Germany to neurotics in the United States indicated that the more sensitive the therapist or teacher, the more likely constructive learning and change would occur. Indeed, empathy has been identified as possibly the most potent factor in bringing about learning and change (Rogers, 1975: 3).

The relationship between empathy and some forms of prosocial behavior (voluntary, intentional behavior that results in benefits for another, the motive being unspecified and either positive, negative, or both [Eisenberg, 1982; Staub, 1978]) has been demonstrated empirically (Eisenberg and Miller, 1987: 115). In a meta-analysis of studies organized according to the method used to assess empathy, low to moderate positive relations generally were found between empathy and both prosocial and cooperative/socially competent behavior for all measures of empathy other than picture/story measures (Eisenberg and Miller, 1987: 91).

Eisenberg and Miller (1987: 111-112) also note that many researchers seem to view prosocial and cooperative behaviors as being on the same continuum or within the same general domain of behavior and, thereby, assume that the same processes mediating prosocial behavior play a role in cooperative behavior (Hoffman, 1977; Iannotti, 1985; Levine & Hoffman, 1975; Marcus, Roke & Bruner, 1985). Eisenberg and Miller (1987: 111-112) contend that this is true, even though cooperative behaviors traditionally have been defined more in terms of consequences for the self rather than for the other. As Patchen (1987: 164) points out, however, two parties (spouses, business associates, labor

and management, incarcerated individual and staff person, or incarcerated individual and incarcerated individual) are commonly interdependent, and each may have incentives for both cooperating with and trying to win advantage over the other. If, therefore, one goal of imprisonment is facilitating constructive change in individuals so that, upon release, they can become productive and contributing members of society, the challenge becomes one of creating a structure and climate within the prison setting that models and supports the development of empathetic and cooperative/socially competent behavior rather than aggressive patterns of winning advantage over another.

Embedded within this challenge is the issue of transforming already-existent conflict-ridden climates into cooperative ones. Indeed, Deutsch (1973, 1980, 1983), after studying conflict and cooperation for several decades, has posited what he calls the "crude law of social relations" (Lindskold et al., 1986: 99). As Lindskold et al. (1986: 99-100) explain, Deutsch believes that the atmosphere of a relationship will foster certain acts and processes. A competitive atmosphere induces threat, coercion, deception, suspicion, rigidity, and faulty communication; a cooperative atmosphere induces perceived similarity, trust, open communication, flexibility, concern for the other, emphasis on mutual interests, and attraction between the parties (Lindskold et al., 1986: 99). Furthermore, Deutsch contends that the processes and acts characteristic of a given type of social atmosphere will induce that very atmosphere if introduced into a newly forming relationship (Lindskold et al., 1986: 99-100).

Expanding on Deutsch's law of social relations, Lindskold et al. (1986) hypothesized that a newly developed atmosphere will be readily changed if one party acts in a contradictory manner.

Cooperation can be spoiled and conflict can be resolved, they suggested, if one party acts deliberately (not accidentally) and clearly (not ambiguously) in a manner incompatible with that sort of relation (Lindskold et al., 1986: 100). This hypothesis was, in fact, supported in two separate empirical studies in which 200 college students played repeated trials of Prisoner's Dilemma with a simulated other who could send verbal communications. The details of these studies are important to this discussion. As

Lindskold et al. (1986: 99) describe them:

In the first study, the other began intensifying conflict by being behaviorally unresponsive over a long duration, by being totally noncooperative, by responding more quickly to the competition than the cooperation of the subject, or by coercing cooperation with threats for the purpose of exploitation. Then the other introduced a program of carefully communicated conciliation. The results showed a significant increase in cooperation by the subjects across conditions. In the second study, the subjects' competition was intensified by the other's choice of verbal communication—threat, insult, or challenge. Then the other introduced conciliation; the subjects responded cooperatively in all cases. Finally, the other lapsed into uncommunicated competition, and the subjects became highly competitive once more.

Lindskold et al. (1986: 113) conclude that the two experiments show a readiness on the part of subjects to follow an adversary's lead in changing the climate of a relationship from competitive to cooperative, with little importance given the precise nature of what went before and what acts of the other may have exacerbated the noncooperative features of the interaction.

Albeit this empirical evidence derived in a laboratory setting cannot easily be generalized to a prison setting, it does suggest potential strategies that might be nurtured and tried in a consciously developed, growth-producing niche-potential.

## **Trust**

This researcher believes that the pivotal factor in attempting to empower individuals is the development of interpersonal trust. Indeed, Phares (1988: 344) has suggested that:

in their pursuit of goals, people develop generalized expectancies or attitudes as to how best to construe situations. Situations may be thought of presenting problems that need to be overcome in order to achieve reinforcement. Individuals will differ in these problem-solving generalized expectancies based upon their unique prior experiences. One such prominent attitude or generalized expectancy is interpersonal trust—the extent to which one can rely on the word of others.

Trust, Gabarro (1978: 294) observes, has been operationalized in the literature in many different ways: the level of openness that exists between two people, the degree to

which one person feels assured that another will not take malevolent or arbitrary actions, and the extent to which one person can expect predictability in the other's behavior in terms of what is "normally" expected of a person acting in good faith (Walton, 1968; Altman and Taylor, 1973; Berscheid and Walster, 1969). One aspect of empowerment as conceptualized in this project is the ability to "respond to" rather than "prevail over" another. Indeed, studies regarding the development of trust indicate that an individual's ability to trust has an impact on how well he/she can work out problems of mutual expectations with others (Gabarro, 1978: 294).

From the cognitive developmentalist perspective, it is not surprising that the key component in the development of trust, (mutuality) is also the key component in the development of internalized values. The degree of influence one person has on another, for example, appears to be very much dependent on how much that person is trusted by the other (Gabarro, 1978: 294). As Phares (1988) suggests:

People who are more trusting are less likely to cheat or steal. They are prone to give other people a second chance and to respect the rights of others. Also, they are less likely to be unhappy, full of conflict, or maladjusted. They tend to be sought as friends more often than are distrustful persons....

Further research suggests that the "response ability" and the level of trust between individuals rests upon each person's perceptions of the other's integrity, motives and intentions, consistency of behavior, openness and discreteness, functional or specific competence, interpersonal competence, and judgment-making ability (Gabarro, 1978: 295).

Gouldner (1970) addressed the issue of mutuality in his notion of consensual reciprocity, which is comparable to the AVP notion of trust. For Gouldner, each party in a social system that is based on consensual reciprocity receives something from the other in return for something given (Gouldner, 1970: 240). In this "exchange of gratification" each party receives both rights and obligations, which, if mutually maintained, insure equilibrium. If the exchange becomes one-sided, however, the relations become precarious and equilibrium is lost (Gouldner, 1970: 240).

Gouldner suggests (1970: 239) that it is this reciprocal relationship that is crucial to

insuring equilibrium in a social system and goes on to postulate that reciprocity is more crucial to social equilibrium than a shared moral code. While parties who share a moral code are more likely to conform because the expectations they develop are considered legitimate and deserving of conformity by both parties, Gouldner (1970: 234) posits that equilibrium can be destroyed if one party sees the other's conformity as being morally imposed rather than "voluntary." When one party defines the other's conformity as "of his own free will," they tend to reward that conformity. If, however, they view the other's conformity as "forced," they may, in fact, be likely to withdraw rewards.

Gouldner also contends (1970: 242-243) that notable disparities in the power of the two parties are conducive to disparate moral values and enable stronger parties to "coerce the weaker and extract gratification from them without appropriate or mutual returns," thus, rendering the exchange dependent rather than mutual and reciprocal (Gouldner, 1970: 243). Differential powers are "thus conducive neither to a consensus of moral beliefs nor to a reciprocity or mutuality of gratification" (Gouldner, 1970: 242-243).

In the prison context in which differential powers and dependency rather than consensual reciprocity are the norm, a major issue to be addressed in this project was whether the AVP notion of trust would be allowed to develop. Empirical evidence strongly suggests that modeling and direct teaching are the most potent forces in developing high or low trusting belief in children (Katz and Rotter, 1969: Intro), and therefore, of import to the study was whether levels of trust could be changed through a program that emphasized development of trusting skills even if the overall environment was not conducive to such development.

**Objective Three: to facilitate participants' learning and utilization of perspective-taking and conflict-resolution skills**

### **Communication Skills**

In a comprehensive study of the roots of violence, Wertham (1966: 50) concluded that communication is the opposite of violence. He concluded that when people do not communicate with each other, they do not know each other; when they do not know each



other, they can be moved to hatred (1966: 57). Similarly, McDougal, in his Foreword to Braswell et al.'s (1985) work on prison violence in America, states that:

Communication is another concern that is frequently mentioned in corrections but rarely understood or systematically developed within correctional operations. All too often, the various constituent groups of the organization fail to trust or talk openly with each other. This fragmentation and distrust frequently solidifies, fed by the recalcitrance of competing officers, middle managers, inmate groups and others.

Such fragmentation, however, is not inevitable. When individuals fully communicate with each other, Wertham observed, they do not use violence (1966: 13). Good communication is a powerful force; it is the greatest single factor affecting a person's relationship to others (Satir, 1976). Indeed, because of the recognition of the powerful nature of communication, nonviolent conflict resolution is a central feature of the AVP strategy.

Such a strategy is not unique to AVP. Ilfeld (1970: 20), a social learning theorist, contends that utilizing positive responses that are incompatible with the act of violence (e.g., smiling, state of muscle relaxation, open and direct communication, active listening and trust development) decreases the likelihood of aggression and/or violence more than do negative sanctions such as punishment, shame or guilt. Whereas aggressive-punitive sanctions frustrate the individual and provide negative models, incompatible positive responses to aggression provide new options and repertoires (Ilfeld, 1970: 80).

From the social learning perspective, aggression and violence are learned behaviors. They can, therefore, within biological and genetic limitations, be altered by utilizing social learning principles such as modeling (Bandura, 1973: 252). Indeed, Bandura suggests:

Modeling is a powerful influence which can be utilized to modify as well as to transmit aggressive patterns of behavior. People will persist in ineffective conduct when they have not learned other ways of handling situational demands. Aggression can therefore be best reduced at the individual level by developing more effective means of coping with interpersonal problems. (1973: 252-253)

Socially adept and verbally skilled individuals, for example, are "able to defuse potentially explosive situations through pacifying moves such as face-saving actions, friendly

persuasion, and humor" (Bandura, 1973: 255). In keeping with AVP principles such as "risk being creative rather than violent," "use surprise and humor" and "seek to resolve conflicts by reaching common ground" (AVP Basic Manual, 1985), Bandura suggests:

...verbal skills not only reduce actions productive of violence, they can also help preserve one's integrity and self-esteem in embarrassing situations without having to dispose of antagonists physically. Social class differences in physical aggressiveness partly result because members of higher strata are taught to talk rather than to fight their way out of difficult situations.

Socially and verbally unskilled persons, have limited means for handling discord, are likely to become physically aggressive on slight provocation, especially in contexts where violent conduct is viewed favorably. Assaultive people can therefore profit greatly from a treatment program that teaches nonviolent techniques for handling interpersonal conflicts. By enlarging their repertory of skills, aggressors achieve greater freedom in meeting present and future problems (1973: 255-256).

Empirical evidence regarding the effects of communication-oriented programs on offenders is provided by Maskin (1976). In a project examining recidivism rates in communication-oriented as opposed to work-oriented programs for juvenile delinquent males, Maskin found that recidivism was lowest in the communication-oriented group. In groups matched for age, ethnic origin, educational achievement and reading scores, results suggested that facilitation of family interaction and communication is related closely to successful treatment of the delinquent and consequent recidivism.

The key word here is interaction, implying mutuality. Albeit Maskin's project was focused on family interaction, Satir (1972), a family therapist, contends that families can be natural, one-parent, blended or institutional. Based on Maskin's findings, as well as empirical evidence that demonstrates verbal skills provide a real behavioral option to aggression and violence (Bandura, 1969; Friedman, 1972; Gittelman, 1965; Mahoney, 1971), the efficacy of stressing conflict-resolution skills in a life-enhancing, affirmative environment such as a niche-potential is supported.

Ironically, while niches provide havens of safety and less vulnerability, they can block the development of communication networks and mutual obligations. In discussing coping strategies of incarcerated individuals, Johnson (1987: 116) warns that people in niches typically avoid dealing with problems (e.g., conflicts with authorities, fear of peers,

anxiety in social situations or feelings of inadequacy when separated from loved ones). Although avoidance is one aspect of a competent coping strategy, Johnson (1987: 116) suggests that:

one cannot avoid all problems, and some methods of avoidance, such as manipulation and deception, are harmful to others. Thus, skills for responsibly circumventing problems must be supplemented with problem-solving skills (1987: 116).

The problem-solving skills of offenders are often questionable. Larson (1988: 70) contends that adolescents with learning problems, who as a population are at greater risk for committing crimes and for incarceration (Keilitz and Dunivant, 1986; Larson, in press), are also reported to have significant difficulties in a variety of social problem-solving skills, among which are interpreting the mood or communication of others (Kronick, 1978; Lerner, 1981) and taking the perspective of others (Bachara, 1976; Larson and Gerber, 1987).

### **Perspective-Taking Skills**

A number of investigators (Anthony, 1959; Chandler, 1972; Feffer, 1970; Gough, 1948; Martin, 1968; Sarbin, 1954; Thompson, 1968) have examined the relationship between delays in the acquisition of perspective-taking skills and the development of various forms of social deviation. Chandler concluded:

these studies have provided considerable support for the view that prosocial behavior is linked to the development of age-appropriate role-taking or perspective-taking skills and have demonstrated that a variety of forms of social deviancy are associated with persistent ego-centric thought [egocentric thought, as shown by Piaget and Inhelder, 1956 and Looft, 1972, is defined here as the relative inability to recognize or take into account the privileged character of one's own private thoughts and feelings]. Persons demonstrating developmental delays in the acquisition of these skills have been shown to systematically misread societal expectations, to misinterpret the actions and intentions of others, and to act in ways which were judged to be callous and disrespectful of the rights of others (1980: 243).

In an attempt to develop and evaluate a program of remedial training in deficient perspective and role-taking skills, Chandler (1980: 244) compared 45 delinquent and 45

nondelinquent boys between the ages of 11 and 13. He randomly assigned youths to one of three groups: a non-treatment control group who had no contact with the research staff other than pre- and post-intervention assessments, an experimental group which employed drama and the making of video films as vehicles for participants to see themselves from the perspective of others and for providing remedial training in deficient role-taking skills, and a kind of placebo experimental group who interacted routinely with the same research staff and made video films but were not provided opportunities to see themselves from the perspectives of others and did not receive special training in role-taking skills), Chandler demonstrated that specific training in role-taking skills substantially reduced the high level of social egocentrism that had previously characterized these subjects (Chandler, 1980: 252). At a ten-month follow-up, a Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks was performed on the difference between the number of preintervention and postintervention delinquencies for the subjects of each of the three treatment groups. Results revealed group differences that were highly significant, indicating a relationship between the type of intervention received and the number of subsequent delinquencies committed (Chandler, 1980: 251).

Using a somewhat different approach, Ostrom et al. (1980) matched two groups of delinquent probationers. Youths, who had been recruited to be "consultants" in a project designed ostensibly to understand "why kids get into trouble," were placed in the role of "valued expert" rather than "delinquent-in-need-of-change" and were randomly assigned to either an experimental or control group. Based on empirical evidence that role-plays have shown long term effects on behavioral change (Elms, 1967; Mann and Janis, 1968), treatment consisted of seven two-hour sessions in which role play plots were created and enacted around the three themes of delinquent behavior, the impact of delinquent behavior on all individuals concerned, and the consequences of delinquent behavior for one's future. Participants took the roles of parents, arresting officers, victims, law breakers, judges, jailers, schoolteachers, school principals, gang leaders, innocent bystanders, militant activists or obstructive bigots. Role plays were devised specifically to pose the kinds of moral dilemmas participants would encounter in the future, should they pursue their present life style

(Ostrom et al., 1980: 228). A ten-month follow-up period was divided into two five-month evaluative periods. Although the net percent benefit for the first five months did not reach significance, the researchers reported a sizable reduction in the overall percentage of delinquency. Nearly 48 percent of the control group committed at least one delinquent act during this period; only 26.3 percent of the experimental group did so (Ostrom et al., 1980).

In terms of the formation of internalized values, cognitive-developmentalists contend that the ability to take another individual's perspective is crucial in the development of moral reasoning. In a discussion of moral education techniques organized around the theoretical recognition of the heuristic value of cognitive conflict, Arbuthnot and Faust (1981: 190) suggested that role plays are an important adjunct or alternative procedure to moral dilemma discussions. In simulations of moral dilemmas, participants might recreate various scenes, taking various roles. Arbuthnot and Faust (1981: 190) concluded that simulation and role playing increased participant involvement, increased the acquisition of reasoning capabilities, and assisted in the generalization of these newly acquired abilities. The researchers demonstrated that such situations could provide experiences of greater impact than discussion alone, and encouraged students to regularly consider moral dilemmas from various individual's perspectives.

Based on the above theoretical support and empirical evidence, conflict-resolution skills and perspective- and role-taking skills were integral parts of this project. Specific conflict-resolution skills, comparable to those in communication enrichment programs to which Peterson (1983: 393) alludes in his discussion of conflict reduction between individuals in high interdependent relationships, were introduced to and practiced by both groups in their respective AVP workshops. However, only the AVP + Skills group received in-depth practice during their six-week follow-up sessions. Conflict resolution skills included "I" statements, active listening and taking the perspective of another. Strategies utilized to facilitate the repeated practice of these techniques included discussion groups, games, role plays and paired and group activities.

## **Gender**

The sole reason this project was completed at a prison for women was that the researcher had a long-standing relationship with the facility. She had been a co-facilitator of AVP workshops there approximately every six weeks for one year.

The underlying question that the project asked (whether it is possible to create a positive niche in an otherwise hostile environment) related more to the effects of a normative structure on incarcerated individuals functioning therein than to how either males or females per se would function.

Deutsch's crude law of social relations pertains to aspects of environments that are inherent in either coercive or cooperative environments and is, therefore, gender neutral. For example, the use of open, clear, honest communication is no more or less effective with males than with females. Social learning theorists would expect that the modeling behaviors (either coercive or cooperative) would be important for either males or females. Cognitive developmentalists would expect internalized values and moral reasoning to develop fully for both males and females only if they had a dynamic and self-directed interaction with their environment.

An interesting question for future research might be whether males and females respond differently to an affirmative, cooperative environment since social learning theorists have found that different types and elements of aggression and violence are exhibited by both males and females. As one would expect, social learning theorists contend that gender differences are due to an interaction of differential modeling, differential reinforcement, genetic factors, hormonal influences, selective association between friends and acquaintances, and structural (physical) characteristics (Bandura, 1973). It would be important in future research to do a comparative study of men's and women's reactions to aggression and violence in an incarcerative facility prior to, during, and following an AVP experience.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

The fundamental goal of this project was to evaluate the effects of the Alternatives to Violence Project, Inc. (AVP) within a medium security prison for women. Project objectives which stemmed from that goal were: (1) to facilitate the empowerment of participants; (2) to facilitate the experience of empathy, trust, cooperation and community among participants; and (3) to facilitate participants' learning and utilization of communication, perspective-taking and conflict resolution skills.

Research questions stemming from these objectives included the following:

1. Will participants maintain the perceptions they formulated during the AVP workshops throughout the project?
2. Will participants' loci of control, levels of trust, empathy, cooperation and perceptions of the change in their respective group's dynamics over the course of the project?
3. Will participants ability to utilize conflict resolution skills (openness and "I" statements) change over the course of the project?
4. Will participants' conceptualization of nonviolence change during the project?
5. Will participants attend the follow-up sessions more regularly than the control group?
6. Will participants' instances of rules infractions change?

#### **Research Design**

To address these questions, a pre-experimental design was utilized. Participants were pretested on the variables listed in Table 1 (Chapter 2, p. 6). After pretesting, subjects were matched according to pretest measures of trust and empathy and then randomly assigned to one of two treatment groups: AVP + Skills and AVP + Sexuality groups.

Originally, this project was to have included two experimental groups and one contact control group. One experimental group was to have received AVP and the six-week

follow-up sessions of conflict resolution practice and the other experimental group was to have received AVP plus Kohlbergian moral education. Their six-week follow-up sessions would have focused on moral education dilemma discussions. The contact control group was to have met weekly for one and one-half hour sessions for the duration of the project. Because of the small number of women who volunteered for the project, however, the researcher decided to drop the moral education component of the project and work with two treatment groups. Both groups received a three-day AVP workshop, but one group received six weeks of repeated opportunities for nonviolent conflict resolution practice (AVP + Skills), and the other group received six weeks of discussions regarding human sexuality issues (AVP + Sexuality). The fundamental research question became whether or not women in the AVP + Skills group would perceive their program as a niche.

### **Sample**

Volunteers for the project were invited from a population of incarcerated individuals at a midwestern medium security prison for women. Those accepted for the project had to meet two criteria: 1) as far as they could judge, they were neither to be released nor transferred for at least three months from the beginning of the project; and 2) they had never participated in any type of AVP project previously. In light of the basic AVP philosophy that only volunteers can participate in AVP programs, the results of this research are limited to volunteers only.

After discussing the project with the Prison Services Director at the research site, the researcher used the following procedure for obtaining volunteers for the project. The researcher provided eye-catching posters, which asked for volunteers for a three-month research project concerning finding alternatives to violence. With authorization from the facility, previous AVP participants posted two posters per unit in the four housing units. The posters stated that persons who had previously participated in AVP could not participate in the research and identified the research as being a project of a graduate student and, therefore, not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections. Interested parties were required to remove small sign-up forms, which were attached to



the posters, and return them to the Prison Services Director, specifying an interest in the program. The sign-up form and posters invited all volunteers to a general meeting where the project would be discussed one week after the posters were placed in the units. Inmates who had participated in previous AVP programs were also invited to the general meeting to help support the idea of research among the women.

At the meeting, the researcher presented a general explanation of the project. The researcher informed those present of the following:

1. The objective of the project was to compare different approaches to dealing with violence.
2. Volunteers would be randomly assigned to separate groups, and respondents would have to be willing to accept assignment to either group (a brief explanation of the procedures for matching and random assignment was also given).
3. That the program would consist of a three-day AVP workshop with six-week follow-up sessions.
4. Participation in the project had to be strictly voluntary, and all participants would be required to answer a battery of questions at the beginning and the end of the project.
5. All participants had to be willing to arrange their personal schedules to be available for the three-day workshop at the beginning of the project and had to be willing to participate in follow-up sessions for six weeks.
6. All records and information obtained during the program would be kept confidential and none of the information obtained would be put in their files (participants also signed a release that permitted the researcher to obtain personal information about each of them).
7. Letters of appreciation would be put into each of the participant's files.

After a questions and discussion period, interested parties were asked to sign up and fill out a release of information form, and the researcher announced the dates and locations for the first week of the project.

Forty participants were accepted for the project. Of these, three did not show up for each workshop, leaving the total number of individuals involved in the project as 32 (16

Equivalence between the two groups was accomplished by matching and random assignment using the pretest scores of two measurements: trust and empathy. The scores were plotted on a scattergram (one point for each participant), and clusters of points that were close in value were identified and circled until all points on the scattergram were encircled in two-point clusters. Each of the two points (individuals) from each cluster were then randomly assigned to one of the two groups. Randomization was accomplished by utilizing a random numbers list. Records were kept of the individuals comprising each cluster for analysis purposes.

Trust and empathy measures were chosen because the researcher believed that those two factors were crucial in the building of community, which, in turn, is fundamental to empowerment. For that reason, equivalence between the two groups in these two measures seemed important. Indeed, as reflected in Table 2, analysis of variance revealed that both groups were equivalent prior to treatment.

	AVP + Skills			AVP + Sexuality			
Pretest scores	<u><math>\bar{X}</math></u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u><math>\bar{X}</math></u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>F</u>
Trust	58.1	22.1	11	57.5	21.1	10	.00
Empathy	121.7	64.8	10	137.4	51.9	9	.33

P < .05

## **Treatment**

Participants in both groups were required to participate in separate, three-day AVP Basic workshops. The workshops were scheduled one week apart. Starting the week after the Basic workshop, each group met once a week for six weeks in separate, one and one-half hour sessions. Follow-up sessions for the AVP + Skills group consisted of repeated opportunities for participants to practice nonviolent conflict resolution skills that had been introduced in the AVP workshop. Follow-up sessions for the AVP + Sexuality group consisted of discussions about human sexuality.

## **Facilitation**

Facilitation of the AVP workshop portion for both groups was by the researcher, trained facilitators from a local AVP group, and inside facilitators (inmates who were training to become AVP facilitators). The facilitators for the first workshop (AVP + Sexuality) included two females and a male. The facilitators for the second workshop (AVP + Skills) included two males and a female.

Facilitation of the follow-up sessions for the AVP + Sexuality group was done by a certified sex educator who, at the time of the research project, had taught human sexuality on the college level for ten years. Facilitation of the follow-up sessions for the AVP + Skills groups was done by the researcher.

At the time of the research, the researcher had co-facilitated eight AVP workshops, four at the facility at which this research occurred, one of which was at an eastern medium security prison for men, and three of which were in two different metropolitan areas.

## **Pretests and Posttests**

Based on information obtained through a literature search (Chapter Two), six sets of variables were examined (Table 3): personality, communication skills, demographics, group dynamics, conceptual and behavioral. The personality variables tested included empathy, trust, and locus of control. The two skills variables assessed the production of

appropriate conflict resolution statements (one was a measure of “openness” and the other measured use of specific “I” statements). Demographic variables included age, race, education, offense histories and total prior convictions. Several aspects of group dynamics were tested under the “Environmental” category: potency, pleasantness, intimacy, control, difficulties and stratification. The conceptual variable included one instrument that evaluated participants’ conceptualizations of nonviolence.

Pretesting for most of the above-described variables was obtained prior to treatment as the experimental design demands, except for the measure of group dynamics. The purpose of this testing was to assess participants’ perceptions of group dynamics of the respective, intact groups following their respective AVP workshops. Therefore, pretesting for this variable was completed for each of the groups at the beginning of the weekly follow-up sessions. Posttesting of all variables occurred during the tenth week of the project.

### **Evaluative Instruments**

For purposes of clarity, evaluative instruments will be discussed according to the variable categories reflected in Table 3. Appendix B contains copies of the test forms utilized for each instrument.

**Table 3. Categories of Variables to be Examined.**

<b>Categories of Variables</b>						
	<b>Personality</b>	<b>Communication Skills</b>	<b>Demographic</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>Conceptual</b>	<b>Behavioral</b>
<b>V a r i a b l e s</b>	Trust  Empathy  Locus of Control	Production of conflict resolution skills, e.g., openness and “I” statements.	Age  Race  Education  Offense History  Number of Priors	Group Dynamics	Understands nonviolence as a concept	Attendance in follow-up sessions  Rules Infractions

## **Personality Variables**

### **Empathy**

Mehrabian and Epstein's Measure of Empathy (ME) was administered to all groups as a pre and posttest. As Mehrabian and Epstein (1972) report, items were selected for the ME from a larger set on the basis of: 1) insignificant correlations with the Crowne and Marlow (1960) Social Desirability Scale; 2) significant .01 level correlations with the total score on the scale; and 3) content validity inferred in part from factor analyses of the larger pool of items.

The final set of items represents intercorrelated subscales that measure related aspects of emotional empathy (Mehrabian and Epstein, 1972: 527). The subscale intercorrelations are all significant at the .01 level and exceed 0.30 in all instances. The split-half reliability for the entire measure is 0.84. The total empathy scale has a correlation of 0.06 with the Crowne and Marlow (1960) Social Desirability scale.

Mehrabian and Epstein (1972) designed experiments to explore the validity of the ME in two distinctly different social situations: one involving aggression and the other involving helping behavior. The 33-item scale consists of intercorrelated subscales that measure related aspects of emotional empathy. The measure is highly reliable and shows discriminant validity (a 0.06 correlation with the Crowne and Marlow Social Desirability Scale).

### **Trust**

Rotter's Interpersonal Trust Scale (RITS) was administered to all groups as both a pre and posttest. Rotter (1967: 653) explains that the first step in the construction of the scale was to develop a number of items written using a Likert format. An attempt was made to sample a variety of social objects (i.e., the subject was called on to express his/her trust of parents, teachers, physicians, politicians, classmates, and friends). The scale was constructed as an additive scale in which a high score would show trust for many social objects. In addition to the specific items, a few items were stated in broader terms presumed to measure a more general optimism regarding the society.

The experimental form was group-administered to two large classes of both male and female students in an introductory psychology course (Rotter, 1967: 645). Three criteria were used for inclusion of an item in the final scale: 1) the item had to have a significant correlation with the total of the other trust items with that item removed; 2) the item had to have a relatively low correlation with the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale score; and 3) endorsement of the item showed reasonable spread over the five Likert categories of strongly agree, mildly agree, agree and disagree equally, mildly disagree, and strongly disagree.

In its final form, scale items were balanced so that 12 indicated trust for agreeing and 13 distrust for agreeing. Filler items did not show significant relations to the trust items but helped partially obscure the purpose of the test. The final form of the test includes 25 items measuring trust and 15 filler items.

Internal consistency based on split-half reliability is relatively high (Rotter, 1967: 655). Two estimates of test-retest reliability reveal correlations of .56 (significant at the .01 level).

Validity was tested against observations of everyday behavior by a sociometric analysis (Rotter, 1967: 659) that revealed a relatively good construct and discriminant validity. Trust as measured sociometrically was negatively related to dependency, not significantly related to gullibility, and positively related to humor, friendship, popularity and, especially, trustworthiness (Rotter, 1967: 664).

### Locus of Control

The instrument utilized for this assessment was Rotter's I-E Scale. As revised, this instrument includes three separate scales: the Internal Scale, Powerful Others Scale, and Chance Scale. Each of the three scales contains eight items and are presented to the subject as one unified attitude scale of 24 items. Specific content areas mentioned in the items are counterbalanced so as to appear equally often for all three dimensions (Levenson, 1981: 56). The IE was administered to both groups as a pre and posttest.

As Levenson (1981: 16) points out, the I, P, and C Scales were originally designed as a reconceptualization of Rotter's I-E Scale and are composed of items adapted from Rotter's

scale and a set of statements written specifically to tap beliefs about the operation of the three dimensions of control: belief in personal control (Internal Scale), powerful others (Powerful Others Scale), and chance or fate (Chance Scale). Pretesting on 36 items included item analyses and correlations with the Marlow-Crowne Social desirability Scale (1964). The final I, P, and C Scales comprise three eight-item subscales with a seven-point Likert format (0-6), which are presented to the subject as a unified scale of 24 items.

Internal consistency estimates, Levenson (1981: 22) reports, are only moderately high, but since the items sample from a variety of situations, this could be expected. The correlations compare favorably with those obtained by Rotter (1966) and other researchers. For a student sample of 152, Levenson (1981: 22) reports, Kuder-Richardson reliabilities yielded .64 for the I Scale, .77 for the P Scale, and .78 for the C Scale (Levenson, 1974). Wallston, Wallston, and DeVellis (1978) found similar estimates for their adult sample of 115 (.51, .72, and .73, respectively) as did Levenson (1973) for a hospitalized psychiatric sample (.67, .82, and .79).

Split-half reliabilities (Spearman-Brown formula) are .62, .66, and .64 for the I, P, and C Scales. Test-retest reliabilities for a one-week period are in the .60-.79 range (Levenson, 1973), and Lee (1976) found comparable correlations with a seven-week test-retest interval (.66, .62, and .73). Zukotynski and Levenson (1976), using simplified versions with an elderly sample, found test-retest reliabilities of .85, .91, and .65 (Levenson, 1981: 23).

Levenson (1981: 23) reports that the validity of the I, P, and C Scales has been demonstrated chiefly through convergent and discriminant methods designed to show significant low-order correlations with other measures of the general construct as well as a pattern of theoretically expected positive and negative relationships with other variables. The three scales were administered to 329 undergraduates and responses were subjected to factor analysis using Kaiser's Varimax method. The rotation yielded seven factors accounting for a total of 52 percent of the variance. The first factor (P) is composed entirely of P Scale items. The second factor (I) is composed entirely of I Scale items, and the third factor (C) contains entirely C Scale items. Of the 24 items, 17 load on the first three factors. Since there is no overlap of the items on the I, P, and C factors, it appears that there is a strong

correspondence between the three orientations as they were developed theoretically and as they emerge empirically (Levenson, 1981: 25). Furthermore, the same three factors were obtained in a factor analysis with a psychiatric sample (Levenson, 1973).

### **Communication Skills Variables**

The Production Test of Conflict-Resolution Skills was developed by the researcher for this study and administered to ascertain participants' abilities to respond in a single sentence to a conflict situation in a way that would open channels of communication. The participants were to listen to the description of a conflict scenario and write a response that might reduce tension. The facilitator described ten different conflict scenarios. At the end of each short scenario, the researcher stated:

You say: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_.

The participants were able to formulate an "I" statement in response to the conflict scenario only in the posttest. The specific format of the "I" statement was as follows:

When you \_\_\_\_\_  
(specific behavior)

I feel \_\_\_\_\_  
(specific emotion)

because \_\_\_\_\_  
(tangible effects of the behavior)

In scoring, two separate scores were assigned: one score reflected whether the response was such that it might open lines of communication and the second score reflected whether an "I" statement in the above-format was used. A total of ten points, then, could be obtained for an "openness" score and another ten points could be obtained for an "I" score. This format was borrowed from Neil's (1980) Interpersonal Communications for Criminal Justice Personnel.



## **Environmental Variable**

### **Group Dynamics**

For purposes of this study, the researcher modified Hemphill's Index of Group Dimensions (HIGD) to get some sense of how participants perceived group dynamics within the experimental and control groups. As reported by Miller (1970: 201), Hemphill (1956) developed the index around 13 comparatively independent group dimensions: autonomy, control, flexibility, hedonic tone, homogeneity, intimacy, participation, permeability, polarization, potency, stability, stratification, and viscosity (how group members react to each other). The 150 items are answered on a five-point scale. The dimensions were selected from a list of group adjectives used by authorities. Items were suggested from a free-response type questionnaire administered to 500 individuals, As Miller (1970: 201) reports, split-half reliabilities range from .59 to .87. The relationship between an item and high-low categories ranges from .03 to .78 with a median of .36 on the keyed items and from .10 to .36 with a median of .12 on the randomly selected items. Intercorrelation of dimension scores ranges from  $-.54$  to  $.81$ , with most within  $+.29$  (which has a .01 significance level). Agreement between different reporters of the same group ranges from .53 to .74.

For purposes of this project, only 28 items were utilized. Those items represented six of the original 13 dimensions (e.g., potency, pleasantness, intimacy, control, equality and stratification). Reliability analysis of the 28-item instrument revealed pre-and posttest alphas of .99 and .97, respectively, reflecting high reliability.

## **Conceptual Variable**

### **Nonviolence as a Concept**

To determine if participants' understanding of nonviolence broadened during the course of the program, participants were asked to write, in their own words what non-violence meant to them as both a pre and posttest. On both occasions they were told they could simply list words, write a paragraph, write a story, or whatever they felt like doing.

## **Analysis**

On the broadest level, this project sought to ascertain whether the experiment had any effects and what the explanation for these effects might be. To answer these questions, analysis of variance and content analysis were completed. Grouped frequency distribution tables were also created to further illuminate the experimental effects. Prior to completing the above analyses, however, scale identification and refinements were accomplished by utilizing factor and reliability analyses.

### **Scale Identification and Refinement**

As an initial step, factor analyses were completed on the personality (empathy, trust, and locus of control) and environmental (group dynamics) variables to identify possible scales within each of the respective tests. Refinement of those respective scales was accomplished by adding or deleting logically and/or statistically related or unrelated items in order to achieve the most significant reliability scores.

### **Analysis of Variance**

Utilizing various versions of the refined scales, analyses of variance were completed to determine if the experimental and control groups differed significantly on change scores (posttest minus pretest score).

### **Content Analysis**

To ascertain participants' pre and posttest conceptualizations of nonviolence, content analysis of their written work was completed. Extensive field notes were written by the researcher at the end of each day. The researcher wrote notes about occurrences of each session using the agendas to stimulate her memory. Content analysis of these notes was completed to supplement the other data obtained and to formulate further hypotheses.

The specific method of content analysis utilized was one of identifying and categorizing various themes and/or patterns that emerged and organizing those themes into categories of interest.

## **Research Hypotheses**

Specific research hypotheses developed around the questions posed at the outset of this chapter were as follows:

### **Personality Variables**

**The AVP + Skills group will exhibit greater change scores in empathy, trust and locus of control more often than will the AVP + Sexuality group.**

### **Communication Skills Variables**

**The AVP + Skills group will exhibit greater change scores on the production of conflict resolution skills more often than will the AVP + Sexuality group.**

### **Group Dynamics Variable**

**The AVP + Skills group will exhibit greater change scores on perceptions of group dynamics more often than will the AVP + Sexuality group.**

### **Conceptual Variable**

**The AVP + Skills group will exhibit greater change in their understanding of nonviolence as a concept more often than will the AVP + Sexuality group.**

### **Behavioral Variables**

**The AVP + Skills group will attend the follow-up sessions more regularly than will the AVP + Sexuality group.**

**The AVP + Skills group will have fewer rules infractions following the research project**

To explain the effects of this project, ANOVA and grouped frequency distribution findings were considered in conjunction with content analysis of the researcher's field notes.

The researcher had intended to pursue further analysis which would address the relationship between the change scores for the various variables and how well the change scores predicted a dependent variable. Since no statistically significant differences between change scores were recorded, however, no further statistical analyses were completed.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **ANALYSIS**

This project sought to answer two main questions: 1) whether the Alternatives to Violence Project, Inc. (AVP) had any experimental effects on a group of incarcerated female adults and 2) what the explanation for those effects might be.

For purposes of clarity, each of the questions is addressed separately, and the discussion is organized according to the various types of analyses utilized. The process involved three steps:

1. The initial step was identifying and refining scales. Factor and reliability analyses were utilized for this purpose.
2. The second step was determining the experimental effects of the project. Analyses of variance, grouped frequency distribution tables of the Personality, Environmental, and Group Dynamic variables, and content analyses of the researcher's field notes as well as the participants' pre and posttest conceptualizations of nonviolence were used.
3. The third step was explaining the experimental effects, for which content analysis of the researcher's field notes was used.

Demographic data was gathered from information provided by the participants or the administration of the prison and is included to reflect similarities and differences between the two groups.

This chapter is divided into four major sections: Demographics, Scale Identification and Refinement, Experimental Effects, and Explanation of Experimental Effects.

#### **Demographics**

Of the 22 participants in the research project, 41 percent were from 18 to 30 years old, while 59 percent were from 31 to 45 years old. Ninety-two percent (92%) of the participants were Black, while only nine percent (9%) were caucasian. Fifty-five percent (55%) of the participants had completed less than a 12th grade education, while 45

percent had completed a 12th grade education (Table 4).

Offense histories of the participants revealed that the majority of offenses (77%) could be categorized as being either "against property" (43%) or "other" (34%). (See Table 4.) Offenses listed in the "against property" category included theft, arson, armed robbery, retail fraud, breaking and entering, larceny, shoplifting, criminal trespass, and unauthorized use of credit cards. The offenses listed under the "other" category included carrying a concealed weapon, resisting arrest, nonsufficient funds checks, disorderly conduct, prostitution and escape.

**TABLE 4. Demographics by Treatment.**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>AVP + Sexuality (N = 11)</b>	<b>AVP + Skills (N = 11)</b>	<b>Total Sample (N = 22)</b>
<b>Age</b>			
18-30 years	5 (45%)	4 (36%)	9 (41%)
31-45 years	8 (55%)	7 (64%)	13 (59%)
	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	22 (100%)
<b>Race</b>			
Black	9 (82%)	11 (100%)	20 (91%)
Caucasian	2 (18%)	--	2 ( 9% )
	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	22 (100%)
<b>Education</b>			
Below 12th grade	6 (55%)	7 (64%)	13 (59%)
12th grade	5 (45%)	4 (36%)	9 (41%)
	11 (100%)	11 (100%)	22 (100%)
<b>Offense History</b>			
Against Property	10 (42%)	9 (45%)	19 (43%)
Against Person	6 (25%)	4 (20%)	10 (23%)
Other	8 (33%)	7 (35%)	15 (34%)
	24 (100%)	20 (100%)	44 (100%)
<b>Prior Convictions</b>	36 (63%)	21 (37%)	57 (100%)

The remaining offenses in the participants' offense histories were categorized as being "against persons." Comprising 23 percent of the offenses, this category included second degree murder, involuntary manslaughter, assault with intent to murder, assault and battery and drugs (possession and/or delivery). Total prior convictions reported by the participants was 57.

The most striking characteristics of the sample in the research project were that 91 percent of the participants were Black, 59 percent had not finished high school, 41 percent were under the age of 30, and 77 percent of the offenses reported were against property rather than persons.

The random assignment of volunteers into two groups based on matching trust and empathy scores resulted in fairly comparable demographic groups. Forty-five percent of the AVP + Sexuality group (N = 11) was less than 30 years of age compared to 36 percent for the AVP + Skills group (N = 11). While 82 percent of the AVP + Sexuality group were Black, 100 percent of the AVP + Skills group were Black. Fifty-five percent of the AVP + Sexuality group had less than a high school education; 64 percent of the AVP + Skills group had less than a high school education. While the AVP + Sexuality group's offense histories revealed 45 percent "against property," 20 percent "against person," and 35 percent "other" offenses, the AVP + Skill group's offense histories revealed 43 percent "against property," 23 percent "against person," and 34 percent "other" offenses.

The most striking difference between the groups demographically appeared to be in the number of prior convictions reported by the participants (records were not available from the administration for corroboration). Sixty-seven percent (67 %) of the total convictions reported for both groups (57) were committed by members of the AVP + Sexuality group, 37 percent were committed by members of the AVP + Skills group. The effects of these differences are discussed on page 120.

Although the information was not used for the analyses, the demographic data for the five individuals who were forced to withdraw from the AVP + Sexuality group and the five women in the AVP + Skills group whose scores were not used is of some interest. Of those in the AVP + Sexuality group, 100 percent were Black. Educational level and date

of birth were not obtained on them. One woman reported no prior convictions, with manslaughter being her current offense; one reported no priors with robbery being her current offense; one reported three shoplifting convictions, one of which was her current offense; two women did not give the information.

Of the five AVP + Skills group women whose data was not considered (the women were those originally matched with the five who were forced to leave the other group), four (80 percent) were Black and one (ten percent) was Caucasian. Again, neither education level nor date of birth were obtained. Two women reported crimes against persons; one reported crimes against both persons and property, and two reported property only offenses.

### **Scale Identification and Refinement**

As discussed in Chapter Three, factor and reliability analyses were completed on the Personality, Skills, and Environmental test items to identify and refine possible scales existent within the respective test instruments.

Scales identified through factor analyses were refined by adding or deleting logically and/or statistically related or unrelated items in repeated reliability runs, seeking always the highest reliability (alpha) scores. Results of factor and reliability analyses are discussed below and are organized according to variable category.

#### **Personality Variables**

##### **Trust**

Table 5 shows the results of factors analysis on Rotter's 25-item instrument with one factor specified. Although a few items reflected negligible item-to-scale correlation coefficients, the majority of the items reflected low to moderate item-to-scale correlation coefficients (in the .3 to .4 range). Additionally, pre and posttest reliability analyses revealed moderately high alphas (.69 and .66, respectively), suggesting moderately high reliability of the instrument.

TABLE 5. Factor and Reliability Analyses of Rotter's 25-item Trust Scale.

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Trust	.69	.66		
Sincere			.37	.66
Onguard			.24	.50
Politics			.47	.38
Keeplaw			.36	.33
Parents			.32	.25
Cheating			.56	.56
Peace			.52	.05
Counton			.30	.18
Courts			.26	.46
Welfare			.46	.18
Future			.37	.02
Likeit			.12	.46
Promises			.47	.24
Accurate			.43	.39
Experts			.44	.24
Punish			.26	.04
Alert			.15	.32
Fixed			.09	.37
Judges			.36	.31
Salesmen			.19	.53
Students			.39	.52
Repairs			.39	.40
Phony			.40	.15
Public			.49	.61
World			.29	.26

Factor analysis of the Trust scale also revealed an eight-item subscale embedded within the larger 25-item scale (Table 6). All eight items in this smaller scale reflected moderate to high item-to-scale correlation coefficients. In addition, pre and posttest alphas for the eight-item subscale were moderately high (.79 and .59, respectively) suggesting a reliable measure of trust. Interestingly, the common theme of the smaller eight-item subscale seemed to relate to respondents' trust or lack of trust in the integrity of public officials and/or institutions (e.g., judges, courts, salesmen, and politicians). Analyses of variance were completed on the 25-item and eight-item scales.



**TABLE 6. Factor and Reliability Analyses of Eight-item Trust Subscale.**

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
<b>Trust</b>	.79	.59		
<b>Public</b>			.84	.67
<b>Experts</b>			.76	.42
<b>Promises</b>			.68	.42
<b>Judges</b>			.65	.50
<b>Future</b>			.62	.43
<b>Courts</b>			.60	.51
<b>Punish</b>			.49	.50
<b>Salesmen</b>			.49	.62

### Empathy

Factor analyses of pre and posttest scores for Mehrabian and Epstein's 33-item instrument revealed a range of item-to-scale correlation coefficients of from negligible to moderately high (from .06 to .77), with the majority being in the low to moderate range (from .3 to .5). Additionally, reliability analyses of the 33-item instrument revealed pre and posttest alphas that were moderately high (.81 and .66, respectively), reflecting moderately high reliability (Table 7).

Factor analysis of this instrument also revealed one nine-item subscale embedded within the larger 33-item scale. As Table 7 reveals, all of the nine items reflected moderate-to-high pre and posttest item-to-scale correlation coefficients (from .5 to .8). Additionally, reliability analyses reflected high pre and posttest alphas (.83 and .77, respectively), suggesting that this nine-item scale is a highly reliable measure of empathy. Each of the nine items seemed to relate in some way to emotionality (i.e., either to specific emotions such as happiness or loneliness or to general references to emotive states and/or behaviors resultant from emotions). Both scales were utilized in analyses of variance.

**TABLE 7. Factor and Reliability Analyses of Mehrabian and Epstein's 33-item Empathy Scale.**

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
<b>Empathy</b>	<b>.81</b>	<b>.66</b>		
Watching			.43	.32
Singing			.44	.15
Moved			.56	.26
Lonely			.25	.10
Happiness			.32	.18
Affect			.52	.18
Tears			.56	.20
Distract			.64	.56
Laughter			.69	.32
Hardsee			.42	.19
Sorry			.36	.25
Childcry			.28	.03
Upset			.11	.18
Balance			.20	-.20
Decision			.28	.44
Excite			.77	.16
Feelings			.18	.14
Helpless			.41	.80
Influenc			.43	.18
Sad			.39	.41
Crying			.44	-.06
Depressed			.10	.63
Anipain			.58	.63
Movicin			.36	.51
Treatmen			.61	.32
Sensitiv			.19	.08
Control			.43	-.04
Nervous			-.25	.11
Involvpr			.58	.30
Charact			.06	.63
Mushy			.49	.30
Bookinto			.77	.28
Role			.08	.34

**TABLE 8. Factor and Reliability Analyses of Nine-item Empathy Subscale.**

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
<b>Empathy</b>	<b>.83</b>	<b>.77</b>		
Watching			.71	.85
Singing			.69	.66
Moved			.75	.42
Lonely			.61	.77
Happiness			.61	.60
Affect			.68	.48
Tears			.85	.49
Feelings			.50	.40
Mushy			.53	.74

### Locus of Control

Factor analyses of Rotter's 24-item I-E Scale revealed three eight-item subscales embedded within the larger 24-item scale. In keeping with Rotter's original intent, the three eight-item subscales included the Internal scale (expectations regarding the control one has in one's own personal life), the Powerful Others scale (one's expectations that his/her life will be controlled by powerful others), and the Chance scale (one's expectations that his/her life will be controlled by luck or fate).

Tables 9, 10 and 11 reflect the factor and reliability analyses for the three separate subscales. In each case, items reflected a range from negligible to high item-to-scale correlation coefficients (from .09 to .78) with the majority of items falling in the moderate to high-moderate range (from .4 to .6) in the Internal and Powerful Others scales and in the negligible to low-moderate range (from .11 to .4) in the Chance scale. Additionally, reliability analyses revealed moderately high pre and posttest alphas, suggesting moderate to high reliability for all three subscales.

**TABLE 9. Factor and Reliability Analyses of Rotter's Eight-item Locus of Control (Internal) Scale.**

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
<b>Locus of Control:</b>				
<b>Internal</b>	.85	.79		
Leader			.65	.55
Driver			.47	.57
Plans			.76	.58
Friends			.47	.38
Selfled			.74	.19
Protect			.45	.75
Hardwork			.59	.50
Actions			.61	.58

**TABLE 10. Factor and Reliability Analyses of Rotter's Eight-item Locus of Control (Powerful Others) Scale.**

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
<b>Locus of Control:</b>				
<b>Powerful Others</b>	.74	.80		
Pressure			.48	.71
Controls			.59	.53
Pleasing			.48	.56
VIPS			.46	.55
Idrive			.78	.22
Desires			.53	.52
Powers			.10	.62
Ability			.14	.48

**TABLE 11. Factor and Reliability Analyses of Rotter's Eight-item Locus of Control (Chance) Scale.**

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
<b>Locus of Control:</b>				
<b>Chance</b>	.58	.69		
Accident			.24	.21
Luck			.20	.53
Lucky			.23	.41
Matluck			.25	.55
Fortune			.47	.57
Place			.11	.57
Fate			.29	.06
Happens			.30	.19

## Communication Skills Variables

### Conflict Resolution: "Openness"

Factor analysis of this ten-item instrument, which was developed by the researcher for this study, revealed a range of from low to high-moderate item-to-scale correlation coefficients (from  $-.05$  to  $.66$ ) with the majority reflecting moderate coefficients (in the  $.5$  range). Additionally, the reliability analyses of the pre and posttest scores revealed a moderately high pretest alpha ( $.79$ ) and a moderate posttest alpha ( $.49$ ) (Table 12).

TABLE 12. Factor and Reliability Analyses of Ten-item Communication Skills (Openness) Scale.

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Communication Skills: Openness	.79	.49		
Wardopen			.87	-.64
Kidopen			.87	-.85
Aggiopen			.76	-.83
Helcopen			-.05	.35
Annaopen			.03	.11
Floopen			-.05	.09
Joyopen			.31	-.26
Almaopen			.17	.20
Prisopen			.43	-.13
Sueopen			.39	-.03

One three-item scale was revealed to be embedded within the larger 10-item instrument (Table 13). Correlation coefficients were moderately high for all three items on both pre and posttests. Reliability analyses for both pre and posttests revealed moderately high alphas ( $.78$  and  $.64$ , respectively) suggesting moderately high reliability. Items that comprise the 3-item scale seem to relate to the issue of responding to another person who has failed to assume responsibility for an act or object. Both scales were used for analyses of variance.

**TABLE 13. Factor and Reliability Analyses of Three-item Communication Skills (Openness) Scale.**

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Communication Skills:				
Openness	.78	.64		
Wardopen			.87	.64
Kidopen			.87	.85
Aggiopen			.76	.83

**Conflict Resolution: "I" statement**

Since scores here reflected participants' likelihood to correctly formulate "I" statements according to a specific formula, it is not surprising that zero variance was reflected in the pretest situation (no one was able to formulate "I" statements correctly). Because of the zero variance in the pretest situation, then, posttest scores were utilized for scale refinement. Because reliability analysis utilizing all ten posttest items revealed that there were less than two non-zero variance items, the ten-item scale was not utilized for further analysis.

Table 14 shows the results of factor analysis and reveals an eight-item scale embedded within the ten-item instrument. Pre and posttest correlation coefficients were mostly high-moderate (.6 and above). Additionally, posttest reliability analysis revealed moderately

**TABLE 14. Factor and Reliability Analyses of Eight-item Communication Skills ("I" statement) Scale.**

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Communication skills:				
"I" statements		*.73		
SueI				.72
HeleI				.66
JoyI				.69
AggiI				.66
KidI				.64
WardI				.86
*Analysis was completed only on the posttest since there was zero variance on the pretest, as would be expected.				

high reliability (an alpha of .73). The common theme running throughout the six items seems to relate to being disrespectful of another person or another person's property.

### **Environmental Variable**

#### **Group Dynamics**

Factor analyses of the 28-item modified test instrument, derived from Hemphill's Index of Group Dimensions, revealed high-moderate to high pre and posttest item-to-scale correlation coefficients (from .37 to .97). Reliability analyses revealed high pre and posttest alphas (.9886 and .9653, respectively) suggesting an extremely reliable instrument. (Table 15)

**TABLE 15. Factor and Reliability Analyses of 28-item Group Dynamics Scale.**

SCALE	Alpha		Correlation Coefficients (Item with Scale)	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Group Dynamics	.99	.97		
Rules			.62	.37
Free			.80	.64
Ideas			.80	.61
Resign			.66	.72
Refused			.66	.59
Chance			.98	.82
Notclose			.89	.71
Knowwell			.87	.56
Equal			.80	.61
Notequal			.73	.64
Controld			.92	.68
Samepriv			.83	.69
Moreinfl			.78	.56
Eqpower			.95	.74
Nothappy			.81	.80
Gripping			.91	.74
Failure			.94	.56
Grplaugh			.97	.82
Honored			.95	.84
Sofail			.97	.82
Hostile			.94	.79
Quarels			.96	.80
Lookout			.94	.68
Norespct			.90	.80
Teamwork			.97	.72
Tensions			.83	.71
Outsider			.86	.67
Joinin			.95	.77

### Summary of Scale Identification and Refinement

Table 16 shows the scales and subscales that were identified and refined through a combination of factor and reliability analyses. Utilizing that process, several reliable measures of the various variables were identified.

**TABLE 16. Summary of Reliability Analyses of the Various Variable Categories.**

SCALE	Alpha	
	Pre	Post
<b>Personality Variables</b>		
Trust:		
Rotter's 25-item scale	.69	.66
8-item subscale	.79	.59
Empathy:		
Mehrabian and Epstein's 33 item scale	.81	.66
9-item subscale	.83	.77
Locus of Control:		
Rotter's Internal scale	.85	.79
Rotter's Powerful Others scale	.74	.80
Rotter's Chance scale	.58	.69
<b>Communication Skills Variables</b>		
Openness:		
10-item scale	.79	.49
3-item subscale	.78	.64
"I" statements:		
6-item scale	----	.73
<b>Environmental Variable</b>		
Group Dynamics:		
28-item subscale derived from Hemphill's Index of Group Dimensions Scale	.99	.97



## Experimental Effects

### Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

To determine whether the AVP + Skills and AVP + Sexuality groups differed significantly on change scores (posttest minus pretest scores), analyses of variance were completed for the Personality (trust, empathy and locus of control), Communication Skills (openness and "I" statements), and Environmental (group dynamics) variables.

Table 17 shows, however, that, contrary to the researcher's hypotheses, ANOVA revealed no statistically significant differences between the groups in change scores for the trust, empathy, locus of control, openness, or group dynamics variables utilizing either the full scales or the smaller scales that were identified for trust, empathy, and openness.

TABLE 17. Analyses of Variance Change Scores by Treatment.

CHANGE SCORES	AVP + Sexuality			AVP + Skills			F
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	
<b>Trust:</b>							
25-item	10.4	19.8	10	11.3	25.4	9	.01
8-item	-20.0	9.4	11	-19.2	7.4	10	.05
<b>Empathy:</b>							
33-item	32.4	61.8	10	19.8	54.6	8	.21
9-item	7.1	15.4	11	3.1	13.5	9	.37
<b>Locus of Control:</b>							
Internal	3.5	5.3	10	6.4	7.7	8	.88
Powerful Others	5.3	7.6	4	.3	6.3	7	1.41
Chance	4.3	10.6	11	-1.8	1.9	4	1.21
<b>Openness:</b>							
10-item	1.8	2.9	5	.25	4.1	4	.44
3-item	.4	1.0	10	.30	1.8	10	.02

Despite the lack of statistically significant differences between change scores for openness, pretest mean scores (3.0 for the AVP + Skills group and 1.3 for the AVP + Sexuality group out of a total possible of ten points) did reflect that some members in

bot  
op  
ref  
for

Tal


use  
was  
pos  
Skil

TAL

PC
'P

I  
findi  
the is

both groups came to the project able to respond to conflict scenarios in a way that would open lines of communication. At posttesting both groups' likelihood had increased as reflected in their respective higher mean scores (5.0 for the AVP + Skills group and 3.3 for the AVP + Sexuality group). (Table 18)

Table 18. Open Communication by Treatment – Comparison of Means.

	Treatment			Nontreatment			F
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	
Pretests	3.0	3.3	8	1.3	1.8	6	1.22
Posttests	5.0	2.1	8	3.3	2.2	9	2.52

Table 19 indicates that, as hypothesized, the AVP + Skills group was more likely to use "I" statements at posttesting than was the AVP + Sexuality group. Although there was a statistically significant difference between groups' usage of "I" statements at posttesting, Table 19 reveals that the number of "I" statements utilized by the AVP + Skills group was still negligible ( $\bar{X}$  = 1.2 out of a possible ten points).

TABLE 19. Analysis of Variance Posttest Score by Treatment.

POSTTEST SCORE	AVP + Sexuality			AVP + Skills			F
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	
"I" Statements 6-items	.09	.30	11	.1	.30	.10	5.7*
* P < .05							

It would, however, be erroneous or misleading to conclude, based on the ANOVA findings alone, that nothing experimentally important occurred in this project regarding the issues of trust, empathy, locus of control, openness, and/or group dynamics. On the

contrary, descriptive techniques utilizing grouped frequency distributions and content analysis of the researcher's field notes provided important supplemental information that must be considered in conjunction with the analyses of variance if an accurate accounting of the experimental effects of this project is to be had.

### **Supplemental Information**

For purposes of clarity, the ensuing discussion will be organized according to variable category. Grouped frequency distribution tables are utilized throughout the discussion. These tables were developed from participant responses to the various variable categories and describe the participants vis-à-vis their pre and posttest functioning. The figures in the tables were derived using the following four-step process:

1. A ranking of High, Medium and Low was derived based on percentage points correct of total points possible for each of the test measures of trust, empathy, and locus of control.

<b>Percentage of Items Correct</b>	<b>*Rank</b>
80% to 100%	High
70% to 79%	Medium
0% to 69%	Low

\*The demarcations between ranks of High, Medium and Low were chosen rather arbitrarily by the researcher. The idea was simply to provide a point of reference from which to discuss change from pre to posttest.

2. Individual participant test scores were translated into Percentage Correct Scores [PCS] (e.g., percentage items correct of total correct items possible);
3. Individual PCS of each participant was ranked according to High, Medium and Low; and
4. Total numbers of participants represented in each rank were added and reflected in the respective tables.

## Personality Variables

### Trust

As reflected in Table 20, the majority of participants in both groups (N = 18) came to the project reporting very low levels of trust for others (80 percent of the AVP + Sexuality group and 100 percent of the AVP + Skills group, respectively). Similarly, the AVP + Sexuality group (N = 10) left the project reporting the same low levels of trust in others while there seemed to be a slight shift upward in the AVP + Skills group (N = 8) levels of trust (from 100 percent low at pretest to 75 percent low and 25 percent moderate at posttest). These findings are somewhat in agreement with the ANOVA results (Table 17) which reflect no statistically significant differences between the groups' change scores.

**TABLE 20. Rank Order of Pre and Posttest Trust Scores by Treatment.**

Categorization	AVP + Sexuality		AVP + Skills	
	Pre (N = 10)	Post (N = 10)	Pre (N = 8)	Post (N = 8)
<b>High</b> (I trust others)	---	---	---	---
<b>Medium</b> (I somewhat trust others)	20%	20%	---	25%
<b>Low</b> (I do not trust others)	80%	80%	100%	75%

If these findings are juxtaposed with the dramatic demonstration of trust exemplified by both groups toward the end of their respective AVP workshops, however, an important question arises: Why was the demonstrated trust not maintained and registered on the posttest measurement of trust? The most dramatic evidence of the development of high trust levels during the three-day workshops occurred for both groups during a workshop exercise called "Trust Lift," which took place during the last session of each workshop.

In th  
when op  
invited  
floor. E  
group, i  
to stand  
slowly,  
their sa  
increme  
and as

The  
fellow p  
Ind  
90 perc  
volunte  
in the li

Aft  
compos  
Sexuali

Fro

The  
there wa  
to compa

In this very solemn sharing, which was placed purposefully at the end of both workshops when optimum levels of trust between participants could be expected, each participant was invited (one at a time) to lie in a supine position on a clean sheet which was placed on the floor. Eight to ten fellow participants then knelt in strategic places around the body. The group, in unison and in silence, cradled their arms under the volunteer, lifting as they rose to stand together. Raising their fellow participant waist high, they rocked her, ever so slowly, and gently. With meticulous care and cradling the life that had been entrusted into their safe keeping, the group then moved in unison, making one full, clockwise turn, one incremental, firmly-planted step at a time. Upon completion of the turn, the group gently, and as one, lowered their precious cargo to the floor.

The person being lifted had to lie back and trust, not only in the joint ability of her fellow participants to safely bear her but also in her own decision to trust.

Indeed, the depth of trust that was achieved in both groups was evidenced by the fact that 90 percent of the AVP + Sexuality group and 93 percent of the AVP + Skills group volunteered to be lifted. All of the participants, 100 percent of them, volunteered to share in the lifting of other participants, trading off turns to allow each other opportunities to rest.

After the last volunteer was lowered to the floor and everyone had an opportunity to compose themselves, silence gave way to comments. From participants in the AVP + Sexuality group came:

“... I felt like a leaf floating down ...;”  
 “...it was like giving birth as we carried each other ...;” and  
 “... I can’t believe I did it!!! ....”

From the AVP + Skills group came:

“... I’ve never experienced anything like it ...;”  
 “... I just felt so at peace ...;”  
 “... I wanted more of it!...;” and  
 “... can we have seconds?!!”

The point can be made that the significance of this occurrence is questionable because there was no pretest of participant willingness to participate in a “Trust Lift” with which to compare post-workshop attitudes. However, it is the researcher’s contention that such a

test would have been counterproductive. Not only would such as test have been contrary to the AVP philosophy of building on previously-established trust and safety, it also would have been unsafe, because the "Trust Lift" is based on certain trust. Additionally, such a test might have robbed the exercise of its potency since, had it been attempted and failed, it would have been unlikely that anyone would have trusted it or the others in the group again. For these reasons, then, a pretest of the "Trust Lift" would have been inappropriate.

The utilization of the women's participation in the "Trust Lift" for the purpose of analysis is warranted because it was evidence of the culmination of a slow, incremental process that nurtured the development of trust throughout the respective workshops. That process was reflected in changes noted in various actions and interactions between participants.

In addition to participation in the "Trust Lift," the researcher also observed changes in body language. At first, the women sat stiffly erect in their chairs, arms folded protectively across their chests and chairs tilted or moved back away from the rest of the group. By the end of the three-day workshops, however, the women slouched comfortably and unselfconsciously in their seats. The shift seemed to occur gradually as the participants became more relaxed with each other.

Laughter and games seemed to be particularly facilitative of that shift. Nervous, self-conscious laughter and chatter evidenced at the outset of both workshops gave way to spontaneous, unselfconscious laughter in response to little games (e.g., Light and Livelies) that were interspersed throughout the workshops (one or two were scheduled during each three-hour session of the eight-session workshop) to enable participants to have fun, experience closer interaction with others, produce laughter and interject physical activity that reenergized.

Analysis of the 11 "Light and Livelies" included in the workshops revealed that games included on the first day invited no physical contact between participants, games on the second day invited close proximity and possible touching between participants, and games on the third day invited touching.

At the final evaluations of the respective workshops, a majority of participants in both



groups reported that "Jail Break," the last game of the workshop, was their favorite "Light and Lively." In this game, pairs of participants were required to link arms and remain linked throughout the entire game as they ran from place to place following the directions of the game. In both workshops, the room was filled with laughter and high energy during this game. The entry of at least their partner during this game into their usual personal space boundaries seemed to be nonthreatening to the participants.

Participant evaluations regarding the "Light and Livelies" included the following comments:

"...I learned its much easier to be pleasant and to have fun with others;"

"...It was lots of laughs and expression. It made me laugh;"

"...I loved the L & Ls. They're lots & lots of fun. I really could open up and be myself."

A second change observed in participant action and interaction was the frequency of informal conversation between participants. People became more relaxed, less guarded and the levels of trust seemed to deepen within the groups. At the outset of the workshops many of the participants did not know each other except, as one participant put it, as "the bitch with the mean eyes across the yard." Thus, they did not engage each other in conversation. By the end of the first day, however, a majority of participants in both workshops were calling each other by their Adjective Names (see p. 58). By the end of the second day, participants in both groups were reporting having sought out fellow group members of their workshop in their cell areas with whom they had not interacted before the workshop.

Similar to the strategic inclusion of games throughout the workshops, listening and sharing activities were introduced that gradually invited more and more verbal input from the participants. The exercises seemed to result in an increased frequency and depth of intimate sharing among participants. At the beginning of the workshops, participants were invited to share simple information about themselves on a one-on-one basis and then in small groups. By the afternoon of the second day, participants were willingly preparing and presenting complex "I" statements to the entire group. By the end of the second day,

participants were invited to work in groups of three or four to develop and present role plays of nonviolent conflict resolution to the entire group.

One hundred percent of the participants in both groups took part in the one-on-one sharing, the small group discussions, and "I" statement formulation; all but three in the AVP + Skills group and all but one in the AVP + Sexuality group participated in the role plays. The three individuals who did not participate in the actual role plays took the part of introducing the role plays and characters. All participants did not participate in all large group discussions, but everyone contributed something at one point or another. In addition to the games, listening, and sharing exercises, a consistent tone of affirmation in the workshop environment enhanced relaxation and deepen trust. In addition to ground rules that established the importance of affirming one another's good points and refraining from put downs, various AVP exercises facilitated the actual experience of affirmation.

The very first exercise in which participants took part, for example, invited them to think of an affirmative adjective which started with the same sound as their own first or last name. Each participant was addressed throughout the workshop by that combination or "Adjective Name," thus, being continuously affirmed. Participants were encouraged to choose only those adjectives that reflected something positive toward which they aspired or with which they already related and/or claimed as their own.

Contrary to the ANOVA findings of pretest low levels of trust in others, the early willingness of participants in both groups to trust was exemplified by their willingness to openly and spontaneously take part in this "Adjective Name" exercise. Not only did each participant have to reveal to the others some self-affirming adjective name she thought of for herself, but, when it became her turn in the circle, she was also invited to recite in a set fashion (which allowed participants to memorize the names) the adjective names of all the participants whose turns had preceded her own. Because of the light-hearted nature of the exercise, no one seemed to feel threatened; everyone participated and the room was soon filled with positive energy and laughter.

Although one or two of the women in both workshops needed the group to brainstorm possible adjectives from which they could choose and another one or two had difficulty

remembering all of the adjective names when it was their turn to receive them all, participants evidenced patience with each other, warmly whispering clues and suggestions as needed. Indeed, as participants in both groups became more comfortable with using their own adjective names, when someone began to speak and forgot to use her adjective name, others gently and with humor reminded that person to use her adjective name. On several occasions when someone forgot to use her adjective name, other participants, without prompting from the facilitators, would say, "Who are you?" The question itself was affirming as evidenced by the obvious willingness of the person to respond in a light-hearted manner with her adjective name.

The affirmative nature of the adjective names that were chosen by each of the respective participants is shown in Table 21. One is struck with the imaginative quality and variety of adjectives. For reasons of confidentiality, fictitious first names are used in this presentation of the data, the actual adjectives chosen by the participants are used.

The combination of laughter, enhanced relaxation, repeated safe opportunities for formal as well as informal communication, and consistent affirmation, then, seemed to provide the framework of the incremental process that fostered the development of trust, culminating in the participation by a majority of both groups in the "Trust Lift."

Table 21. Adjective Names Chosen by Participants by Treatment.

AVP + Skills (N = 11)	AVP + Sexuality (N = 11)
Mystical Mona Fancy Fawn Terrific Toni Genuine Geri Vivacious Vi Devastating Dana Classy Conna Sophisticated Sue Darling Diane Sizzling Sally Loveable Luc	Beautiful Barbara Juicy Joyce Zesty Zelda Cheerful Chonda Love Lois Dancing Donna Dazzling Doris Devastating Dale Caring Corine Clever Cleona Shy Shandra



Indeed, evidence of the contribution of this four-fold combination to the development of trust is reflected in the responses to the query: "I feel trust in another person when...."

Responses from the AVP + Sexuality group included:

"... when they listen to me;"  
 "... when I can be myself;"  
 "... when they are willing to forgive me;" and  
 "... when they give me what I need."

Responses from the AVP + Skills group included:

"...when they look at me in the eyes when they talk to me;"  
 "... when they can laugh with me and not at me;"  
 "... when I am not judged;" and  
 "... when they help me out."

Not surprisingly, increased trust among group members seemed to result in "testing" by some participants of both group and facility limits. Throughout the workshop, the facilitator made conscious efforts to "reshuffle" the group so the participants would have opportunities to work with different people. It became obvious by the end of the first day, however, that two of the participants in the AVP + Skills group would simply rearrange themselves in order to sit together. By the middle of the first day, the two participants were continuously whispering to each other during exercises, even after other participants had gently shushed them. Additionally, one of the two participants usually sat with her arm resting on the back of the other participant's chair, giving a sense of intimacy between them.

In contrast, when the two arrived on the second day, they weren't speaking to each other. One sat quietly all morning and made few contributions to the group; the other was her usual outgoing self. They did not speak to each other and seemed to go out of their way to not come into contact.

One the morning of the third day, however, the two arrived at the workshop together and again sat and whispered on and off for the duration of the workshop. This type of interaction continued between the two into the follow-up sessions.

It was interesting that none of the group members confronted the two on their somewhat disruptive actions during the workshop. However, one of the other participants, who worked

as a secretary for one of the program staff members commented to the staff person during the week following her workshop that: "AVP let a lot of lesbian activity go on." The fact that this discussion did not take place in the workshop may have indicated a need for the facilitators to be more sensitive to group cues and to draw out more comments and discussion. This is further supported by the fact that both groups reported moderate levels of difficulty between group members in their respective posttests of group dynamics. (Data to support this statement are found in Tables 34 and 35.)

As group members became more relaxed with each other, facilitators experienced more difficulty in quieting the group after breaks, at the beginning of new exercises, and after particularly lively discussions. At one point, for example, the AVP + Sexuality group had a very lively discussion about whether guns contributed more to violence or to nonviolence. More women began to interrupt while others were speaking, and soon several people were speaking at once. In an apparent effort to maintain some sort of order, one of the participants raised her voice and yelled, "Yo! Ladies!!!" Although she got everyone's attention and people became quiet, the situation soon returned to its chaotic state. Someone else yelled, "Yo! Ladies!!!" to regain order. Soon the pattern became one of loud discussion accompanied by an occasional, loud "Yo! Ladies!"

The issue was resolved on the third morning. When the group first came together, one of the participants shared that when she had belonged to the Girl Scouts gaining quiet had been simply a matter of one person raising her hand when she noticed things were getting too loud. When someone else noticed the raised hand, they would become quiet and raise their hand as well, and so on until everyone's hands were raised and the group was quiet. The group tried that for the duration of the workshop and it worked. (The facilitators introduced the concept to the AVP + Skills workshop and everyone agreed to try it. It worked!)

The development of trust between the participants enabled participants to, as one group member stated, "trust some ladies I didn't even know." At the same time, however, the enhanced relaxation seem to free some participants sufficiently to test group ground rules about interrupting others.

This apparent increased relaxation, deepening trust, and testing of limits among participants is in keeping with the increased posttest levels of a sense of personal power reported by both groups (Table 27, 28, 29, and 30).

### Empathy

Empathy is a natural outcropping from the development of trust. Indeed, a majority of participants of both groups reported moderate-to-high levels of empathy for other in both the pre and posttest situations (Table 22). This level of empathy was supported by the field notes.

**TABLE 22. Rank Order of Pre and Posttest Empathy Scores by Treatment.**

Categorization	AVP + Sexuality		AVP + Skills	
	Pre (N = 9)	Post (N = 9)	Pre (N = 8)	Post (N = 8)
<b>High</b> (I empathize with others)	33%	44%	50%	25%
<b>Medium</b> (I somewhat empathize with others)	56%	56%	50%	63%
<b>Low</b> (I do not empathize with others)	11%	---	---	12%

The most telling display of empathy occurred in the AVP + Skills group during the afternoon session of the second day of their workshop. The episode is important because it occurred in spite of, or perhaps because of, a very stormy conflict that occurred at the outset of that group's workshop and that revolved around the same participant in both cases. It is the researcher's sense that it was the opportunities that conflict inadvertently provided the participants for conflict resolution that seemed to heighten the genuine sensitivity of group members to each others' needs. Indeed, in the course of developing

a consensus, empathic understanding may have emerged, dissolving any alienation that may have been developing between group members (Rogers, 1975).

### Empathic Episode

In the midst of the second afternoon session of the AVP + Skills group's workshop, one of the participants jumped up unexpectedly, exclaimed loudly, "Oh no! What am I going to do!!! What am I going to do!!!," and, holding her face in her hands, ran out of the room. Two of the facilitators followed her and were gone for quite some time. During their absence, several participants voiced concern, wondering what had happened. When the facilitators finally returned without the participant and explained that she was having a meeting with one of the security officers, the participants' concern seemed only to escalate.

When the participant finally returned almost two hours later, she simply walked quietly into the room and started toward her seat. Without prompting, everyone stopped what they were doing and applauded. The women rose as a group and surrounded the participant, some hugging her, others making comments such as: "We missed you!!," "It's good to have you back!!," "I want a hug," and "It's my turn now."

When all the women converged on her, the returning participant began to sob. After all the hugging and words of concern had finally subsided and everyone was seated again, the returning participant continued to cry. One of the women in the group soothed very softly and lovingly, "Let it out, Baby." Another added quietly, "Let her cry." Holding her head in her hands and continuing to cry, the returning woman said, "Seven years I been carrying it. I ain't told no one for seven years." With that, she became quiet.

No one in the group pushed for further explanation. The comments of support and affection continued: "It'll be all right." "Um-hum, Baby; it's O.K." As more and more women in the group needed the one roll of toilet paper that was being passed back and forth for tissue, everyone began to laugh and cry at the same time, hearts opening wider and wider.

It was not until the following morning at the break that the participant who had hurriedly left the room approached the researcher to talk. She explained that on the previous day she had been sitting on the side of the room where she could see out of the



windows. She just happened to be watching when a new guard walked across the yard. He was, she choked as she began to cry again, one of five men who had gang raped her seven years earlier. In her meeting with the security officer, she had been promised that the new guard would not be assigned to the area of the facility where she was housed. Little comfort. As if desperate for something on which to cling, she said:

I'm so glad for the Fridays we'll be together [referring to the up-coming follow-up sessions of the research project]. I need them so much. These Fridays will be so important to me. I need some help right now to deal with all this.

(In spite of the urgency reflected here, the participant never came to any of the follow-up sessions. A discussion of factors which might have contributed to that are addressed in the second section of this chapter, Explanations of Pre-experimental Effects.)

This episode evidences the keen sense of community that had developed in the AVP + Skills group by the end of the second day. During the evening session, for example, participants were invited to share something they had learned about themselves thus far in the workshop. Responses typical of the feelings of the group included:

“...I've learned it's O.K. to trust...;”  
 “...why can't we be like this when we're together on the ground?;”  
 “...where is this part of us [that we now share] out in the population?;”  
 and  
 “...why do we have to have our guards up [in the prison population] and be so full of shit?”

Beyond a willingness to understand each other, a real desire to be understood seemed to have emerged among the group members. As if in response to the above rhetorical questions, one woman stated:

You must understand that those of us in long term [confinement] can't let our guards down; we're dealing with a lot of shit.”

Agreeing, another woman added:

I'll be here a long time; I'm in for murder. I have a lot to deal with. I'm living one second to another, just keeping anyone from getting in my space.

**I have to keep everything together—just this little space around me. You [other people] see me and don't understand how much I'm dealing with. You don't understand.**

**Leaning forward in her chair and drawing the outline of a small square on the floor in front of her with her hands, she concluded: "I be mean or whatever and its about me just keeping my own little square of space together."**

**During this exchange, the entire circle of participants was attentive and supportive, their listening postures reflecting genuine respect, concern and care. One woman who had a relatively shorter sentence than the woman who had been speaking responded gently, "Thank you. I didn't understand before. Now I do. You are dealing with so much."**

**The moderate-to-high pre and posttest levels of empathy reported by both groups were exemplified by the above-described caring and concern demonstrated by the AVP + Skills group members when their fellow participant had a crisis in the midst of their workshop.**

**A similar episode occurred in the AVP + Sexuality group on the second day of their workshop. Following the guided meditation, participants were sharing their insights and feelings in small group discussions. One of the women who had earlier shared that she "don't trust nobody" asked to be excused and left the room. One of the women in her small group followed her, saying, "I'll check on her."**

**The researcher followed the two women and joined them in an adjacent room, which had been used on and off during the workshop for eating, breaks and some exercises.**

**The woman who left began to cry, saying that she was only 12 years old when she married a man 60 years old. He had recently died at the age of 73. She still missed him and blamed a lot of her problems on the fact that she was left with his children, who were her age.**

**The woman who had accompanied the first woman stated that, although she had "gotten messed up with drugs," which caused her to be in prison, she had been a counselor. At that, she began to gently counsel the other woman, saying that she "could not live in the past any longer." After about 15 minutes of back and forth discussion, the "counselor" praised the other woman for her honesty in admitting this.**

**By then, two other women who had been in the small group discussion with these two women had left the larger group and joined this discussion. One of the two began to cry.**

She said that everyone called her a baby killer. (She told one of the facilitators later that her baby had died in his crib.) At that the counselor/participant began to talk with her and held her as she sobbed. All of the women in the small group were crying and patting the young woman gently. When the discussion finally came to a close, the women left the room one at a time and went to lunch.

Even though these incidents demonstrate a sense of strength and unity among the women, elements of the penal environment in which they found themselves seemed to sap that strength, rather than harness it. As epitomized by the unexpected appearance and authority of the alleged rapist-guard in the midst of their confined space, the unpredictability of the penal environment seemed to make it quite difficult for participants to "keep their own little square of space together," as one of the participants suggested. Contrary to the logical assumption that the paramilitaristic structure of a penal environment would render it highly predictable, such did not always seem the case in this facility.

#### Locus of Control

As discussed in Chapter Three, three separate scales were used to measure three dimensions of locus of control: Internal scale, Powerful Others scale, and Chance scale.

Tables 23 and 24 indicate that in the pretests a majority of the participants in both the AVP + Sexuality and AVP + Skills groups reported little expectation to control their

TABLE 23. Rank Order of AVP + Sexuality Pretest Locus of Control Scores by Scale Dimension.

Expectation	Internal (I expect to have control over my own life) (N = 10)	Powerful Other (I expect powerful others to have control over my life) (N = 5)	Chance (I expect chance to control my life) (N = 10)
High	30%	60%	70%
Medium	10%	40%	30%
Low	60%	---	---
Total	100%	100%	100%

**TABLE 24. Rank Order of AVP + Skills Pretest Locus of Control Scores by Scale Dimension.**

<b>Expectation</b>	<b>Internal</b> (I expect to have control over my own life)	<b>Powerful Other</b> (I expect powerful others to control my life)	<b>Chance</b> (I expect chance to control my life)
	(N = 7)	(N = 7)	(N = 7)
<b>High</b>	---	43%	100%
<b>Medium</b>	---	43%	---
<b>Low</b>	100%	14%	---
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%

own lives (internality) and moderate-to-high expectation to have their lives controlled either by powerful others and/or by chance.

When pre and posttest scores of internality are compared for both groups (Tables 23 and 24 compared to Tables 25 and 26), it is clear that both groups' posttest internality expectations increased (with high expectations increasing from 30 percent at pretest to 60 percent at posttest in the AVP + Sexuality and from zero percent at pretest to 57 percent at posttest in the AVP + Skills group).

**TABLE 25. Rank Order of AVP + Sexuality Posttest Locus of Control Scores by Scale Dimension.**

<b>Expectation</b>	<b>Internal</b> (I expect to have control over my own life)	<b>Powerful Other</b> (I expect powerful others to control my life)	<b>Chance</b> (I expect chance to control my life)
	(N = 10)	(N = 5)	(N = 10)
<b>High</b>	60%	100%	70%
<b>Medium</b>	20%	---	20%
<b>Low</b>	20%	---	10%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%

**TABLE 26. Rank Order of AVP + Skills Posttest Locus of Control Scores by Scale Dimension.**

<b>Expectation</b>	<b>Internal (I expect to have control over my life) (N = 7)</b>	<b>Powerful Other (I expect powerful others to control my life) (N = 7)</b>	<b>Chance (I expect chance to control my life) (N = 7)</b>
<b>High</b>	57%	57%	100%
<b>Medium</b>	43%	---	---
<b>Low</b>	---	43%	---
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%

Although both groups reported increased internality expectations in the posttest situations, a majority of both groups simultaneously maintained moderate-to-high expectations from pre to posttest that either powerful others and/or chance would control their lives. These seemingly contradictory findings reveal that while a good portion of both groups' sense of self and personal power increased from the pretest to posttest situations, participants still remained in touch with the reality of the prison setting in which they were incarcerated. Whereas "powerful others" might logically have been construed as the correctional and/or administrative staff who wielded near total control over their immediate lives, for instance, "chance" might logically have been construed as the inconsistent, unpredictable and often contradictory nature of rule interpretation and enforcement evidenced by the security staff at this facility. Content analysis of the researcher's field notes supports both of these contentions (See Explanations of Experimental Effects).

Tables 27, 28, 29 and 30 indicate that in spite of the low levels of trust reflected on both pre and posttest measures of trust in both groups, a dramatic demonstration of trust was reflected by nearly all of the participants (90 percent of the AVP + Sexuality group and 93 percent of the AVP + Skills group) in their respective workshops.

TABLE 27. Summary of AVP + Sexuality Pretest Scores by Rank Order.

Rank	Trust (N = 8)	Empathy (N = 9)	Locus of Control		
			Internal (N = 10)	Powerful Other (N = 5)	Chance (N = 10)
High	---	33%	30%	60%	70%
Medium	20%	56%	10%	40%	30%
Low	80%	11%	60%	---	---
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 28. Summary of AVP + Skills Pretest Scores by Rank Order.

Rank	Trust (N = 8)	Empathy (N = 8)	Locus of Control		
			Internal (N = 7)	Powerful Other (N = 7)	Chance (N = 4)
High	---	50%	---	43%	100%
Medium	---	50%	---	43%	---
Low	100%	---	100%	14%	---
Total	100 %	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 29. Summary of AVP + Sexuality Posttest Scores by Rank Order.

Rank	Trust (N = 8)	Empathy (N = 9)	Locus of Control		
			Internal (N = 10)	Powerful Other (N = 7)	Chance (N = 10)
High	---	44%	60%	100%	70%
Medium	20%	56%	20%	---	20%
Low	80%	---	20%	---	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLL

Ra

High

Medi

Low

Total

The

exempl

ndivid

that th

of the c

At

expecta

modera

It may

particip

they co

environ

Commun

Commun

Commun

Commun

Commun

Commun

Commun

Commun

Commun

Commun

Commun

**TABLE 30. Summary of AVP + Skills Posttest Scores by Rank Order.**

Rank	Trust (N = 8)	Empathy (N = 8)	Locus of Control		
			Internal (N = 7)	Powerful Other (N = 7)	Chance (N = 4)
High	---	25%	---	57%	100%
Medium	25%	63%	43%	---	---
Low	75%	12%	57%	43%	---
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The moderate-to-high pre and posttest levels of empathy reported by both groups were exemplified in the AVP + Skills group by the strong show of concern and caring for the individual who had spotted her alleged rapist among the facility guards. It was surmised that this heightened sense of empathy might have been partly due to the win/win nature of the conflict resolution that the group had achieved early-on in their workshop.

At post-testing the majority of participants from both groups reported an increased expectation to have control over their own lives; however, they simultaneously maintained moderate-to-high expectations that powerful others and chance would control their lives. It may be surmised that these seemingly contradictory findings reflect that while participants' sense of personal power seemed to increase during the course of the project, they continued to be in touch with the coercive and unpredictable nature of the penal environment in which they were incarcerated.

### **Communication Skills**

#### **"I" Statements**

One of the emphases throughout the duration of the workshop was on the practice of open, clear, honest communication. Conflict resolution skills were introduced and practiced, particularly the formulation of "I" statements in response to various conflict scenarios.

In keeping with the AVP principle of affirmation, the "I" statement exercises were



**not introduced into the workshops until a good base of trust had been established among participants. The fact that everyone participated and formulated several "I" statements is an indication that this was the appropriate timing for the exercise.**

Each person was given a slip of paper on which was written a two or three sentence conflict scenario. Each scenario was different. Each person was then asked to formulate and write an appropriate "I" statement to fit her scenario. They then read the scenarios and the "I" statement they had formulated to the rest of the group, who critiqued and commented on the statement. When participants had difficulty, others in the group volunteered suggestions until everyone in the group agreed that the "I" statement developed was appropriate and would probably open lines of communication.

**Using this procedure, all members of both groups experienced success in formulating various accurate and appropriate "I" statements.**

**The specific format of the “I” statement is as follows:**

I feel \_\_\_\_\_  
(specific emotion)

when you \_\_\_\_\_  
(specific behavior)

because \_\_\_\_\_  
(tangible effect of the behavior)

The format invites users to get in touch with their feelings; distinguish between emotions, cognitions, and actions; distinguish specifically how a certain behavior or action was tangibly affecting them; and to own the fact that the problem was theirs and not necessarily that of the person with whom they were in conflict.

Despits the opportunity to practice “I” statements, the researcher observed the spontaneous and unrehearsed usage of an “I” statement only once during the project, and that statement was made by one of the inside facilitators in the AVP + Sexuality group’s workshop.

**The statistically significant difference between the AVP + Skills and the AVP + Sexuality groups' posttest use of "I" statements in response to conflict scenarios was**

heartening and suggests that further opportunities for practice were beneficial. As will be discussed further in Chapter Five.

## **Conceptual Variable**

### **Nonviolence as a Concept**

To ascertain pre and posttest conceptualizations of nonviolence, participants were asked to describe in their own words what nonviolence meant to them. They could simply list words, write a paragraph, or write a story. As reflected in Table 31, content analysis of the responses revealed the following five major categories of conceptualizations: 1) relationship-related (prosocial behavior, communication, and management of situation); 2) negative definitions; 3) control (of self and/or emotions); 4) self improvement; and 5) belief in God.

The category entitled "Negative Definitions" is taken from Schaef's work (1987) and refers to instances in which nonviolence was described in terms of not doing something (e.g., not hitting, not getting in trouble, not killing) as opposed to doing something (e.g., kindness, listening, caring).

## **Pretest Similarities**

### **Relationship-Related Concepts**

As Table 31 suggests, the most striking finding in both groups was that participants seemed to come to the pretest situation with at least a minimal understanding that relationship related concepts and behaviors are important aspects of nonviolence. Specifically, 48 percent and 53 percent of the total responses of the AVP + Sexuality and AVP + Skills groups, respectively, referred to either prosocial behaviors (e.g., caring, kindness, compassion, respect), communication (e.g., "talk to peoples [sic] about your problem;" "listening;" "should be able to talk about what's bothering you with the person the problem is with", and/or situational management concerns (e.g., "ability to walk away



**TABLE 31. Pre and Posttest Conceptualization of Nonviolence by Treatment.**

<b>Conceptualization</b>	<b>AVP + Sexuality</b>		<b>AVP + Skills</b>	
	<b>Pre (N = 10)</b>	<b>Post (N = 10)</b>	<b>Pre (N = 10)</b>	<b>Post (N = 10)</b>
	<b># of responses</b>	<b># of responses</b>	<b># of responses</b>	<b># of responses</b>
<b>Relationship-Related:</b>				
<b>Prosocial Behavior (e.g., kindness, caring, etc.)</b>	3 (18%)	12 (50%)	14 (34%)	23 (50%)
<b>Communication</b>	3 (18%)	4 (17%)	3 ( 7%)	6 (15%)
<b>Manage of Situation</b>	<u>2 (12%)</u>	<u>2 ( 8%)</u>	<u>5 (12%)</u>	<u>4 ( 7%)</u>
<b>Subtotals</b>	8 (48%)	18 (75%)	22 (53%)	33 (72%)
<b>Negative Definitions</b>	5 (29%)	4 (17%)	9 (22%)	10 (22%)
<b>Control</b>	3 (18%)	---	4 (10%)	1 ( 2%)
<b>Self Improvement</b>	---	1 ( 4%)	4 (10%)	1 ( 2%)
<b>Belief in God</b>	<u>1 ( 5%)</u>	<u>1 ( 4%)</u>	<u>2 ( 5%)</u>	<u>1 ( 2%)</u>
<b>Total</b>	17 (100%)	24 (100%)	41 (100%)	46 (100%)

from something that might become violent;" "trying to get someone to help them out with their situation;" "making the best out of a bad situation") in their thinking about non-violence.

### **Negative Definitions**

A second important similarity between the AVP + Sexuality and AVP + Skills groups was in their use of negative definitions to describe nonviolence. Table 31 demonstrates that 29 percent of the AVP + Sexuality group's pretest responses reflected negative definitions of nonviolence, and 22 percent of the AVP + Skills group's pretest responses did so. The slight reduction in the AVP + Sexuality group's use of negative definitions at posttest (from 29 percent at pretest to 22 percent at posttest) seems to suggest that participants replaced those more vague concepts with specifics. Indeed, examination of

the data reveals that of the cases in which participants in the AVP + Sexuality group utilized negative definitions to define nonviolence in the pretest situation, they replaced them on some occasions with other concepts (e.g., states of being, communication-related and/or situational-management) in the posttest.

### **Control**

A third important similarity between the groups' pretest conceptualizations of non-violence was their inclusion of the need for control of one's self and/or emotions, particularly anger. Whereas 18 percent of the AVP + Sexuality group's responses reflected this concern, ten percent of the AVP + Skills group's responses did so.

## **Pretest Dissimilarities**

### **Total Number of Responses**

The most striking dissimilarity between the groups' posttest results was the difference in the total number of responses proffered by each group. As reflected in Table 31, the AVP + Sexuality group contributed only 17 total responses, whereas the AVP + Skills group contributed 41. This difference continued to be reflected in posttest responses, with the AVP + Sexuality group contributing 24 total responses and the AVP + Skills group contributing 46. One major contributor to this was that several women in the AVP + Skills group listed single- word responses whereas the AVP + Sexuality group participants seemed more inclined to use phrases.

### **Self Improvement**

The two groups were also dissimilar with regard to their concepts of self improvement. None of the AVP + Sexuality group mentioned self improvement as part of nonviolence at pretest, while 10 percent (N=4) of the AVP + Skills group participants did so.

## **Posttest Results**

### **Relationship-Related Concepts**

An important similarity between the groups' posttest conceptualizations of non-violence was an increase in prosocial behavioral concepts. Table 31 indicates that the AVP + Skills group increased their use of prosocial conceptualizations by 16 percent from pretest to posttest (from 34 percent to 50 percent), while the AVP + Sexuality group increased their usage by 32 percent (from 18 percent to 50 percent).

Interestingly, while the AVP + Sexuality group's responses reflected a consistent number of communication-related concepts (18 percent and 17 percent in the pre and posttests, respectively), the AVP + Skills group doubled their communication-related conceptualizations (from seven percent in the pretest to 15 percent in the posttest). This is in keeping with the ANOVA results (Table 18), which reflected that the AVP + Skills group participants were more likely to use "I" statements in the posttest situation than were the AVP + Sexuality group.

Surprisingly, both groups reflected a slight decrease in responses that related to situational management techniques—the AVP + Sexuality group went from 12 percent in the pretest to 8 percent in the posttest; the AVP + Skills group went from 12 percent in the pretest to seven percent in the posttest. Since one of the emphases in the AVP workshops was on transforming potentially or already violent situations into nonviolent situations by various means (e.g., finding common ground with an adversary, listening before making judgments, being ready to revise a position if it is wrong, risk being creative rather than violent, using surprise and humor), increased usage of situational management techniques would have been more reflective of these various types of "transforming" techniques.

It is interesting to note, however, that one woman reflected an understanding of one of the basic AVP tenets of nonviolence (seeking always to find win/win solutions to conflict) in her pretest conceptualization of nonviolence by stating that "everyone has to try to figure out what will work for everyone." Again, this is in keeping with the finding

(Table 31) that a majority of participants in both groups came to the project with an understanding of the importance of relationships in nonviolent conflict resolution.

### **Negative Definitions**

The AVP + Skills group maintained a 22 percent response rate in both the pre and posttest situations with regard to negative definitions, while the AVP + Sexuality group reflected a decrease (from 29 percent in the pretest to 17 percent in the posttest).

### **Control**

Although the reference to control-related concepts decreased for both groups, the decrease was greater for the AVP + Sexuality group. The issue of control was reduced by eight percent in the AVP + Skills group (from ten percent in the pretest to two percent in the posttest) and was reduced by 18 percent in the AVP + Sexuality group (from 18 percent in the pretest to zero percent in the posttest).

### **Self Improvement**

The AVP + Sexuality group increased usage of self-improvement concepts from pre to posttest (from zero percent to ten percent) while the AVP + Skills group stayed relatively stable (from four percent to two percent).

### **Belief in God**

A very small percentage of participants in both groups' pre and posttest measures reported belief in God as being an important part of nonviolence.

## **Summary of Nonviolence Conceptualization Findings**

Approximately 50 percent of both groups' total pretest conceptualizations of non-violence reflected relationship-related concepts and behaviors. That percentage increased

to approximately 75 percent of total posttest responses for both groups. Of the three relationship-related conceptual categories identified, (prosocial behavior, communication, and management of the situation), the most marked increase at posttest was reflected in the prosocial category (a 50 percent increase in the AVP + Sexuality group and a 16 percent increase in the AVP + Skills group).

The AVP + Skills group doubled their communication related responses ( from seven percent to 15 percent) while the AVP + Sexuality group maintained similar numbers (18 percent and 17 percent) from pre to posttest. Both groups reflected slightly fewer situational management techniques from pre to posttest (from 12 percent to 8 percent for the AVP + Sexuality group and from 12 percent to seven percent for the AVP + Skills group).

The AVP + Skills group maintained similar levels of negative definitions in both pre and posttesting situations (approximately 20 percent of total responses), while the AVP + Sexuality group reflected a decrease from pre to posttest (from 29 percent to 17 percent). Both groups showed a decrease in control-related concepts responses (AVP + Skills group decreased from ten percent in pretest to two percent at posttest, and the AVP + Sexuality group decreased from 18 percent in pretest to zero percent at posttest).

### **Group Dynamics**

As alluded to earlier, the group dynamics pretest was completed by participants after they completed their respective AVP workshops. Posttests were completed at the end of the research project along with all other posttests.

As reflected in Tables 32 and 33, on the pretest, the majority of both groups reported:

1. moderate-to-high levels of group potency (members' sense of being honored as being seen as a part of the group and/or b) concern for the success of the program);
2. low sense of being controlled (fear to say what they really thought and/or fear that only certain kinds of ideas could be said freely in the group);
3. a moderate-to-high sense that the tone of the group was pleasant;



4.

5.

6.

TABLE 3  
of Scores.

Rank
High
Medium
Low

TABLE 4  
Order of

Rank
High
Medium
Low

Post  
to postt  
moderat  
respecti  
percent  
tively), a

4. a moderate-to-high sense of intimacy among the group members (people had a chance to get to know each other very well and to develop likes/dislikes for each other);
5. a moderate sense of stratification (everyone was considered equal) and,
6. a moderate-to-high sense of difficulties among group members.

**TABLE 32. Group Dynamic Scores of AVP + Sexuality Following AVP Workshop by Rank Order of Scores.**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Potency (N = 9)</b>	<b>Control (N = 9)</b>	<b>Pleasantness (N = 9)</b>	<b>Difficulties (N = 9)</b>	<b>Intimacy (N = 9)</b>	<b>Stratification (N = 9)</b>
<b>High</b>	67%	--	44%	44%	44%	11%
<b>Medium</b>	33%	11%	44%	22%	33%	78%
<b>Low</b>	---	89%	11%	33%	22%	11%

**TABLE 33. Group Dynamic Scores of AVP + Skills Group Following AVP Workshop by Rank Order of Scores.**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Potency (N = 9)</b>	<b>Control (N = 7)</b>	<b>Pleasantness (N = 10)</b>	<b>Difficulties (N = 7)</b>	<b>Intimacy (N = 10)</b>	<b>Stratification (N = 9)</b>
<b>High</b>	77%	---	30%	14%	50%	33%
<b>Medium</b>	22%	29%	40%	57%	40%	44%
<b>Low</b>	---	71%	30%	29%	10%	22%

Posttest results revealed some important differences between the groups. From pre to posttest, for example, a majority of the AVP + Sexuality group seemed to maintain a moderate-to-low sense of difficulties among group members (66 percent and 67 percent, respectively), while a slight increase was reflected in their high sense of potency (from 67 percent to 78 percent, respectively), pleasantness (from 44 percent to 56 percent, respectively), and control (from zero percent to 11 percent, respectively). Their pre to posttest

moderate-to-high sense of intimacy increased (from 77 percent to 99 percent, respectively), while their moderate sense of stratification or equality among members decreased (from 78 percent to 44 percent, respectively). While the greatest majority (89 percent) reported a low sense of control in the pretest, a slight shift was reflected at posttesting, revealing that, while no one had reported the perception of a high sense of control at the pretest, 11 percent did so at the posttest.

**TABLE 34. Group Dynamic Posttest Scores of AVP + Sexuality Group by Rank Order of Scores.**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Potency (N = 9)</b>	<b>Control (N = 9)</b>	<b>Pleasantness (N = 9)</b>	<b>Difficulties (N = 9)</b>	<b>Intimacy (N = 9)</b>	<b>Stratification (N = 9)</b>
<b>High</b>	78%	11%	56%	11%	44%	11%
<b>Medium</b>	11%	11%	33%	56%	55%	44%
<b>Low</b>	11%	78%	11%	33%	---	44%

Interestingly, and very important to an understanding of the experimental effects of this project, the AVP + Skills group's posttest perceptions of their group's dynamics were not nearly as positive as were those of the AVP + Sexuality group. Indeed, from pre to posttest, the AVP + Skills group seemed to lose ground vis-à-vis not only a high sense of potency (from 67 percent to 33 percent) and a moderate-to-high sense of pleasantness (from 70 percent to 40 percent) but also a moderate-to-high sense of intimacy (from 90 percent to 70 percent) (Table 35). Furthermore, a slight increase was reflected in their moderate-to-high sense of stratification (from 77 percent to 88 percent, respectively) while a more marked increase was reflected in their moderate-to-high sense of difficulties among group members (from 71 percent to 100 percent). Similar to the AVP + Sexuality group, while the majority (57 percent) continued to perceive low control over their own lives, a small portion (14 percent) reported a high sense of control at posttesting.

The AVP + Skills group, then, did not seem to fare as well as the AVP + Sexuality group over the long haul, vis-à-vis their perceptions of their own group's group dynamics.

**TABLE 35. Group Dynamic Posttest Scores of AVP + Skills Group by Rank Order of Scores.**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Potency (N = 9)</b>	<b>Control (N = 7)</b>	<b>Pleasantness (N = 10)</b>	<b>Difficulties (N = 7)</b>	<b>Intimacy (N = 10)</b>	<b>Stratification (N = 9)</b>
<b>High</b>	33%	14%	30%	86%	30%	22%
<b>Medium</b>	44%	29%	10%	14%	40%	66%
<b>Low</b>	22%	57%	60%	---	30%	11%

At posttest the AVP + Skills group seemed to have lost the high sense of potency and moderate-to-high sense of both pleasantness and intimacy achieved during their initial workshop together, and they reported increases in group stratification, difficulties among group members, and a sense of being controlled.

On the other hand, the AVP + Sexuality group seemed to maintain a fairly positive perception of their group's dynamics from pre to posttest, and a moderate-to-high sense of difficulties between group members. They also reflected a slight increase in a high sense of both potency and pleasantness. A larger increase was reflected in their moderate-to-high sense of intimacy, while their moderate sense of stratification or inequality among group members decreased. A majority (78%) continued to perceive low control; only 11% came to perceive high control.

### **Summary of Group Dynamics Findings**

The data seem to reflect that, while both groups became cohesive throughout the course of their respective AVP workshops (reporting moderate-to-high senses of group potency, pleasantness and intimacy, low levels of feeling controlled, and a moderate sense of stratification), they simultaneously reported moderate- to-high levels of difficulties among group members. Only the AVP + Sexuality group, however, seemed to maintain their reported sense of cohesiveness throughout the project, while the level of reported difficulties increased in both groups from pre to posttest. Factors that might have contributed to these findings will be addressed in the second section of this chapter.

## Behavioral Variables

### Follow-up Session Attendance

The weekly attendance in both groups reflected the same differences between the groups as revealed in the previous discussion of group dynamics.

Table 36 shows that weekly attendance in the six weekly follow-up sessions was consistently better in the AVP + Sexuality group than in the AVP + Skills group. Although 73 percent of the AVP + Skills group (N=11) attended the first follow-up evening session, attendance steadily dwindled in that group until the fourth week and then leveled out to a moderate 55 percent on the last meeting.

**TABLE 36. Weekly Attendance of Follow-Up Sessions by Treatment.**

<b>Week</b>	<b>AVP + Sexuality (N = 11)</b>	<b>AVP + Skills (N = 11)</b>
1	6 (55%)	8 (73%)
2	7 (64%)	7 (64%)
3	10 (91%)	6 (56%)
4	8 (73%)	4 (36%)
5	6 (55%)	5 (45%)
6	6 (55%)	6 (55%)

Interestingly, attendance by the AVP + Sexuality group (N = 11) was lower on the first evening (55 percent) but steadily climbed to a peak of 91 percent during the third week. Attendance for this group also leveled out to 55 percent on the last evening.

Table 37 indicates the number of weekly sessions each participant attended in the respective groups. Sixty-four percent of the AVP + Sexuality group attended from three to five sessions, while 46 percent of the AVP + Skills group attended from three to five sessions. Factors that seemed to contribute to the disparate attendance will be addressed in the explanation section of this chapter.

**TABLE 37. Rank Order of Total Weekly Sessions Attended by Treatment.**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>AVP + Sexuality (N = 11)</b>	<b>AVP + Skills (N = 11)</b>
<b>High (6 sessions)</b>	<b>1 ( 9%)</b>	<b>2 (18%)</b>
<b>Medium (3-5 sessions)</b>	<b>7 (64%)</b>	<b>5 (46%)</b>
<b>Low (0-2 sessions)</b>	<b>3 (27%)</b>	<b>4 (36%)</b>

### **Rules Infractions**

Records were requested from the facility at which the project was completed for rules infractions that occurred three months prior to the project (May, 1989), in the month immediately following the project (August, 1989), and nine months after the project had ended (May, 1990).

At the time these data were requested (June, 1990), 11 of the 22 women in the project had been either transferred or released. Unfortunately, the facility did not keep records on transferred or released individuals. Thus, data for only six (55 percent) of the AVP + Sexuality group and five (45 percent) of the AVP + Skills group were available. Because of the extremely small number of participant rule infractions reported here, then, results must be examined with caution.

Tables 38 and 39 show that in August, 1989 (the month following the completion of the research project), the total number of rules infractions for the AVP + Sexuality group (N=6) was reduced by half. There appeared to be no change in the number of rules infractions by the AVP + Skills group (N=5). While this pattern is born out for individuals in the AVP + Sexuality group, it is not born out for the AVP + Skills group. Indeed, one individual in the AVP + Skills group, Participant No. 2, did incur a rule infraction in May but not in August. At the same time, however, one individual who did not incur a rule infraction in May (Participant No. 1), did incur an infraction in August.

Because of the extremely small sample size reported here, the effects of this project on rules infractions are unclear.

**TABLE 38. Time Series Display of AVP + Sexuality Rules Infractions by Date of Testing.**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>May, 1989 (N = 6)</b>	<b>July, 1989 RESEARCH</b>	<b>August, 1989 (N = 6)</b>	<b>May, 1990 (N = 6)</b>
1	1		1	1
2	1		0	1
3	1		1	2
4	1		0	0
5	0		0	0
6	0		0	0
	—		—	—
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>

**TABLE 39. Time Series Display of AVP + Skills Rules Infractions by Date of Testing.**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>May, 1989 (N = 5)</b>	<b>July, 1989 RESEARCH</b>	<b>August, 1989 (N = 5)</b>	<b>May, 1990 (N = 5)</b>
1	0		1	0
2	1		0	1
3	0		0	0
4	1		1	0
5	0		0	1
	—		—	—
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>

### **Summary of Findings Regarding Experimental Effects**

The two groups of participants came to the project reporting low levels of trust, moderate-to-high levels of empathy, low expectations of having control of their own lives,

and moderate-to-high expectations that powerful others or chance would control their lives. Both groups reflected open lines of communication. A majority of members of both groups seemed to enter the project with an understanding of the importance of relationality to nonviolence.

Finally, the members of both groups seemed to have moderate-to-high levels of group potency, low senses of being controlled, moderate-to-high senses of group pleasantness, moderate-to-high senses of group intimacy, moderate senses of group equality, and moderate-to-high senses of difficulties among group members.

Although ANOVA revealed no statistically significant change scores for either group in the areas of trust, empathy, or locus of control, some trends of change were evidenced. Even though almost all had participated in the "Trust Lift" exercise, grouped frequency distributions base on posttest results reflected the same low levels of trust and moderate-to-high levels of empathy. While both groups reported increased expectations of controlling their own lives, they simultaneously maintained moderate-to-high expectations that powerful others and chance would control their lives. These findings suggest that, while participants' sense of personal power and trust seemed to increase during the course of the project, they maintained an awareness of the coercive and unpredictable nature of the penal environment in which they lived.

Grouped frequency distributions reflected significant differences between the AVP + Skills group's pre and posttest likelihood of utilizing "I" statements in response to conflict scenarios. Both groups reflected a marked increase (from 50 percent to 75 percent) of relationship-related concepts in their conceptualization of nonviolence, with the largest increase in the prosocial category. The AVP + Skills group doubled their communication-related responses, and both groups used slightly fewer situational management techniques. The AVP + Skills group maintained similar pre and posttest negative definition levels, while the AVP + Sexuality group showed a decrease. Both groups' control-related concepts decreased.

While both groups reported a moderate-to-high sense of group cohesiveness following thier respective AVP workshops, it was only the AVP + Sexuality group that seemed to



**maintain their reported sense of cohesiveness. This finding was supported by consistently better follow-up attendance by the AVP + Sexuality group.**

**Because of the extremely small sample size of rules infractions reported by the facility administrations, the effects of this project in that area are unclear. Unpublished evidence reflected reduced rules infractions following an AVP workshop.**

## EXPLANATION OF EXPERIMENTAL EFFECTS

The issues of empowerment and trust are fundamental to the whole endeavor of AVP. Therefore, it seems the key to understanding the experimental effects of this project lies in explaining the contradictory findings regarding these two issues.

Both groups reported an increased expectation at posttest to have control over their own lives (personal power), but members of both groups continued to report a moderate-to-high expectation that powerful others and chance would control their lives. The seeming contradiction is troubling in that, as MacKenzie and Goodstein (1986: 209) suggest, individuals who have a sense of being controlled by powerful others and/or chance also tend to have a sense of impotence, i.e., they "neither perceive a high correspondence between behaviors and subsequent events nor expect to control events, and, consequently, do not appear to be as active in attempting to master the environment."

Similarly, despite the depth of trust evidenced by the willingness of a majority of participants in both groups to entrust their safe-keeping to their fellow participants' joint ability to lift and carry them in the "Trust Lift," low levels of trust in others continued to pervade participants' reported sense of trust at posttesting.

If, indeed, one administrative objective of incarceration is to influence those who are incarcerated, and, if, as Gabarro (1978: 295) suggests, "the degree of influence one person has on another appears to be dependent on how much that person is trusted by the other," then questions regarding environmental factors within incarcerative facilities that impede or facilitate the development of trust become important. The same concern can be voiced for factors that impede or facilitate the development of a sense of personal power and potency as opposed to a sense of impotence or control by powerful others or chance.

To assess these factors within the facility in which this research was conducted, important information was distilled from content analysis of the researcher's field notes. The data derived from the analysis suggest that the coercive and unpredictable nature of this penal environment may, in fact, explain the discrepant findings of this project. Additionally, important differences between the two group's follow-up sessions must be

examined in order to explain the inability of the AVP + Skills group to maintain as positive a sense about their group as did the AVP + Sexuality group. Further, the data may identify factors that contributed to the high attendance at follow-up sessions by members of the AVP + Sexuality group.

The discussion is organized according to three sections. First, the various characteristics of the penal environment are compared to those of the AVP workshop environment that seemed to most directly affect the research project. Second, a comparison is made between the contents of the two groups' follow-up sessions. Third, other factors that might explain the results are considered.

### **The Nature of the Penal Environment**

Deutsch's (Lindskold et al., 1986: 99) conceptualization of the "crude law of social relations," wherein he compared competitive and cooperative environments, was used as the basis for this comparison of the penal environment and the AVP workshop environment. Deutsch suggests that a competitive atmosphere induces threat, coercion, deception, suspicion, rigidity and faulty communication, while a cooperative atmosphere induces perceived similarity, trust, open communication, flexibility, concern for the other, emphasis on mutual interests and attraction between the parties (Lindskold et al., 1986: 99)—the development of which is the goal of the AVP workshop. The discussion centers on the degree to which the environment in which the participants were incarcerated impeded or facilitated the development of the latter concepts.

#### **Inflexible Rule Enforcement**

One series of events that was particularly illuminating about the penal environment spanned the first full week of the project, extending from the first weekend workshop into the second weekend workshop. During the first workshop (that of the AVP + Sexuality group), five participants were given permission by the workshop facilitators to leave the first evening's session somewhat early. Although each participant had signed an AVP

contract stating they were committing themselves for the full three-day duration of the workshop, none of the facilitators perceived the women's leaving early as a breach of that contract. The only aspect of the evening workshop the participants would miss by leaving early was the final evaluation of the evening session's events, and each woman could give her input during the following morning's evaluation.

All the participants, including those who asked to leave early, had spent a good full day working diligently together, and it seemed perfectly natural to grant the requests of these women, as their reasons seemed reasonable. One participant had been ill all day; one was an Avon representative and, since she would be in the workshop for three full days, wanted to deliver her order that had come in unexpectedly early; two needed to go to the commissary before it closed; and one had had to move all of her belongings from her living quarters into the hall before she came that morning so painters could have access to them, and she was concerned about the safety of the items.

Listening to and respecting these participant's individual needs was one form of affirmation and, thus, empowerment; indeed, in keeping with AVP principles, each participant needed to have a voice in the shaping of her own workshop experience. Too, a precedent had been set in previous AVP workshops at this facility during which the administration allowed the AVP facilitators to determine when participants could come and go throughout the workshops based on special and unexpected needs such as unexpected visits.

In this particular instance, however, and unbeknownst to the facilitators, the security staff made their own judgment about the five women's requests to leave early and disagreed with the facilitators' joint decision to allow them early departure. To be sure, on the following morning of the workshop when the five women who had left early did not arrive for the first session, the security officer on duty stated, when approached, that her Captain had made the decision that because the five women "had known the rule [that they] all have to leave any activity together," they had knowingly broken the rule and would not be allowed to return to the workshop.

The researcher explained to the security officer on duty, who in turn relayed the information via telephone to the Captain, that each of the five women had left only after

having asked permission from and engaging in in-depth discussions with the facilitators. The researcher also stated that neither she nor any of the other facilitators had known about the rule. The Captain would not change his mind, however, and the five women were therewith dropped from the workshop, and, thus, from the research project.

A similar event occurred the following weekend during the second workshop (that of the AVP + Skills group), though with somewhat different results. When one of the participants excused herself for a two-hour period from the workshop to attend her regularly-scheduled Saturday morning class, the same Captain who ousted the five women from the previous weekend workshop ordered her to return to the workshop, stating that she could not do both (attend both the workshop and her class).

The researcher went to the Captain and explained the special conditions of the research project. She explained that normally, and in accordance with AVP not prison policy, AVP participants had to sign a contract stating that they would arrange their schedules so that nothing would interfere with their AVP time frame commitment. Due to the several-week length of the research project, however, the Prison Services Director had agreed to allow participants to have visitations with their children. When, at recruitment, the women had asked to be allowed to attend their regularly-scheduled, two-hour Saturday morning classes, too, the researcher had agreed.

The Captain responded by saying that the Deputy Warden had said that he(the Captain) was to "enforce the rules and regulations" and that "these people have to learn to make choices and live by them." The researcher explained that the women had made a choice at the time of recruitment. At that time, each person had considered her options, had made her decision, and had signed a contract based on her understanding of the project.

The Captain responded by stating that the researcher had been wrong to agree to make an exception and that he was going to "straighten it out today." When the researcher said that the situation had been handled this way during the last weekend without a problem, the Captain replied: "It was wrong then and I am going to fix it now."

The researcher stated that if things were changed midstream, it would be comparable to the Captain signing a contract for a job but upon arrival at the job finding that all the

expectations had changed. Seeming to ignore the comment, the Captain moved on to other ground. He stated: "These women can't leave the program for periods of time; they'll miss too much." The researcher explained that she was one of the facilitators and, therefore, knew how much time was too crucial to miss. She explained that she had not accepted volunteers during the recruitment phase whose time commitments conflicted too much with the research schedule.

To this the Captain replied: "This is a prison. I'm the one who enforces the rules. We will do it this way." During the entire conversation, both the Captain and the researcher spoke calmly and matter-of-factly. Only during this final exchange did the Captain seem to become testy.

At that point, the secretary offered to show the Captain the contracts she had drafted and the participants had signed specifically for the research project. The researcher had not seen the contract revisions. While visitations were shown on the contracts, class attendance was not. It had not occurred to the researcher that regularly-scheduled class attendance would be considered an exception and, therefore, she had not mentioned it to the secretary as a revision to the contract. To complicate matters further, the Prison Services Director with whom the researcher had worked closely throughout the planning of the project and who had cleared everything else was not now on duty to verify her statements to the Captain.

The researcher explained her misunderstanding. She reasoned to the Captain that since visitations were indeed included on the contract revision and allowed participants to be excused from the workshop for up to four hours, it made sense that they be excused for scheduled classes which lasted only two hours. Additionally, she explained, the women had a verbal agreement regarding class attendance, even though it was not reflected in the contract. The Captain replied: "They are bending the rules and manipulating you."

At that, the researcher stated that she would like to see the Deputy Warden. The Captain replied that he doubted that the Deputy Warden would want to see the researcher. Upon the researcher's request, the secretary said that she would arrange a meeting between the researcher and Deputy Warden.

The researcher had just returned to the workshop, which had continued in her absence, when the Captain appeared, unannounced. Situating himself in the center of the seated circle of participants and standing with his back to several participants, he stated: "Breaks will only be allowed at midmorning, lunch and midafternoon. No exceptions!"

Since the Captain had barged into the room unannounced without checking his facts with the researcher, since his information was erroneous, and since he seemed to be setting ultimatums, the researcher felt it imperative to correct him, even though it was in front of the group. She stated quietly: "There will also be a break in the evening session," which, given the circumstances, had the appearance of challenging the Captain's authority. Without pausing, the Captain continued: "If anyone knows of any exceptions, they need to leave right now."

Reflecting what seemed to be a total lack of respect for the Captain, one of the participants addressed him by his last name only. Cursing angrily, she said, "You don't have anything to do with this. You always have to stick your nose in!!"

Another woman demanded: "What'll you do; give us a major [write-up] if we don't leave now?" "Yes!," he replied, "You'll get a major if you decide to leave later and don't go now."

The woman to whom the Captain had originally refused to grant permission to attend class spoke up and asked about her class. Before the Captain could respond, several other women reminded her that she could miss three classes and would not be dropped from the class roll. Since she had only missed one class at that time, she wouldn't be dropped from the class if she decided to stay in the workshop.

The Captain asked her what she was going to do, and the woman replied: "This is it!" Impatiently, the Captain barked: "Well?!" The woman repeated "I say, this is it!," (meaning, "I'll stay"). The Captain left.

By the time the Captain left, it was almost mid-morning break time. At the break, another participant, one who was also functioning as an inside facilitator in the workshop, approached the researcher saying that she had a class she had planned to attend. Since she and the researcher had originally agreed that she could help facilitate the workshop

and attend her class, too, she was now confused. The Captain's announcement had frightened her. First, when he had made the announcement, she was unclear about whether or not it pertained to her since she had the dual role of participant and facilitator in the workshop. Second, she had a Parole Board hearing scheduled for the following Monday and could not risk a major write-up from the Captain at this time.

The researcher went to the Captain and explained the woman's understandable confusion. She stated that the woman had entered the workshop with the full understanding that she would be able to attend both her regularly-scheduled class and the workshop. Because of her dual role as participant and inside facilitator in the workshop, however, she had been confused by the Captain's announcement. The researcher asked that the woman be able to attend both her class and the workshop. The Captain replied: "No! She knew what I meant. She's playing games with the rules. These people know the rules."

At that point, the researcher stated again that she wanted to see the Deputy Warden. The Captain again stated that the Deputy Warden would not want to see the researcher. He stated: "I strongly suggest that you don't bother her." At that, the Captain left the room and the meeting ended.

At the lunch break, the researcher approached the secretary and asked about seeing the Deputy Warden. The secretary apologized, stating that she hadn't had an opportunity to tell the researcher that the Deputy Warden would see the researcher immediately after lunch.

At the meeting, the researcher explained what had happened. After an open discussion of several minutes, the Deputy Warden stated that although the researcher had had no authority to grant the class exceptions, the women had entered into the agreement with the researcher fairly. Without further ado, she allowed the participants to attend their regularly-scheduled classes, continue their participation in the workshop and be available for any visitations that might occur. (No one had any visitors during the workshops and only one woman attended a class.)

The researcher did not see the Captain again during that workshop. Several weeks later at a follow-up session, he was on duty when the researcher went into the facility.



The researcher spoke to him but he did not respond. The researcher had the sense of having encountered a closed door.

#### **Faulty Communication: Coercion versus Consensus**

The rigidity of the Captain's actions in the above example was symptomatic of the coercive environment (as defined by Deutch 1973, 1980, 1983) that existed at this particular facility. Faulty communication also contributed to the Captain's inflexibility (Satir 1972), particularly as it relates to rule enforcement as one aspect of faulty communication. The ramifications of the faulty communication that seemed prevalent in this facility as exemplified by the Captain's interactions with the participants and researcher is of major import to this study. In keeping with social learning theory (Bandura, 1973; Ilfeld, 1970) and cognitive developmental theory (Higgins, Power, & Kohlberg, 1984; Jennings & Kohlberg, 1983, p.35; Kohlberg, 1970, 1976; Kohlberg, 1981; Reimer & Power, 1978), when participants in the AVP + Skills group were faced with an unexpected, real-life conflict at the very outset of their workshop, they reflected the values that prevailed within the environment in which they were incarcerated. While it is true that the conflict occurred at the outset of the workshop prior to the AVP experience and that the participants were unaware of alternative methods of conflict resolution, one of the principle parties in the conflict was an inside facilitator who had been in two previous AVP workshops. The fact that she resorted to attempted coercion and control (both of which were routinely modeled by the security staff but are, nonetheless, conducive to violence) rather than open, clear, honest discussion (all of which are in keeping with AVP principles and are antithetical to violence), provided an unexpected measurement of both the effectiveness of AVP and the collateral effects of the coercive conflict resolution techniques modeled by the security staff at the research site facility.

The issue of AVP effectiveness will be addressed in the last chapter, but an in-depth analysis of the conflict itself is important at this point to aid in the understanding of the experimental effects of this project.

### The Gum-Popping Episode

This episode started innocently enough, when one of the participants approached one of the two inside facilitators during the first break of the AVP + Skills group's workshop to complain about the loud gum chewing and popping by some of the other participants. The conflict was exacerbated when the inside facilitator tried to resolve the conflict unilaterally and without confiding in the other facilitators about her knowledge of the situation. Rather than inviting the group to have an open discussion and develop some consensus about the simmering conflict, which would have been in keeping with AVP principles, the inside facilitator announced the imposition of a new ground rule, which she assumed would encompass, and thereby squelch, the gum-popping problem.

Instead, the attempt to facilitate control through rule imposition rather than facilitate understanding through open communication resulted in pandemonium. Several participants exploded in anger since they were caught unaware and, no doubt, felt accused, singled out, and backed into a corner.

Following the angry outbursts, however, the seasoned facilitators, in accord with AVP principles, guided the group into an open discussion of the conflict, the goal and result of which, as pointed out to the group, was to find, as nearly as possible, a win/win solution for everyone involved.

Two important aspects of this exchange are pertinent to this discussion: Why did the inside facilitator not confide in the other facilitators when she became aware of the brewing conflict, and why did she reflect a "need to control" rather than a need to "respond to" as Schaef (1987) would describe her actions?

One explanation could have been that she was a novice facilitator, this being only the second workshop she had helped facilitate. A second explanation might have been related to role confusion. As an AVP facilitator, she was expected to function in the dual capacity of facilitator and participant; thus, when she was approached during the break by the participant who was seeking help in resolving the gum-popping problem, she may have been confused about whether to proceed as a friend and fellow participant and not breach the shared confidentiality about the problem or as a facilitator with a responsibility to do

something about the problem. Her decision to act without confiding in the other facilitators, then, may have reflected a desire to maintain the confidentiality entrusted in her by the participant while, at the same time, taking some sort of responsible action (i.e., imposing a rule).

A third, and perhaps more fundamental explanation is related to the penal environment in which the inside facilitator was living. Her actions did not occur in a contextual vacuum. She had spent the previous weekend immersed in a full three-day AVP workshop and had geared up to co-facilitate this one. In spite of this, the model of conflict resolution which she mirrored vis-à-vis the gum-popping episode was that which was routinely modeled by security staff in the facility in which she was kept: one of imposed, coercive, unilateral control.

When considered in the broader context, then, the similarities between the inside facilitator's actions and the Captain's become apparent. To be sure, and as herewith evidenced, attempts by the Captain and the inside facilitator to resolve conflicts coercively resulted not in openness and understanding, both of which are conducive to trust, but rather they resulted in anger, entrenchment and mistrust, all of which are conducive to violence, the antithesis of trust.

Indeed, as mentioned above, when the seasoned facilitators rejected the idea of setting an additional rule in order to squelch the bothersome gum popping, opting instead for open, though heated, group discussion and grappling with the issue, understanding and a consensus about gum popping finally emerged.

What is important to recognize about the consensus that emerged is that it did not include or require a promise on the part of the "offenders" that they would never again pop their gum or that gum popping was either "good" or "bad." To be sure, no one came away from the discussion feeling either like an "offender" or as though they were being forced to do something against their will. On the contrary, each party to the conflict was given an opportunity to express their feelings about the issue in a forum in which they could be respectfully heard. As each person registered the fact that all others in the group were not only listening but, in fact, hearing, much of the emotion surrounding the issue began to

dissipate. As emotion dissipated, so did the sense of entrenchment that had been evidenced by the gum poppers' initial responses to the unexpected announcement of an impending gum-popping rule (the gum-popping had increased both in volume and numbers of gum-poppers). As emotion dissipated during the course of the open discussion, popping dissipated, only occurring on rare occasions during the rest of the workshop. When it did occur, it seemed to be unconscious habit rather than intentional intrusion. Indeed, gum popping was not mentioned again in the group.

As the discussion wound down, the consensus that emerged about the gum popping seemed to be an unspoken recognition that there was no longer a conflict. Indeed, it was the inside facilitator who had originally suggested the rule imposition who brought closure to the discussion when she stated, "Let's move on. We haven't even gotten to the first exercise yet, and you're going to love it."

The fact that everyone moved so readily into the exercise, participated so fully, and filled the room with such positive energy and laughter is evidence of the amicable resolution of the conflict. The members of the group had approached each other openly and had erected no barriers between themselves as would have been the case had they attempted to squelch the conflict and certain participants' self-expression through rule imposition after the conflict had emerged. The women were all able to move on, leaving the conflict behind them and feeling good about themselves and each other. In keeping with AVP principles, the group had definitely achieved a win/win solution to the conflict.

The development of a sense of trust and community, both of which are antithetical to violence, seemed to be facilitated in the AVP + Skills group by an open discussion of the conflict that arose among them. Whereas an initial attempt to coercively control the problem through rule imposition had resulted in anger and entrenchment, an open discussion of the problem allowed participants to vent their anger, air their views, listen to other's views, and come to consensus.

In keeping with Deutsch (1973, 1980, 1983), then, the consciously-created, open communication of the affirmative AVP workshop environment proved to be conducive to concern for the other, an emphasis on mutual interests, and even perhaps the beginnings

of trust. In contrast, the coercive environment in which the Captain's role had been defined proved to be conducive to the negative cycle of anger, entrenchment, faulty communication, inflexibility, and alienation evidenced vis-à-vis the Captain's handling of the class attendance misunderstanding and mirrored by the inside facilitator's attempts to "control" the conflict rather than facilitate understanding.

#### **Further Evidence of Faulty Communication**

Another instance of faulty communication occurred during the pretesting phase of the project. On two occasions, the researcher found it necessary to have previously unanticipated, and, therefore unannounced, meetings with participants. On both occasions, the participants were put into a situation of having to drop what they were doing and go, without choice, with the correctional officer who summoned them. In neither case, the women reported, did the correctional officer explain to the women why they were being summoned nor by whom. Not surprisingly, the women arrived at both meetings angry, frustrated, and in foul moods, their personal time and schedules having been co-opted.

One woman reported, for example, that she had worked the midnight shift on the night prior to being unexpectedly summoned to one of the early morning meetings. When the correctional officer awakened and summoned her without explanation, the participant reported that she "went off" on the officer, only exacerbating the sense of alienation between them.

The faulty communication evidenced in this facility and as modeled by the security staff seemed to contribute to a negative cycle of anger, entrenchment, inflexibility and alienation. Inherent in this cycle, however, is yet another characteristic of competitive environments which was identified by Deutsch (Lindskold et al., 1986) and which was evident in this facility—suspicion.

#### **Suspicion versus Trust**

Earlier discussion of personality variables indicated that the deep level of trust exhibited in the "Trust Lift" was apparently not maintained by either group after their

respective AVP workshops to be registered during posttesting. While content material of the respective treatment programs must certainly be considered in an effort to explain this occurrence, so must the suspicion, and, thus, lack of trust, which seemed to prevail in this facility.

In keeping with AVP principles, the researcher and other AVP facilitators exhibited a willingness and conscious effort to nurture the development of trust between themselves and the participants throughout the research project. Such willingness and effort, however, particularly when it resulted in giving participants the benefit of the doubt, seemed to be met by security staff with much skepticism.

Evidence of such skepticism was reflected by one of the security officers, a Lieutenant, during the first project workshop (AVP + Sexuality group). One of the participants asked the researcher to intervene on her behalf with the Lieutenant who would not allow her to leave the workshop before the regularly- scheduled break to change a sanitary napkin. The researcher approached the Lieutenant to discuss the situation, but the Lieutenant stated: "Rules are rules. If she goes, I will not let her return."

After the participant walked away in anger, the Lieutenant continued: "You don't really believe her, do you?" When the researcher replied: "Yes," the Lieutenant stated: "No one flows that heavily!," implying, first, that she (the Lieutenant) could judge the frequency with which another woman should need to change her sanitary napkin, that the participant was lying, and that anyone who believed the participant was a dupe.

Another troubling aspect of the Lieutenant's decision is the similarity between the inflexibility with which both she and the Captain interpreted facility rules. The suspicious tone of the Captain's conclusion that the women who wanted to attend both the workshop and their regularly-scheduled classes were simply "breaking the rules" and intentionally "manipulating the researcher" was mirrored in the Lieutenant's statement that "Rules are rules. If she goes, I will not let her return." Again, the negative implication in both instances was that it was either a desire to break the rules or an inability to abide by the rules that prompted the participant's request. Add to this inflexibility and suspicion the Lieutenant's intimation that the participant's primary motivation was one of intentional

deception ("No one flows that heavily"), and the tangle of negativity, which Deutsch (Lindsfold et al., 1986) identified as being part and parcel of competitive environments, becomes apparent.

Indeed, the competitive nature of the relationship existent between the security officers and participants was attested to by one of the program staff at the research site.

The rule that required all participants to leave all activities as one group, for example, and that had been the basis on which the Captain had ousted the five women from the first workshop, was never consistently enforced. The program staff person suggested:

No wonder the women are confused. When they [the security staff] want them out early for something, the rules are bent. I always have problems with this; it's strictly at the officer's whim. There is an on-going battle between officers and inmates, both trying to get back at the other.

The officers try to block them [inmates] so often. Instead of wanting them to be in a program [like AVP], they want to get back at them, and the women lose out. It's gotten to the point where if I have a program, I stay so that we don't have to have an officer involved.

With anger in his voice and in response to the fact that five women had been ousted from one of the research workshops, the program staff person stated:

...that is your program; you should be able to say if the women can come and go. The officers should have no say; they are there for security purposes only.

To be sure, security was a real and heightened concern at the research site since the facility was extremely overcrowded. The rooms in which the workshops and follow-up sessions were held, for example, were located adjacent to the gymnasium in which 125 women were being "temporarily" housed until a new building could be erected. Indeed, at the time of the research project, the women had been in the gym for several months and the ground breaking was several weeks behind schedule.

As well, the restroom facilities for AVP participants was located immediately across the hall from the gymnasium, and, complicating matters further, the hall area outside the restroom was a designated smoking area. At any given time, several women were relaxing and smoking in that area. For security reasons, then, and as explained by the security

staff, any time AVP participants used the restroom facilities, all the women who were either housed in the gym or who were relaxing in the smoking area had to be ushered away. Consequently, breaks for the AVP participants were coordinated with the security staff at regularly scheduled times.

The participant's request for special permission to obtain a sanitary napkin prior to the regularly-scheduled break, then, was no small thing. It would have required that either she be allowed to use the restroom facilities, thus necessitating the ushering away of all the women from the smoking and restroom areas or that she would be allowed to return to her own cell, for which a security officer would be needed to escort her to and from her cell. A reasonable conclusion, therefore, would be that the Lieutenant's underlying concern in her refusal of the participant's request was one of security. Such did not seem to be the case, however.

Prior to the research project, a precedent had been set at this facility for security staff to escort AVP participants to and from their cell areas when people needed to use the restroom facilities before regularly-scheduled breaks. Security, per se, then, did not seem to be the issue. Indeed, as the Lieutenant herself explained and as alluded to earlier, her concern seemed to be more about rule breaking, punishment, and being conned than about security.

The Lieutenant's skepticism did not seem limited to the participant. Apparently annoyed that the researcher had broached the matter after she had denied the participant's request to leave the workshop before the regularly-scheduled break, the Lieutenant commented to the researcher:

To be honest, the [security] staff dreads being on duty for an AVP weekend because you [AVP facilitators] pit the women against the staff. You make the staff look like the heavies.

To be sure, one of the purposes of AVP and, by extension, the project, was to enable participants to actually experience within the workshop context what it was like to create a genuinely affirmative environment wherein consensus rather than coercion, support rather than suspicion, trust rather than mistrust and, thus, healing rather than hostility



were the norm. If participants' perceptions of the AVP and penal environments revealed disparity, thus, as the Lieutenant suggested, making the officers "look like the heavies," it was not reflective of intentional undermining by either the researcher or AVP facilitators of the security staffs' authority. On the contrary, any disparity that emerged reflected the extent to which the coercive penal environment differed from the affirmative AVP environment, or, conversely, the extent to which the affirmative AVP environment differed from that of the prison.

The researcher as an AVP representative recognized and honored the importance of rules but also recognized the need for flexibility in rule enforcement. Indeed, as Satir (1972: 4) suggests, whereas nurturing families are characterized by rules that are "flexible, humane, appropriate and subject to change," troubled families are characterized by inflexible rules that are "rigid, inhumane, nonnegotiable and everlasting." Too, as Deutsch (Lindsfold, 1986) suggested, whereas competitive environments are characterized by rigidity and suspicion, cooperative environments are characterized by flexibility and trust.

The most troublesome issue here was not so much whether the participant was, in fact, lying as the Lieutenant implied in her accusation that "no one flows that heavily," but rather that there seemed to be apparently little in the penal environment to mitigate the pervasive sense of mistrust that existed between the security staff and their charges, be they incarcerated individuals or outsiders (such as the researcher and other AVP facilitators). Indeed, there seemed to be little which nurtured openness and trust in the penal environment, little that gave one the sense that it would be safe to be truthful rather than prudent to lie. Given this environment, it is not surprising that the depth of trust nurtured in the respective workshops and evidenced in the Trust Lift did not generalize beyond the workshop and, thus, survive sufficiently to become registered at posttesting.

#### Links Between Suspicion and Inflexible Rule Enforcement

Evidence of the links between suspicion and rigid rule enforcement as well as the debilitating results of those links were demonstrated on the first evening of the follow-up sessions.

of  
of  
of  
of  
at  
re  
of  
the  
the  
the  
the  
the

The researcher arrived on the first evening of the follow-up sessions to find that five of the AVP + Skills group participants had attempted to attend the evening session but had been sent back to their cells. For some reason, these women had not received their authorization passes, which the administration had prepared the week earlier and which the correctional officer on duty insisted he needed as proof of their eligibility for the program. To further complicate matters, and according to the correctional officer on duty, the call-out list for the evening sessions that included the names of all participants had been "lost" by the day shift.

Though definite problems, neither were insurmountable. The researcher explained to the correctional officer on duty that she and one of the program staff had worked diligently during the previous week to get all the passes in place and that she knew for a fact that the names of the five people in question had been cleared. She, therefore, could vouch for their eligibility. The correctional officer, however, refused to consider that as sufficient proof.

The researcher then asked that the correctional officer check with the senior security officer. The Captain in charge (a different one than the Captain involved with both the ousting of the women and the class attendance conflict) agreed with the correctional officer, however, and stated that to allow the women to participate without proper proof of authorization would "bend the rules."

The twelve women in the AVP + Skills group who had received their administrative authorizations and who had been allowed to stay when they had arrived were sitting in a room within earshot of the conversation between the researcher and the correctional officer. While the participants had all arrived laughing, joking and in high spirits since this was their first reunion as a group since the conclusion of their workshop, but by the time the session got underway (some 45 minutes late and without their five companions), the entire group seemed demoralized. Of the five women who were turned back, four never returned to the follow-up sessions.

One woman who had arrived bubbling with quips and laughter now sat sullen and unresponsive. When the session finally got started and everyone was starting the session

by giving their Adjective Name, she refused to give hers and asked to leave. Although everyone tried to dissuade her, she insisted. When she attempted to leave, with the researcher's permission, the correctional officer on duty would not grant her a pass to return to her cell.

By the evening's end, she was half-heartedly participating. At one point during the evening, however, as if to "get back" in some way, she said in a very loud voice, which the correctional officer could easily overhear, "You know, don't you, that \_\_\_\_\_ (the correctional officer) has been fired twice for drinking. He is an alcoholic."

While everyone except the one woman who had attempted to leave participated for the most part throughout the evening, the distaste and negativity which resulted from the inflexibility of the security staff continued to intrude in the session. Whereas participants had seldom if ever opted not to participate during "Light and Livelies" during the workshops, six of the 12 women present did not participate in the "Light and Lively" at this session. Although people were never asked to justify their decision to pass, participants on this occasion provided justifications, some of which were: "I'm tired," "My back hurts," and "I'll just sit this one out," further proof of the low energy prevalent in the room.

One woman seemed to capture the sense of the group when she stated at one point during the evening: "We're treated like bugs here. Why do some people think that groups like this don't help?"

Links between suspicion and inflexible rule enforcement, then, extended beyond interactions between the security staff and incarcerated individuals to include outsiders. Again, in keeping with Deutsch's characteristics of competitive environments (Lindsfold, 1986), this is not surprising.

## **Summary**

The penal environment in which this project was completed was, indeed, characterized by the aspects of a competitive environment which Deutsch (Lindsfold et al., 1986)

identified. These negative aspects of the penal environment had a negative effect not only on the project but also on the participants themselves.

The inflexible rule enforcement, faulty communication, and suspicion evidenced by the security staff in their interactions with both the participants and researcher seemed to be part of a negative cycle of coercion, threat, (alleged) deception, anger, and alienation, all of which are conducive to violence.

The consequences of this cycle with regard to the research project were negative. Five participants were ousted from the control group's AVP workshop due to the inflexible enforcement of a rule that one of the program staff persons suggested was never consistently interpreted, anyway. As a result of that ousting, the data on their five matched counterparts had to also be dropped from the data analysis, thus reducing the total number of the sample to 22 (11 per group). Although the data were not analyzed on those women, they were allowed to stay in the project.

When faced with an unexpected conflict, one of the inside facilitators who had had previous experience with AVP attempted to utilize the unilateral, coercive conflict resolution technique modeled daily by the security staff rather than open discussion and consensus-building in accord with AVP principles. This is in keeping with both social learning and cognitive developmental theories which suggest, respectively, that 1) modeling is a potent teaching technique and 2) that the values we reflect are often those prevalent in the normative environment in which we are immersed.

Anger, frustration, and entrenchment resulted in two separate instances when a security staff Captain and an inside facilitator attempted to resolve separate conflicts unilaterally and with coercion and control. Consensus and dissipation of anger and entrenchment resulted in one instance when participants were enabled to openly discuss the conflict with which they were confronted.

The security staff's apparent suspicion of their charges' motives (both participants and outsiders, alike) were evidenced on different occasions and seemed to demoralize the participants.

There seemed to be little in the penal environment to mitigate the negative, competi-

tive cycle of suspicion, rigidity, faulty communication, deception, threats and coercion. These negative characteristics seemed to stem from the administration's definition of the security staff's role, since they seemed to be evidenced only by the security staff.

### **The Nature of the Project Environment**

From the outset of their respective workshops, participants found themselves in a "seeker friendly" environment (AVP Education Committee, 1985). In keeping with the AVP philosophy that it is the birthright of each person to live life with dignity and self respect, participants found that the experience of each of them was equally valued. This was evidenced by both groups' reported perceptions of moderate-to-high equality among group members as reported in the pretests of group dynamics which were completed following their respective AVP workshops (Tables 32 and 33).

In the workshops, facilitators represented the AVP belief that each person has within themselves answers to their own questions if they can but open to them. The merit of this belief was evidenced by the fact that participants came to the workshop with an intuitive understanding of nonviolence (Table 18) as well as an ability to open channels of communication in response to conflict scenarios (Table 31). Encouraging participants, then, to reach down within themselves for those solutions, the workshop leaders simply facilitated that search within, offering new techniques (e.g., games, role plays, affirmative exercises) different tools ("I" statements and situational management techniques), and a broad range of experiences from which to choose in order to enable participants to gain further insights into themselves.

It was to this environment that the participants in each group came, each with their own individual histories and motivations for being there. As one participant put it: "When I first came through that door, it was to be with my lady friend." Another said, "I came hoping to gain something." Still another stated that she came for "my certificate." Many participants came initially with hesitation and nervousness. As one woman suggested: "I had doubts in terms of if there was anything I could gain." Another said: "I felt nerves

[sic] 'cause I never have been in a group." Still another stated: "I wondered what it would be like. I thought it would be dull...." All of the participants arrived acquainted with one form or another of violence, as was evidenced by their offense histories and the mere fact of their incarceration (Table 4).

The point of the AVP workshop was that violence did not have to be a part of their daily lives. The basic premise of AVP, as explained at the outset of the respective workshops, was that human beings don't have to be violent with each other, that human violence is not a given. In fact, the spirit that permeated everything in the workshops reflected assumptions that were quite to the contrary: there is always a possibility for an alternative, rather than a violent, response to any action; we must be willing to set aside old, habitual assumptions that violent or destructive solutions are the only ones possible and be willing to try something different, something creative; we must believe that a win/win solution is possible and that there is something in the person who is challenging us, no matter how hidden it may be, that is willing to join us in seeking such a solution; and, finally, we must expect the best, not only from ourselves, but from others in our interactions with them (AVP Education Committee, 1985).

The focus, always, was on experiencing these tenets rather than simply discussing them. One of the most illuminating experiences shared in the AVP + Skills group's workshop was the gum-popping episode wherein participants were able to transform their group conflict into consensus. They then knew from first-hand experience how it felt to be truly listened to and heard, and conversely, how others reacted to them when they were truly heard.

Participants in both groups experienced, some perhaps for the first time, what it was like to be affirmed by others and appreciated for simply being themselves. As one participant put it: "When I first came, I just wanted my certificate. Now I feel that the group excepts [sic] me for me...." Another stated: "I really could open up and be myself." Indeed, the initial willingness to trust, to test the waters so to speak, as evidenced by participants actually showing up for the first workshop sessions as well as their continued participation throughout the respective workshops, was consciously nurtured by the meticulous care with

which an affirmative environment was created within the respective workshop environments.

After initial welcomings and a brief overview of what participants could expect from their three days together in the workshops, several simple ground rules were discussed which set a tone of affirmation from the very outset. Two ground rules, for example, asked participants to look for and affirm one another's good points and to refrain from putting down themselves or others. Three additional ground rules recognized the inherent nature of affirmation in positive communication channels by asking participants to listen to what others had to say, to not interrupt others, and to be sensitive to the need to share communication opportunities with fellow participants by not speaking too long or too often. Finally, three ground rules that affirmed the importance of personal power or empowerment asked participants to volunteer only themselves, to observe confidentiality, and to remember their right to pass.

By and large, participants in both workshops honored the ground rules throughout the workshops. When put downs did occur, however, they were usually self-focused, with participants devaluing their own abilities or self-worth. On such occasions, other participants, as instructed at the beginning of the workshop, would very gently say: "That's a put down." This simple statement reminded everyone of how subtly put downs, particularly those that are self-directed, creep into conversations, but that the mere acknowledgment of the put down seemed to defuse it. The fact that someone else recognized the statement as a put down meant they had obviously been paying enough attention to catch it and cared enough to point it out. In and of itself, this action was an affirmation of the person who had put herself down.

The three ground rules relating to positive communication greatly facilitated listening and sharing activities that were crucial to the development of both trust and community and that were discussed earlier. On more than one occasion, these particular ground rules defused potential conflicts. One of the participants in the AVP + Sexuality workshop, for example, was particularly verbose. The challenge for the group became one of respecting her desire to share her thoughts while at the same time encouraging her not to monopolize the conversation. After three particularly long-winded responses in a group discussion on



the second afternoon and at the outset of what appeared to be a fourth, one of the other participants interjected: "Remember the ground rule." The individual said the phrase with such a clowning manner that everyone broke into laughter. A discussion ensued thereafter about being honest with each other as well as risking being creative and trying humor.

This is not to suggest that all communication within the workshops was conflict free — on the contrary. Both workshops had their difficult moments. The gum-popping episode that occurred at the outset of the AVP + Skills workshop was one such example. Another occurred in the midst of a "Light and Lively," of all things, on the second afternoon of the AVP + Sexuality workshop. When the instructions for a game were given, several participants apparently misunderstood them, and when they played incorrectly and fouled out, they became angry, saying that they had misunderstood the rules. Since they probably had, the facilitator allowed them to return to the game. This action made the rest of the group angry. Several participants from the group sat down and passed on that game.

Oral evaluations, which were held at the end of each three-hour session and through which participants could comment on what elements of the workshop they liked or disliked or make suggestions for improvement, for that session included several comments about the incident. One participant remarked: "You should not let people back in. They have to learn to listen." Another asked the facilitator to explain why she had handled things the way she had, which the facilitator did.

One participant was still dealing with the episode at the end of the workshop the following day. She commented to the facilitator involved in the episode: "I like the way you were able to be called on the "Light and Lively" but still continue to be sweet afterwards." What was important to her was not so much the issue of the game itself but how the facilitator had reacted when confronted.

That, in essence, was at the heart of the workshops. Given the fact that the respective groups of participants were together for three 12-hour days, conflicts were bound to emerge. What was at issue was not whether conflicts arose, but rather how those conflicts were dealt with. In the affirmative environment, wherein the obvious focus was on communication,

community building, cooperation, and conflict resolution, it was safe to be at odds with each other since the focus was always on nonviolent resolution of problems.

To be sure, some exercises purposefully invited discord to provide opportunities to practice nonviolent conflict resolution. "Moon Explorer" was one such exercise, and, in fact, four out of five participants in the AVP + Skills group and two of the AVP + Sexuality participants listed it on their final evaluations as one of the activities they did not like. This does not, however, mean that the experience was nonproductive.

"Moon Explorer" was not introduced until the third morning of the workshops, when trust and community had developed. The purposes of the exercise were to show that group resources are superior to those of any individual and to provide participants with an opportunity to use consensus processing to reach group decisions. The object of the game was for each of several teams to rank order those survival items which they would need in order to get back to the mother ship from their crashed spaceship.

Participants had to rely on actual knowledge about the moon and its environment. Those people with more factual knowledge about the moon became more powerful. Conversely, those people with less knowledge about the moon became less powerful. The ensuing struggle, proceeding from differential power within the group, resulted in real conflicts and aroused emotions.

The beauty of this exercise was that it allowed participants to examine, in a safe environment, issues that came up for each of them when they were given a task within the group and were confronted with varying degrees of cooperation and power, either someone else's or their own.

An interesting dynamic occurred in the AVP + Sexuality workshop. Two members on one of the teams became very loud and argumentative during this task. Both were angry. A third member of the group, who had continued to be humorous and fun throughout the workshop, took on the role of mediator, a concept that had not been previously discussed in the group. She kept trying to let them both know that each of them could be right. Although they both maintained their positions, the mediator's input did seem to temper their emotions somewhat.

When debriefing this exercise, one participant in the AVP + Sexuality group, who had been particularly argumentative and who had had little knowledge about the moon, stated: "I didn't like this one. It made me mad. You shouldn't do ones that are so hard." One of the other women on her team, who had known more about the moon said that she had had a hard time getting people to listen to her. When, at the end of the game, the list that had been put together by NASA was revealed, she felt exonerated because much of what she had been arguing was correct.

When the group was asked how this applied to real life, one woman stated: "I could see us all getting mad and then we weren't getting anywhere. No one was listening." Another said, "I be wanting to fight." Another added: "It was hard to decide since there weren't none of us who knew much about the moon."

When the AVP + Skills group participated in the "Moon Explorer," they also argued and haggled. Five persons in that group listed "Moon Explorer" as one of the activities they did not like about AVP.

The "Moon Explorer" was the most structured opportunity in the workshop in which the participants could develop the consensus- building skills. While the groups had been introduced and had utilized those skills in the planning of several role plays before this exercise, the element of differential power, present only in "Moon Explorer," seemed to be the factor that aroused emotions.

Role plays offered an excellent opportunity for participants to deal with conflicts head on. Indeed, in role plays constructed to examine conflicts that the participants had identified, participants were confronted with real-life situations and were pressed to begin to develop a nonviolent experience base with which to offset their far-too-familiar violent experience base. Topics which were addressed in the role plays by the AVP + Sexuality group included threatening the life of a neighbor who refused to become involved in a drug deal, leaving prison and finding one's lover living with another woman (the group of four women who did this role play explained that "lover" could mean either a lesbian or straight relationship), being devalued by the guards or other incarcerated individuals in the facility, and competing as an ex-convict with a person for a job for which

the ex-convict was better qualified and had more years of experience.

Participants in both groups were enabled to laugh uproariously in silly games, work diligently at serious tasks, and weep cleansingly – all together.

As one participant put it when she was asked to evaluate her workshop:

I like all the sections because I got a chance to meet new friends, to know them, enjoy them. We laugh, we cried, we was happy and sometimes sad, but hang together. We made it.

In the final written evaluation of the workshops, participants were asked to comment on aspects they did or did not like about the workshop and to make suggestions regarding how the workshops might be improved.

Comments from the AVP + Skills group regarding aspects of the workshop they liked included:

...I have learn [sic] a lot from AVP. Change and try to be the best I can with understanding and consideration for others. I really do appreciate this opportunity.

...The Trust Circle was a wonderful way to demonstrate the trust that we had built.

...Transforming power was a very positive form of rechallenging [sic] negative energy into a positive force.

...it gave me a lot of insight of myself and that in spite of anything I can have a great deal of controll [sic] of ugly situations.

...I really got a lot from Who Am I [ because it made me realize even more who I really is.

...I loved the role plays and the Light and Livelies.

...I really got into the role play. it [sic] made me felt [sic] like an actress. I also liked the tinker toys, I learn [sic] working together can be a lot of fun.

...I like that I was allow [sic] to express how I really felt in the workshop.

...I like the role play –gave me a chance to see people for their selves.

...I loved the Texas Hug [the closing of the first evening's session], I felt alot [sic] of careing [sic] put into it.

...I liked all of the activite [sic] because I got a lot of understanding out of it. I've really learned a lot and I'm going to stick with what I have learned.

Unfortunately, the final written evaluations from the AVP + Sexuality group consisted solely of the listing of exercises that they either liked or disliked. There were no written comments regarding reasons. Consequently, the "things I like" list written by each participant consisted virtually of the entire list of workshop activities and were, therefore, not very informative.

Comments from the AVP + Skills workshop participants regarding aspects they did not like included:

...I feel that the Moon Explorer was to [sic] heavy to deal with so early in the morning.

...I didn't like the Moon [Moon Explorer] because it cause [sic] a lot of strife for those who weren't familar [sic] with the moon.

...I did not like such long hours.

...I didn't like the moon thing because it was something that caused confusion.

...The moon explorer wasn't to [sic] much fun.

...I disliked Zip Zap Boing [a "Light and Lively" on the second afternoon] because people refuse [sic] to understand it.

...the role play should be picked silently not by choice.

...I didn't like the Zip Zap Boing – no special reasons.

...I didn't care to [sic] much for Jail Break. It was sort of dangerous.

Participants from the AVP + Sexuality group made the following comments about activities they did not like:

...I didn't like the fact that we didn't end with all the individuals we began with.

...I didn't like the dinners or bathroom breaks on the first day.

...the meditation and Moon Explorer.

...Moon Explorer.

...Moon Explorers guided meditation and Trust Circle.

...Guided meditation...

...1st day breaks and bathroom.

...meditation.

...Moon Explorer.

The common theme that seemed to run through the aspects of the workshop that participants did not like seemed to be those that generated disquietude or discomfort. The "Moon Explorer," for example, resulted in what participants perceived as "confusion," "strife," and "not much fun." Logistical matters such as "long hours," "bathroom breaks," and "dinner" were bothersome. Their unfamiliarity with meditation apparently resulted in a dislike of that activity.

It is interesting that none of the participants mentioned interpersonal relationships or related issues in their lists of dislikes. Although both groups reported moderate levels of group difficulties in their posttest perception of their respective groups' dynamics (Tables 34 and 35), they did not apparently surface as a factor related to the workshops themselves. This suggests that perhaps the group difficulties the participants alluded to predated the workshops.

At the end of the workshops, participants were also asked to respond to the following statements:

1. When I first came to the workshop on Friday, I felt \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Now that I've finished the workshop, I feel \_\_\_\_\_.

Although time constraints did not allow the AVP + Sexuality group to respond to these queries, comments from the AVP + Skills group included the following:

When I came on Friday, I wonder [sic] what it was going to be like. I thought it would be dull and found out it was wonderful. Now I feel like a new person and I know how to meet all my problems and deal with them. To be aware of trouble.

I had doubts in terms of it there was anything that I could gain. Now I know that people truly [sic] make the world go around, and there is much beauty in all people if you'll find it.

When I got here Friday I felt put out and frustrated. Now I wish we didn't have to leave. But since we do I'm going to try hard to carry on what you wonderful people have taught me. I'll work on me and AVP for a life time.

When I can't [sic] on Friday it was slow but I start and I like the hold [sic] thing.

When I first came through the door it was only to be with my lady friend. But after being in the workshop I really have gotten some constructive help — and the next time I come will be to gain all I can out of it.

I wasn't sure I wanted to be in the program. Now I feel more in touch [sic] with myself in all positive [sic] way.

I felt like I might not like it but I felt good all at the same time. Now I feel very good better yet like a million dollars.

...On Friday I was interested and nervous, Now I feel like I have a better grip on resolving my attitude problem and I have put some of my guilt feeling from past incidents in check.

When I came on Friday I was hoping to gain something and I did. I feel now a almost new person and I LOVE it. Thanks.

I felt anxious when I came friday [sic]. Now I feel half human.

I felt nerves [sic] cause I never have been in a group. Now I feel so releived [sic] and I've reached one of my goals.

When I came on Friday, I just thought how so many previous groups I've been in through my life and thought I can handle it. But wow it hit me surprisingly to trigger my shield to drop and I was scared. Realized I didn't have to follow my game plan and be logical and I was able to go with the flow. With strangers I could always relax but this was with people I was going to see again. Its beautiful. Thanx.

The positive feelings of having received help and of gaining new skills for dealing with

problems expressed by the participants is consistent with the moderate-to-high pretest levels of cohesiveness reported by both groups related to their group dynamics (Tables 32 and 33).

The warm feelings reflected in the final evaluations were also verbalized between the participants in the final session of their respective workshops. The closing occurred just prior to graduation (when everyone received their Certificate of Completion) and just following the "Trust Lift" exercise. Participants were asked to close their eyes and focus on the person seated to their right in the circle. Thinking back over what they had learned about that person over the course of the workshop, they were to think of an imaginary gift they wanted to give that person to help her along her journey as she left the workshop.

Gifts given were poignant reminders of the sense of community that had developed between the participants of the groups. In the AVP + Skills group, one woman turned to the person to her right, faced her straight on, took her hands into her own, and said, "\_\_\_\_\_, I give you you. I want you to know for real what a beautiful person you are." The recipient of this gift was a large, extremely dark woman with very yellow teeth, very difficult-to-manage hair and very poor language skills. She had been fairly quiet throughout the workshop and the comments she did make were in halting, unsure sentences. She seemed to be the type of person that few people would notice in a room full of people. The Adjective Name she had chosen for herself at the outset of the workshop was "Devastating Dana."

As she received her gift from her very perceptive fellow participant, she sobbed. It was this quiet, unassuming woman who was the one of the two women who attended 100% of the follow-up sessions (Table 36). Her conviction-related crime had been theft.

Another woman gave a gift of her friendship so that "you'll always know I'm there if you need me." Another gave the gift of "the Lord's love, to watch over you and keep you in His hand." Still another gave the gift of "strength and courage to heal and help you." The young woman standing to the left of the researcher said, "I give you me, to help you in the work you do in these workshops." Interestingly, one of the participants who had always shared freely with good substantive comments during the workshop, had difficulty



with this experience. When it came time for her to receive her gift, she began to move about like a robot, acting very silly. It seemed she was very uncomfortable with such intimate sharing—one can only guess why.

Gifts given in the AVP + Sexuality group included “a song to sing when the going gets tough”; “my friendship always so that you know I’m always here when you need me;” “the sunshine to always smile down and warm you;” “the stars to guide you;” and “the gift of laughter and happiness.”

The final event of both workshops was the graduation ceremony. Facilitators called out each participant’s Adjective Name and the person came forward to accept her certificate. In the workshops, as each person rose to accept her certificate, everyone clapped loudly, whistled and cheered, totally affirming the recipient. One young woman broke into tears when she received her certificate saying, “I’m 28 and I’ve never received a certificate before.” As each person received her certificate, she was hugged by everyone, until everyone was hugging everyone.

Indeed, both workshops ended with the room filled with beaming faces, laughter, tears, high spirits, and energy, as reflected in participants’ positive perception of their respective group’s dynamics following the workshop. Trust and community had evolved over the course of the workshops.

The questions that need to be addressed concerning these issues are:

1. Whether it is important to carry over that level of trust and community from the workshop into the prison environment; and
2. If it is important, how can the carry over be accomplished.

In this project, the follow-up sessions, which were held on a weekly basis for six weeks, were to provide the vehicle for maintaining and even heightening the sense of community and trust participants felt at the end of the three-day workshops. As stated, it was the researcher’s sense that only the sessions that focused on nonviolence and further skills building would succeed.

### **Content Materials of the Respective Follow-up Session**

The most important distinguishing factor between the two groups' treatment modalities was the content of material covered in the follow-up sessions.

The general focus of the AVP + Sexuality group was on issues of human sexuality. Each weekly session was interest-driven with the facilitator choosing timely topics of pertinence to the women. Subjects covered included prostitution (two members of the group reported experiences as prostitutes and added rich insights), homosexuality (one member shared that she was a lesbian), problems associated with having no "normal" sexual outlets in prison, and AIDS and other sexually-transmitted diseases. The facilitator, a male, reported that the discussions were always lively. The fact that the facilitator was male probably added to the stimulation of the discussions as evidenced by comments made by two of the participants: "I could show you how, better than tell you how," and "...when I get out, we could check it out."

The format of the AVP + Skills group, on the other hand, was to provide weekly practice with conflict resolution skills (e.g., "I" statements), role plays of conflict scenarios, quieting exercises (e.g., guided meditation) and affirmation exercises. All were provided in the broader context of nonviolence.

Whereas the AVP + Sexuality group was receiving new, stimulating and informational material weekly, the AVP + Skills group was repeatedly practicing conflict resolution skills, though presentation of the skills was embedded within slightly different exercises each week. This routine practice of conflict resolution skills may account for the posttest findings that the AVP + Skills group: 1) was more likely to formulate an "I" statement in response to a conflict scenario (Table 19); 2) had doubled their communication-related responses in their conceptualization of nonviolence (Table 31); and 3) reported the sense that what they said and thought in the group was more controlled than it had been at pretest (Tables 32, 33, 34, and 35). This last finding may have been due to the fact that rather than having free-flowing discussion about topical issues as did the AVP + Sexuality group, the AVP + Skills group actually practiced skills. Albeit the practice was couched

in a variety of mini role plays and practice exercise, the repetitive nature of the practice may have contributed to the group's dwindling weekly attendance (Tables 36 and 37) as well as their sense at posttesting of a loss of potency and pleasantness (Tables 32, 33, 34, and 35). As attendance dwindled in this group, there may also have been an increased sense of loss of intimacy.

The fact that only the AVP + Sexuality group reflected decreased use of negative definitions in their conceptualizations of nonviolence at posttesting suggests that the stimulating discussions may have enhanced their sense of cohesiveness,, which, in turn, enhanced their already-existent intuitive recognition of the importance of relationships. Indeed, as reflected in Table 31, the AVP + Sexuality group's use of negative definitions at pretesting seems to have been replaced at posttesting with either specific relational concepts or communication related terms, both of which, as Schaef (1974) suggests, are more productive and concrete.

Some findings seem more indicative of the similarities between the group's respective treatment modalities (AVP workshops) than the differences. The fact that both groups recorded slightly few situational-management techniques from pre to posttest conceptualizations of nonviolence (Table 31), for example, suggests that more emphasis could have been placed on making the connection between situation-management techniques (e.g., trying to find common ground, basing a position on truth, risking creativity rather than violence, and using surprise and humor) and the actual resolution of hypothetical conflicts. Indeed, one participant made this precise recommendation regarding how to improve the workshops. She stated, "You need to have more practice with "I" statements and transforming power." The only other suggestions participants made regarding improvement of the workshops included doing "Jail Break" in a larger room since it is so active.

In their conceptualizations of nonviolence (Table 31), both groups reflected a decrease at posttesting of control-related issues (this is not to be confused with locus of control issues). Since the antithesis of "control" has been defined as "response ability," it is important that, as both groups' understanding of the importance of relationship seemed to increase, their sense of need to control decreased (Table 31).

A majority of the participants in both groups came to and left the project reporting moderate-to- high levels of empathy (Table 22). In keeping with Eisenberg and Miller's (1987) work regarding the relationship between empathy and prosocial behavior, it would seem that the heightened sense of relationship reported by both groups' conceptualizations of nonviolence enabled them to maintain their sense of empathy, in spite of negative elements of the penal environment in which they were incarcerated.

## **Other Factors That May Have Affected the Experiment**

### **Design Issues**

#### **Human Sexuality Treatment Mode**

The choice of topical human sexuality issues for the comparison treatment group was actually serendipitous. The researcher wanted a subject that would maintain the participants' interest, be beneficial, and be somewhat easy to accomplish. Her husband had taught human sexuality for several years on the college level so it was easy to ask for his assistance, which he graciously gave.

The fact that the discussion group turned out to have such positive results is suggestive of how important it is to merge education and training of any sort into the context of real-life concerns. During the first meetings, the facilitator asked the women what issues they wanted to discuss and the following five-week agenda was built around their voiced concerns.

The fact that participants were incarcerated no doubt heightened issues of relationships and identity for them. Since sexuality itself is so related to both of these issues, it was a natural catalyst to pique and maintain the participant's interest.

#### **Gender of Facilitator for Follow-up Sessions**

The point could be made that the facilitator's gender could have been a factor in maintaining interest levels in the follow-up sessions. While this might have been the case,

i

g

th

m

se

fer

sex

aro

4

7

in th

the "

gener

1967:

"socia

parent.

Giv

one nat

was not

Rotter's

required

Staff Rel

By an

project an

it is the researcher's sense that the most important factor was the topic, rather than the gender of the facilitator.

Several comments were made during both workshops that had sexual connotations; had they been pursued, the conversation could have easily expanded into sexually-related matters. Since the focus was on other issues, the conversations were directed away from sexuality and onto the matters at hand.

It is the researcher's sense that if the human sexuality discussions had been led by a female facilitator who was as experienced and knowledgeable and comfortable with her own sexuality as was the facilitator of the AVP + Sexuality follow-up sessions, she would have aroused and sustained as much interest during the six weeks as did the male facilitator.

#### Appropriateness and Number of Test Instruments

The point can be made that Rotter's Interpersonal Trust Scale, utilized to measure trust in this project, was possibly measuring something quite different than what was reflected in the "Trust Lift." When Rotter developed the scale, he defined "interpersonal trust" as "a generalized expectancy that the verbal statements of others can be relied upon" (Rotter, 1967: 664). Many questions included in this instrument relate to what Rotter referred to as "social objects," and people who take the test are "called upon to express [their] trust of parents, teachers, physicians, politicians, classmates, and friends," (Rotter, 1967: 653).

Given that the trust reflected in the "Trust Lift" is of a much more intimate, one-on-one nature than Rotter had in mind, it may be that the more global focus of Rotter's scale was not sensitive enough to quantify what transpired in the "Trust Lift." Furthermore, Rotter's scale was a paper and pencil test of expectancies, whereas the "Trust Lift" required actual physical involvement.

#### **Staff Relationship to the Project**

By and large, the administrative and program staff were supportive of the research project and, by extension, were supportive of the participants. Representatives from both

the administration and program staff met several times with the researcher to assist in the arrangements of logistical details regarding recruitment of volunteers, pre and posttesting, and the workshop and follow-up session. Whenever problems arose, someone was made available to help find a solution.

During the course of the project and at posttesting, administrative and program personnel continued to be supportive. The researcher observed their warm and friendly interaction with the inmates on several occasions.

The security personnel, on the other hand, were a different matter. As evidence in the various discussions above, they often seemed more obstructive than facilitative of the project (e.g., the ousting of five participants from the AVP + Sexuality group). Records for five women who attempted to attend the AVP + Skills follow-up session were lost; four of the five women did not attend any of the session thereafter.

Although these obstructions by the security staff were problematic, the very obstructiveness itself became a part of the research project. The suspicion with which the security staff treated the researcher and other AVP facilitators seemed part and parcel of the negative penal environment.

### **Demographic Differences**

The one demographic factor which suggested possible major differences between the two groups (Table 4) was in the number of prior convictions reported by the two groups (of the 57 total convictions, 67 percent were reported by the AVP + Sexuality group and 37 percent were reported by the AVP + Skills group). More prior convictions might translate into more time spent in prison, and the duration of prison terms could have had an impact in some way on the functioning of participants in this project. Mean scores in the respective groups were divided into separate arbitrary categories of High and Low Priors, with high being anything over four.

As Tables 40 and 41 suggest, however, the difference in numbers of reported prior convictions may not be accurate. The data seem strange in that the women reported either

zero prior convictions or at least five; no one reported one, two, three, or four priors. Perhaps people interpreted the instructions incorrectly or simply failed to report correctly. For this reason, the data regarding prior reported convictions should be considered with caution, since it was not corroborated by documentation.

**Table 40. Categorization of Prior Convictions for the AVP + Sexuality Group by Individual's Number of Reported Convictions.**

<b>Categorization</b>			
<b>Low (0 - 4)</b> <b>N = 3</b>		<b>High (5 +)</b> <b>N = 6</b>	
<b>Participant</b>	<b>No. of Prior Convictions Reported</b>	<b>Participant</b>	<b>No. of Prior Convictions Reported</b>
No. 1	0	No. 4	5
No. 2	0	No. 5	5
No. 3	0	No. 6	5
		No. 7	6
		No. 8	6
		No. 9	<u>9</u>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>

**Table 41. Categorization of Prior Convictions for the AVP + Skills Group by Individual's Number of Reported Convictions.**

<b>Categorization</b>			
<b>Low (0 - 4)</b> <b>N = 4</b>		<b>High (5 +)</b> <b>N = 4</b>	
<b>Participant</b>	<b>No. of Prior Convictions Reported</b>	<b>Participant</b>	<b>No. of Prior Convictions Reported</b>
No. 1	0	No. 5	0
No. 2	0	No. 6	6
No. 3	0	No. 7	5
No. 4	0	No. 8	<u>5</u>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>



Table 42 indicates the mean scores for trust, empathy, locus of control, openness and group dynamics categorized according to numbers of prior reported convictions. Since all of the participants in both groups' "Low" categories reported zero prior convictions, it was not possible to test the significance of the differences between the means. Visual scrutiny of the groups' posttests reflects means that are very close in both groups for all variables except Group Dynamics. Whether any mean differences are statistically significant cannot be determined.

Table 42. Effect of Number of Prior Convictions on Mean Scores by Measurement.

	AVP + Sexuality				AVP + Skills			
	Reported No. of Prior Convictions				Reported No. of Prior Convictions			
	Low (0 - 4)		High (5 +)		Low (0 - 4)		High (5 +)	
Mean scores	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Trust	44.33	69.67	60.50	66.33	41.67	69.50	65.0	7.05
Empathy	153.00	154.67	125.00	156.17	117.00	156.33	155.67	158.00
Locus of Control								
Internal	35.00	38.33	27.00	33.00	26.67	38.00	30.67	27.67
Powerful								
Others	14.50	14.50	17.50	20.67	16.00	25.30	25.75	24.00
Chance	21.00	25.00	19.50	24.33	27.50	26.00	26.33	20.00
Openness	0	3.33	1.60	3.75	4.00	5.00	0	2.50
Group Dynamics	111.67	123.00	70.00	87.50	61.00	111.00	121.00	94.25

### Summary

The experimental effects of the project seemed to be mainly related to the nature of the penal environment on the one hand and the treatment modalities on the other. The security staff's negatively defined role of coercion and the resultant negative cycle of

rigidity, suspicion, competition, and faulty communication seemed to characterize the normative structure of the prison. The content material of the AVP + Sexuality group seemed to enable the participants to maintain a strong sense of group cohesiveness, which was, in turn, reflected in relatively high attendance in the follow-up sessions.

Other factors that might have affected the experiment included design issues such as the pertinence of the topical human sexuality discussions to the AVP + Sexuality group's lives as well as the fact that the facilitator of the AVP + Sexuality group was male. Too, the test instrument utilized to measure trust (Rotter's Interpersonal Trust Scale) may not have been sensitive enough to measure the intimate type of one-on-one trust reflected in the "Trust Lift."

While the relationship of administrative and program staff to the project was consistently positive and supportive, the correctional staff seemed more obstructive than facilitative of the project.

a  
ti  
p  
Sk  
sic

per  
resp  
posi  
was

empa  
Skills  
search  
follow  
follow

In

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **DISCUSSION**

Seymour (1980) suggests that informal niches are created by incarcerated individuals in an effort to manage prison stress. Transactional in nature, these niches involve both a prisoner with imported skills, interest and liabilities, and a prison setting that represents the self-assessed optimal solution to the problems and preferences of that prisoner (Hagel-Seymour, 1982: 269). It is the ameliorative transaction between prisoner and setting, then, with the “setting providing relief from fears and concerns rooted in situation-aggravated vulnerabilities” that gives the setting its essential quality and meaning as a niche (Hagel-Seymour, 1982: 169).

This research project attempted to create an environment within a medium security prison for women that might potentially be construed and, thus, claimed by the women as an informal niche. The program or “niche-potential” as implemented consisted of participation in a three-day AVP workshop plus six weeks of follow-up session that afforded participants repeated opportunities for nonviolent conflict resolution practice (AVP + Skills). A comparison group received a three-day AVP workshop plus six weeks of discussions regarding topical human sexuality issues (AVP + Sexuality).

The underlying hypothesis of the project was that, even though both groups would perceive their respective groups positively and as a possible “niche” following their respective AVP workshop, only the AVP + Skills group would be able to maintain that positive sense or “niceness” throughout the six-week follow-up session. Additionally, it was hypothesized that the AVP + Skills group would reflect higher scores for trust, empathy, locus of control, and production of conflict resolution skills and the AVP + Skills group would have a better understanding of nonviolence as a concept. The researcher believed that these factors would be reflected in better attendance in the weekly follow-up sessions as well as a reduction in rules infractions (measured in the month following the project and again several months after the end of the project).

In general, the hypotheses were only partially supported by the data. As hypothesized,

both groups did become cohesive throughout the course of their respective AVP workshops, reporting moderate-to-high senses of group potency, pleasantness and intimacy, low levels of perception of having their speech and/or ideas controlled, and a moderate sense of equality between group members.

Contrary to the hypotheses, however, the AVP + Sexuality group seemed to fare better than did the AVP + Skills group. Although there were no statistically significant differences between or with the groups' posttest scores on various measures (trust, empathy and locus of control), the AVP + Sexuality group seemed to be able to maintain their sense of group cohesiveness at a higher level across the six-week follow-up period than did the AVP + Skills group. Too, the level of attendance in the follow-up sessions was consistently higher in the AVP + Sexuality group than in the AVP + Skills group.

It was not possible to measure the effects of the project on the number of rules infractions in the research setting because records were not available for evaluation (See Chapter 4). However, the researcher has received information from another source that at least the three-day workshop has an effect on the number of rules infractions of participants. In a recent telephone conversation, the warden of a midwestern maximum security prison for men related his findings to the researcher. The warden had, of his own volition, set up a matched control group when the first group of 15 men at his facility participated in an AVP workshop. He then compared the number of rules infractions of the two groups both three months prior to the workshop and three months after the workshop. His records indicate the facility experienced an across-the-board increase in rules infractions for the three months following the workshop, but, while the rate of increase for the control group was 82 percent, the rate of increase for the AVP group was only 52 percent. Even though the data from that group cannot be generalized to prison populations as a whole, the data would suggest that participation in these types of workshops may have a positive effect on the later behaviors of incarcerated individuals.

The data that was available from the research site seem, therefore, to suggest that of the two treatment programs, the AVP + Sexuality combination was the most productive over the long term. The question remains, however, as to whether the data suggest that

either an AVP workshop alone or an AVP workshop in combination with a human sexuality follow-up component facilitates a positive niche environment wherein participants can "assert freedom, garner safety and find outlets for self-expression" (Hagel-Seymour, 1982: 286) within a prison setting.

Obtaining a precise answer to the question will require further and long-term research, but it is the researcher's sense that the data do suggest that the affirmative AVP environment may, indeed, be conducive to a sense of freedom and safety wherein self-expression can occur.

Although no statistically significant change was reflected in participants' reported levels of trust, empathy or locus of control at posttesting, the participation by the overwhelming majority of both groups in their respective groups' "Trust Lift" exercise and the closely-related strong sense of group cohesiveness following the workshops seem evidence of this. Posttest measurements of trust, however, seem to indicate that the isolated one and one-half hour follow-up session that occurred once a week for six weeks were not sufficient to sustain the deep level of trust evidenced by both groups in the "Trust Lift." In this instance, however, the effectiveness of the AVP program is not the only factor that must be considered. The larger issue is whether deep trust levels can survive in a prison setting.

In a penal environment wherein the social exchange system is based on disparate power, compliance is rewarded and noncompliance is punished (Gouldner, 1970). The relationship between correctional staff and incarcerated individuals, therefore, becomes one of coerced dependency rather than reciprocal sharing. In such an environment, an AVP model of trust based on reciprocal and equal sharing as well as consensus building is, no doubt, perceived to be an anomaly to be aborted.

Indeed, the interactions of the correctional staff with the participants as observed by the researcher in this project reflected a consistent focus on the consequences of either compliance or noncompliance with rules. What is bothersome about this is that research has demonstrated that the moral features of an environment may either stimulate or retard moral growth (Jennings and Kohlberg, 1983; Kohlberg, 1970, 1976, 1981, Reimer and

Power, 1978; Rucker, 1986) and may have a direct impact on the moral decisions made in that environment (Higgins et al., 1984; Rucker, 1986). To be sure, the normative values which were driving the interactions between correctional staff and inmate during this project seemed to be those of a primitive preoccupation with punishment and blind obedience rather than some higher value orientation such as fairness, goodness, mutual obligations, or principles of human rights and responsibilities.

Braswell et al. (1985:160) have demonstrated that an undue emphasis on obedience is counterproductive, and Arbuthnot and Faust (1981:83) posit that individuals develop internalized values and the ability to reason morally only when they have repeated opportunities for independent and dynamic interaction (in the form of decision-making and role-taking) with their environment. If, therefore, the normative structure and value system within a prison is derived from coerced dependency and the most important reason for abiding by prison rules is to avoid punishment, the ability, or even probability, of incarcerated individuals to learn, practice, and embody higher value orientations is impeded. Given that research has demonstrated a moderate correlation between the ability to reason morally and the ability to act morally (Blazi, 1980; Rest, 1986), normative structures within prisons that impede rather than enhance moral development become questionable. Data in this project provide an opportunity to observe the immediate consequences of environments that are conducive to coercive dependency on the one hand or consensual reciprocity on the other.

The security staff of the research site facility exhibited a coercive stance which was bleak, rigid, guarded, inflexible, uncompromising, closed and aloof. Their persistent attempts to dominate and control participants rather than enter into relationships with them seemed to result always in the continuation of a negative cycle of anger, bitterness, mistrust, faulty communication, inflexibility and alienation, propagating seeds of despair rather than hope, negation rather than nurturance, conquest rather than community. The data in this project suggest that both the blind obedience that was demanded and the coercive conflict resolution that was modeled by the correctional staff was destructive rather than constructive in terms of both moral reasoning and moral behavior.

s

d

he

co

a n

yet

ticip

beha

oblig

the b

cerate

decep

empath

Alt

regardi

keeping

AVP wo

sense of

of safety



Even so, the gum-popping incident demonstrated that inmates can, even in a coercive larger environment, understand and apply the principles of moral reasoning to a situation and come to a consensus when they are placed in a life-affirming environment wherein dignity, respect, and personal empowerment are the norm. When invited by the facilitators to find a win/win rather than a coercive, rule-imposed solution to a real-life conflict that erupted in their workshop, participants in the AVP + Skills group reflected their pretest intuitive understanding of the importance of relationality to nonviolence. They were able to change a climate of competition, anger, alienation and entrenchment into one of cooperation and good will. This is in keeping with cognitive developmental theory, which suggests that individuals are able to understand moral reasoning that is above their developmental level as long as it is not too far above that level (Rest, 1969).

The incident also supports Deutch's (1973, 1980-1983) law of social relation in which he maintains that already-existent, conflict-ridden climates can be transformed into cooperative ones if one party acts deliberately (not accidentally) and clearly behaves in a manner incompatible with the sort of relation that is to be changed. The incremental yet steady development of trust and sense of community that emerged among the participants in their respective AVP workshops made it possible for them to reason and behave morally, since the normative structure was one of fairness, goodness, mutual obligation, and principles of human rights and responsibilities. In applying these data to the broader issue of feasibility, the question then becomes: Is it feasible to expect incarcerated individuals to be able to transform their environment of violence, based on threat, deception, suspicion, rigidity and coerced dependency, into one of cooperation, trust, empathy, and mutuality—an affirmative niche.

Although the data from this project did not provide strong, compelling evidence regarding change scores on the measures of trust, empathy and locus of control, in keeping with social learning and cognitive developmental theories, it did reveal that an AVP workshop followed by human sexuality discussions created and maintained a strong sense of group cohesiveness in one group of inmates. Combined with the trust and sense of safety exhibited by the participation of the majority of both groups in the "Trust Lift"

during their respective AVP workshops, this is at least a start. Qualitative research in the form of in-depth interviews prior to and following AVP workshop involvement might produce insights that could be utilized in the development of a program that is more sensitive to the kinds of changes that occur in the AVP experience and that would assist inmates in maintaining the skills learned and the sense of group cohesiveness and trust developed for longer periods of time. This, in turn, might provide insights regarding the most productive, long-term goal of correctional policy as well as the role of correctional staff vis-à-vis incarcerated individuals.

Arbuthnot and Faust (1981) suggest a dynamic and free exchange between individuals and their environments is central to the development of internalized values. If, as Braswell et al. (1985) suggest, undue emphasis on obedience impedes the development of internalized values, then correctional policies that facilitate internalized values and, thus empowerment must be considered seriously. Within the parameters of such a policy, management strategies and normative structures that are conducive to mutuality and consensual reciprocity rather than coercive dependency would take precedence.

Since participants in this project were all volunteers, future research might examine the issue of volunteerism in the prison setting (e.g., who volunteers, are certain normative environments more conducive to volunteerism than others, does participation in a program such as AVP facilitate participation in other prison programs). It is the researcher's sense that one aspect of the AVP experience that renders it so important and potent in the prison setting is that it might enable and encourage individuals to either create their own strategies for growth or make better use of already-existent programs within the prison setting. This is an important area for future research.

## **APPENDICES**

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Description of Weekly AVP Sessions**

#### **AVP + Skills Group**

**(One, one and one-half hour session per week)**

##### **Session 1**

**Agenda Review**  
**Gathering**  
**Transforming Power Guidelines**  
**L & L**  
**Clear Communication Crossfire**  
**Closing**

##### **Session 2**

**Agenda Review**  
**Gathering**  
**Image a Better Community**  
**L&L**  
**Role play with negative response**  
**to "I" statement**  
**Closing**

##### **Session 3**

**Agenda Review**  
**Gathering**  
**Unexpected Upsets (Short statement**  
**by one person to another; person**  
**must use "I" statement; use**  
**observer)**  
**L&L**  
**Closing**

##### **Session 4**

**Agenda Review**  
**Gathering**  
**Creativity/Self Expression**  
**(create rhythm/chants as unit)**  
**Surprise Attacks (Role plays with rude**  
**characters harrassing participants;**  
**must use "I" statements)**  
**L&L**  
**Up Close (Concentric Circles with**  
**topics appropriate to what**  
**women shared on first day.)**  
**Closing**

##### **Session 5**

**Agenda Review**  
**Role Plays (Brainstorm issues and**  
**get volunteers)**  
**L&L**  
**Role Play #2**  
**Cross Currents (Brainstorm insults;**  
**one person fires insult across**  
**circle to another participant;**  
**person must use "I" statement**  
**to open response.)**  
**Closing**

##### **Session 6**

**Agenda Review**  
**Gathering**  
**Try Again! (Double-chair roles of some**  
**instance in which you forgot to**  
**use transforming power, practice**  
**the way you would have like the**  
**scene to have happened)**  
**L&L**  
**Let's Take Stock (Reflection of how we're**  
**doing and where we go from here)**  
**Closing**

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Listing of Evaluative Instruments**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Instrument</b>
<b>Empathy</b>	<b>Mehrabian and Epstein's Measure</b>
<b>Trust</b>	<b>Rotter's Interpersonal Trust Scale</b>
<b>Locus of Control</b>	<b>Rotter's I, P, and C Scales</b>
<b>Moral Reasoning</b>	<b>Social Reflection Questionnaire</b>
<b>Skills</b>	<b>Recognition Test of Conflict Resolution Skills</b>
<b>Skills</b>	<b>Production Test of Conflict Resolution Skills</b>
<b>Seeking Win/Win Solutions</b>	<b>Experimental Game</b>
<b>Maladaptive Aggression</b>	<b>Experimental Game</b>
<b>Group Dynamics</b>	<b>Hemphill's Index of Group Dimensions</b>
	<b>Group Dimensions Descriptions Dynamics</b>
	<b>Questionnaire</b>
<b>Conceptual Nonviolence</b>	<b>Conceptual Objective Measure of</b>
	<b>Nonviolence as Concept</b>

### **Mehrabian and Epstein's Measure of Empathy**

This is a questionnaire to find out what different people think about different statements. Please read each statement and circle the response that you think tells how you feel about that statement. If you strongly agree with a statement, circle "strongly agree." If you agree, circle "agree." If you disagree, circle "disagree." If you strongly disagree, circle "strongly disagree."

1. It makes me sad to see a lonely stranger in a group.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
2. People make too much of the feelings and sensitivity of animals.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
3. I often find public displays of affection annoying  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
4. I am annoyed by unhappy people who are just sorry for themselves.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

5. I become nervous if others around me seem to be nervous.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
6. I find it silly for people to cry out in happiness.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
7. I tend to get emotionally involved with a friend's problems.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
8. Sometimes the words of a love song can move me deeply.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
9. I tend to lose control when I am bringing bad news to people.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
10. The people around me have a great influence on my moods.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
11. Most foreigners I have met seemed not to have any feelings.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
12. I would rather be a social worker than work in a job training center  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
13. I don't get upset just because a friend is acting upset.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
14. I like to watch people open presents.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
15. Lonely people are probably unfriendly.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
16. Seeing people cry upsets me.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
17. Some songs make me happy.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
18. I really get involved with the feelings of the characters in a novel.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
19. I get very angry when I see someone being ill-treated.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree
20. I am able to remain calm even though those around me worry.  
strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

21. When a friend starts to talk about his/her problems, I try to steer the conversation to something else.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

22. Another's laughter is not catching for me.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

23. Sometimes at the movie I am amused by the amount of crying and sniffing around me.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

24. I am able to make decisions without being influenced by people's feelings.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

25. I cannot continue to feel OK if people around me feel depressed.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

26. It is hard for me to see how some things upset people so much.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

27. I am very much upset when I see an animal in pain.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

28. Becoming involved in books or movies is a little silly.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

29. It upsets me to see helpless old people.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

30. I become more irritated than sympathetic when I see someone's tears.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

31. I become very involved when I watch a movie.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

32. I often find that I can remain cool in spite of the excitement around me.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

33. Little children sometimes cry for no apparent reason.

strongly agree   agree   disagree   strongly disagree

# Rotter's Locus of Control Scales

Prisoner No. \_\_\_\_\_

Listed below are some commonly held opinions. There are no right and wrong answers. You will probably agree with some and disagree with others. Read each statement carefully and circle which response tells how you feel about it. If you strongly disagree, circle +3. If you agree somewhat, circle +2. If you agree just a little bit, circle +1. If you disagree just a little bit, circle -1. If you disagree somewhat, circle -2. If you strongly disagree, circle -3.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree somewhat	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree somewhat	Strongly agree
1. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
2. To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
3. I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
4. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on how good a driver I am.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
5. When I make plans, I am almost certain to make them work.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
6. Often there is no chance of protecting my personal interests from bad luck happenings.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
7. When I get what I want, it's usually because I'm lucky.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
8. Although I might have good ability, I will not be given leadership responsibility without appealing to those in positions of power.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
9. How many friends I have depends on how nice a person I am.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
10. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
11. My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
12. Whether or not I get into a car accident is mostly a matter of luck.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3

(cont.)



(cont.)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree somewhat	Slightly disagree	Slightly agree	Agree somewhat	Strongly agree
13. People like myself have very little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
14. It's not always wise for me to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
15. Getting what I want requires pleasing those people above me.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
16. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends on whether I'm lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
17. If important people were to decide they didn't like me, I probably wouldn't make many friends.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
18. I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
19. I am usually able to protect my personal interests.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
20. Whether or not I get into a car accident depends mostly on the other driver.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
21. When I get what I want, it's usually because I worked hard for it.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
22. In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
23. My life is determined by my own actions.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
24. It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many friends.	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3

## Rotter's Interpersonal Trust Scale

Prisoner No. \_\_\_\_\_

This is a questionnaire to find out what different people think about different statements. Please read each statement carefully and then circle the response that tells best how you feel about that statement. If you strongly agree, circle "strongly agree." If you agree, circle "agree." If you agree and disagree, circle "agree/disagree." If you disagree, circle "disagree." If you strongly disagree, circle "strongly disagree."

1. Most people would rather live in a climate that is mild all year around than in one in which winters are cold.

strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

2. It seems like people are becoming less and less sincere in our society.

strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

3. It is better to be on guard with strangers until they have proven that they can be trusted.

strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

4. This country has a dark future unless we can attract better people into politics.

strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

5. It is fear of disgrace or punishment that keeps most people from breaking the law.

strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

6. Parents usually can be relied upon to keep their promises.

strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

7. The advice of older people is often not very good because older people don't recognize how times have changed.

strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

8. Cheating would probably increase during tests if the teacher was not present.

strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

9. Countries will never be able to work together to keep world peace.

strongly agree   agree   equally   disagree   strongly disagree

10. Parents and teachers are likely to say what they believe and not what is good for children to hear.

strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

11. Most people can be counted on to do what they say they will do.

strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

12. Pe  
stro

13. Th  
stro

14. I  
str

15. S  
st

16.  
really

17

18  
get

19

12. People in our country don't seem to do what is right anymore.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
13. The court system treats everybody fairly and equally.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
14. In spite of what people may say, most of us are mainly interested in our own welfare.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
15. The future seems very promising.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
16. Reporters often report the news like they would like for it to be rather than the way it really is.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
17. It is more confusing than helpful to get advice from a lot of different people.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
18. Most people who run for political office are really sincere in the promises they make to get you to vote for them.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
19. There is no simple way of deciding who is telling the truth.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
20. The schools in this country are not good at all anymore.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
21. It is hard to find newspapers, radio stations or TV stations that report things the way they really happen.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
22. It is more important to be a happy person than a great person.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
23. We can count on most experts to tell us when they don't know the answer to something we might ask them.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
24. Most parents who threaten to punish will punish.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
25. One should not attack the beliefs of someone else.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
16. We have to stay alert or someone will take advantage of us.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

27. Teachers and parents need to guide children more than they do.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
28. Most rumors are mostly true.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
29. Many national sports contests are fixed on way or another.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
30. A good leader is willing to stand up for what he/she believes in and not just go along with the crowd.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
31. Most judges are sincere and practice what they preach.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
32. Most salesmen are honest in describing their products.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
33. Education in this country is not really preparing young men and women to deal with the problems of the future.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
34. Most student sin school would not cheat even if they were sure of getting away with it.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
35. The many homeless people in this country are going to be able to find jobs and homes soon.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
36. Most repairman will not overcharge for their services.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
37. Many of the insurance claims filed against insurance companies are phony.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
38. One should not attack the religious beliefs of another.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree
40. If we really knew what was going on in worldwide politics, we would probably be very worried about the future.  
strongly agree   agree   agree/disagree   disagree   strongly disagree

### **Instrument Developed by Researcher**

**Facilitator passes out forms to participants and then describes the exercise.**

**I am going to describe several short conflict situations to you. Each situation that I describe could end in violence for the people involved if the conflict is not handled carefully.**

**After I have described one scenario to you, I will ask you to imagine that you are one of the characters. The objective is to resolve this conflict without using violence but also without letting the other person walk all over you. You are to write what you would say to the other person in the conflict to reduce tension between you.**

**So, it's very simple. After I have described a conflict, you will write on your paper what you would say if that situation was really happening to you and you were trying your dead level best to respond without using violence.**

**Let me give you an example.**

**Jane has been standing in line for 45 minutes to return a blouse that doesn't fit. Just as she gets to the window, the clerk says that he has to go to lunch and will be back in an hour.**

**Jane is FURIOUS since she only has an hour for lunch. She broke her neck getting here this lunch hour since this store is all the way across town from where she works. She will not be able to come back for three weeks because her car was just put in the shop for body work. There is no bus that goes to the store.**

**REMEMBER, THE IDEA IS TO HANDLE THE SITUATION NONVIOLENTLY**  
**Imagining that you are Jane, what would you say to the clerk when he tells you that he will be back in an hour?**

**You say: \_\_\_\_\_**

**After each conflict scenario has been read aloud, write a one- sentence response that you think will open lines of communication and/or reduce tension.**

**Other conflicts.**

**1. Carol finishes reading her book and walks away from where she has been working and leaves the light on. Sue has asked Carol a thousand times to turn off the light when she is finished using it. Sue is sitting across the room from Carol and sees Carol get up and leave the room without turning off the light.**

**Sue is steaming. She is the one who has to pay the bills since Carol is not working right now.**

**Sue says to Carol: \_\_\_\_\_**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Anna is sitting in a quiet corner trying to think. She has just gotten a letter from her best friend saying that her friend's daughter has disappeared. Anna is feeling very sad and low and just needs some time to herself. A new woman who she has seen in the yard a couple of times comes over to her unexpectedly, sits down right beside her and drops some contraband into her lap. This is the last thing that Anna wants to deal with right now; not only is she feeling miserable about her friend's daughter but she also just got off toplock. She doesn't have any energy to deal with any hassle.

Anna says: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

3. Martha keeps telling racist jokes. Helen just walked into the kitchen and Martha says something very ugly about the new white cook. Helen has had enough of these remarks because she believes that, although people may come in different colors, underneath it all, we're really all the same. She has never said anything to Martha about the jokes but she can't stand it anymore.

Helen says: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

4. Joy is sitting on a bus and a very old woman is sitting in front of her. The old woman is wearing old torn clothes and Joy guesses that she hasn't had a bath in weeks -- her hair is all matted down and her coat smells like old dirty socks. A group of school children have just gotten on the bus and are all jeering and laughing at the old woman. They all start holding their noses and calling her ugly names.

Joy stands up and says: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

5. Flo has just finished work and is ready to go back to her unit. A man dressed in an expensive business suit and carrying a briefcase comes unexpectedly around the corner and accidentally knocks into her. He glares at Flo and yells: "Why were you standing in the way? Don't you people ever do anything right?" Flo recognizes the person as a parole board member.

Flo says: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

S  
W  
c

to  
pat  
bit

L  
-  
-



6. Aggie's bunkie has just used Aggie's ONLY white sweater without asking. She wore it to the ball game, got ketchup on it, and put it back in Aggie's locker without saying anything. Aggie has planned to wear the sweater tonight and has nothing else clean to wear. When she finds the dirty sweater, Aggie walks over to her bunkie.

Aggie says: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

7. Mary's six-year-old niece has just broken Mary's favorite lamp. Mary spanked the child even though she knew that her sister does not believe in hitting anyone, particularly children. Mary has had arguments about this with her sister dozens of times but her sister insists that there are better ways of teaching children than hitting them. Mary's sister comes home after work and her daughter tells her that Mary spanked her.

Mary's sister says: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

8. The warden loves plants and flowers. She has gone on a vacation and asked May to water her plants while she is gone. When she gets back, she finds that all of the plants are dry as a bone, and dead. When the warden sees May the next time

The warden says: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

9. Alma is standing on the corner waiting for the light to change. She hears a child screaming and turns around. A woman in the laundromat is beating a little boy with a stick. Without even thinking twice, Alma rushes into the laundromat to try to protect the little child. As the woman raises the stick again,

Alma says: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

10. Pris is a black woman. She is walking across the yard and three white women start to walk toward her. As they pass, one of the women steps in front of Pris, blocking her path. The woman puts her hands on her hips and says in a very threatening voice, "Black bitch." Looking the woman right in the eyes,

Pris says: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

### **Instrument Developed by Researcher**

The facilitator hands out response sheets and then says:

O.K. now. We are going to do some more work with these conflict scenarios. This time I'm, going to read the conflict and role- play two possible responses. I want each of you to decide which response is likely to lead to further conflict and just make things worse.

Let's go back to the example we used at the beginning and I'll show you what I mean.

Remember Jane has been standing in line for 45 minutes to return a blouse that doesn't fit. Just as she gets to the window, the clerk says that he has to go to lunch and will be back in an hour.

Jane is FURIOUS since she only has one hour for lunch. She broke her neck getting here this lunch hour since this store is all the way across town from where she works. She will not be able to come back for three weeks because her car was just put in the shop for body work. There is no bus that goes to the store.

Now, I want you to imagine that you are the STORE CLERK. I am going to role-play two possible responses that Jane could make when the clerk tells her that he is leaving for lunch. Imagining that you are the store clerk, which response that Jane makes to you would most likely make matters worse instead of better? Mark on your sheet of paper which one you think would lead to more conflict and possibly violence.

Response No. 1: Look! I've been standing here for 45 minutes and you tell me you're going to lunch? Do you thin I'm stupid or something? I'm the customer here; it's your job to wait on me, not my job to wait on you!!

Response No. 2P: I feel very frustrated when I've been waiting for 45 minutes to see you and you just up and leave. I feel that you don't have any respect for me as a paying customer.

O.K., want me to role-play them again?

Now, circle the response on your paper that you think would lead to MORE conflict rather than less; i.e., Response No. 1 or Response No. 2.

Now, lets do the real thing. I'll read the conflict, role-play the responses, and you mark which response you think will probably only lead to more conflict and make matters worse.

1. Carol finishes reading her book, walks away from where she has been working, and leaves the light on. Sue has asked Carol a thousand times to turn off the light when she is finished using it. Sue is sitting across the room from Carol and sees Carol get up and leave the room without turning off the light.

Carol is steaming. She is the one who has to pay the bills since Sue is not working right now.

Carol says:

Response No. 1: (Read very condescendingly) Sue, you always leave things undone. I am surprised that you can make through the day without getting lost. Someone always has to take care of you because you just simply can't seem to do things right. It is not surprising to me that you have left the light on AGAIN. What do you have to say?

Response No. 2: Sue, I feel very angry when you leave the light on because I am the one that has to pay these enormous light ills.

Circle the response which could possibly lead to more conflict and make matters worse.

2. Anna is sitting in a quiet corner trying to think. She has just gotten off toplock and has a parole board hearing coming up in two weeks. A new woman who Anna has seen in the yard a couple of times comes over to her unexpectedly, sits down right beside her, and drops some contraband into her lap. This is the last thing that Anna wants to deal with right now; she has told this woman in the past that she doesn't want to have anything to do with this stuff.

Anna says:

Response NO. 1: Look. I really feel very annoyed when you insist on pushing that stuff on me because I have too much to lose. Leave me alone!

Response No. 2: Look. You keep pushing that stuff on me and somebody is going to get hurt!! Leave me alone!!

Circle the response which would be more likely to lead to more conflict and only make matters worse.

3. Martha keeps telling racist jokes. Helen just walked into the kitchen and Martha says something very ugly about the new white cook. Helen has had enough of these remarks because she believes that, although people may come in different colors, underneath it all, we're really all the same. Helen has never said anything to Martha before about the jokes but she can't stand it any longer.

Helen says:

Response No. 1: Martha. You always say the worse things about people. I'm SICK of hearing your racist comments.

Response No. 2: Martha. I really feel uncomfortable when you put white people down because I feel that they are my brothers and sisters.

4. Joy is sitting on a bus and a very old woman is sitting in front of her. The old woman is wearing old torn clothes and Joy guesses that she hasn't had a bath in weeks -- her hair is all matted down and her coat smells like old dirty socks. A group of teenagers have just gotten on the bus and are all jeering and laughing at the old woman. They all start holding their noses and calling her ugly names.

Joy stands up and says:

Response No. 1: I feel very bad when you make fun of this woman because I feel that when we put each other down, we MAKE the world an ugly place which it doesn't have to be.

Response No. 2: Listen here, you brats! I wish your Mamas could see you now. They'd never allow this. You're nothing but a bunch of rif-raff and you're worthless. Leave her alone!!

5. Flo has just finished work and is ready to go back to her unit. A man dressed in an expensive business suit and carrying a briefcase comes unexpectedly around the corner and accidentally knocks into her. He glares at Flo and yells: "Watch where you're going.

Don't you people ever do anything right?" Flo recognizes this man; he is a Parole Board member.

Response No. 1: Flo bites her tongue and says nothing, seething inside.

Response No. 2: I feel confused that you are angry because I feel that this was an accident and has nothing to do with doing something "right" or "wrong." Are you hurt?

6. Aggie's bunkie has just used Aggie's ONLY white sweater without asking. She wore it to the ball game, got ketchup on it, and put it back in Aggie's locker without saying anything. Aggie has planned to wear the sweater tonight and has nothing else clean to wear. When she finds the dirty sweater, Aggie walks over to her bunkie and says:

Response No. 1: You're really getting to me! You're inconsiderate, rude, sneaky and dishonest. Not only did you NOT ask if you could use my sweater, but you didn't even have the decency to wash it after you got it filthy!!

Response No. 2: I feel angry when you take my things without asking because I feel that I can't trust you now.

7. Mary's sister's six-year-old daughter has just broken Mary's favorite lamp. Mary spanked the child even though she knew that her sister does not believe in hitting anyone, particularly children. Mary has had arguments about this with her sister dozens of times, but her sister insists that there are better ways of teaching children than hitting them. Mary's sister comes home after work and her daughter tells her that Mary spanked her.

Mary's sister says to Mary:

Response No. 1: Look! You keep your hands off my child. You are becoming a real pain in the neck and I'm sick of it. Who do you think you are? I'm her mother, not you!

Response No. 2: I feel angry that you spanked Sissy because I feel that you have ignored my feelings.

8. The warden loves plants and flowers. She has gone on a vacation and asked May to water her plants while she was gone. When she gets back, she finds that all of the plants are dry as a bone, and dead. When the warden sees May the next time, she says:

Response No. 1: You're going to have to take more responsibility with your life than you did with my plants. I trusted you' you've totally let me down and you are a real disappointment.

Response No. 2: I feel really bad that you didn't water the plants because I feel that you let me down.

9. Alma is standing on the corner waiting for the light to change. She hears a child screaming and turns around. A woman in the laundromat is beating a little boy with a stick. Without even thinking twice, Alma rushes into the laundromat to try to protect the child. As the woman raises the stick again, Alma says:

Response No. 1: What kind of a witch are you, beating this child? You want to spank him, spank him, but don't stand there and beat him. What kind of a mother are you?

**Response No. 2: Damn it, woman. How can I help you? When you beat him that way I feel so SAD because I KNOW you're just trying to get rid of that shit and frustration that is boiling inside you. Tell me how I can help you. What do you need? What can I do?**

**10. Pris is a black woman. She is walking across the yard and three white women start to walk toward her. As they pass, one of the women steps in front of Pris, blocking her path. The woman puts her hands on her hips and says in a very threatening voice, "Black bitch." Looking the woman right in the eyes, Pris says:**

**Response No. 1: Who the fuck do you think you are? You white trash. I'll kill you. Get out of my way.**

**Response No. 2: Ummm. Pleased to make your acquaintance, too. I am, indeed, black. I feel really bad that you lump me in with the whole group of other people who are black because who I am gets lost in the cracks that way and it's hard for us to get to know each other as people. My name is Pris.**

**Response form:**

**After each conflict scenario has been role-played, Lila is going to role-play two possible responses. Circle the response which you think would probably lead to more conflict or possibly even violence. If you think Response No. 1 will lead to more violence, circle Response No. 1. If you think Response No. 2 will lead to more violence, circle Response No. 2.**

- 1. Response No. 1   Response No. 2**
- 2. Response No. 1   Response No. 2**
- 3. Response No. 1   Response No. 2**
- 4. Response No. 1   Response No. 2**
- 5. Response No. 1   Response No. 2**
- 6. Response No. 1   Response No. 2**
- 7. Response No. 1   Response No. 2**
- 8. Response No. 1   Response No. 2**
- 9. Response No. 1   Response No. 2**
- 10. Response No. 1   Response No. 2**

## Instrument Developed by Researcher

Prisoner No. \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe in your own words what nonviolence means to you. You can do this by simply listing words, writing a paragraph, writing a story, or whatever you feel like doing. It's your choice.

### Evaluation:

Please read each item carefully and circle the response that best describes the group that you are in:

1. The group has well understood but unwritten rules concerning member conduct.

Mostly True	True	Can't Decide	Mostly False	False
----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-------

2. Group members fear to say what they really think or feel.

Mostly True	True	Can't Decide	Mostly False	False
----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-------

3. Only certain kinds of ideas can be said freely in the group.

Mostly True	True	Can't Decide	Mostly False	False
----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-------

4. A group member can leave the group by resigning at any time she wishes.

Mostly True	True	Can't Decide	Mostly False	False
----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-------

5. A request made by a member to leave can be refused.

Mostly True	True	Can't Decide	Mostly False	False
----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-------

6. A member has the chance to get to know all other members of the group.

Mostly True	True	Can't Decide	Mostly False	False
----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-------

7. Members are not in close enough contact with each other to develop likes or dislikes for each other.

Mostly True	True	Can't Decide	Mostly False	False
----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-------

8. All members know each other very well.

Mostly True	True	Can't Decide	Mostly False	False
----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-------

9. The opinions of all members are considered as equal.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

10. Facilitators hold a higher status in the group than others.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

11. The group is controlled by the actions of a few members.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

12. Every member of the group enjoys the same group privileges.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

13. Certain members of the group have more influence on the group than others.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

14. Each group member has as much power as any other member.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

15. Members are not happy about most of what the group does.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

16. Members always gripe about the work they do in the group.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

17. A feeling of failure is very strong in the group.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

18. There are a lot of times when the group laughs together.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

19. Members gain a feeling of being honored by being seen as a member of this group.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

20. Failure of the group would mean nothing to group members.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

21. Certain group members are hostile to other members.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

22. There is constant quarreling among members of the group.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

23. Members know that each one looks out for the other one as well as for herself.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

24. Certain group members have no respect for each other.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

25. Members of the group work together as a team.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

26. There are tensions among a few members that tend to interfere with the group's activities.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

27. Certain members don't seem to be able to work as a part of the group.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False

28. There is a lot of participation by members in activities.

Mostly		Can't	Mostly	
True	True	Decide	False	False



## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **Alternatives to Violence Project, Inc. (AVP)**

- 1985     **AVP Manual Basic Course. Alternatives to Violence Project, 15 Rutherford Place, New York, NY 10003.**

### **Anchor, K.N. and H.J. Cross**

- 1974     **Maladaptive aggression, moral perspective, and the socialization process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 30 (1): 163-168.**

### **Angell, S.**

- 1988     **The Alternatives to Violence Project, Inc. Fellowship (March).**

### **Anthony, E.J.**

- 1959     **An experimental approach to the psychopathology of childhood autism. British Journal of Medical Psychology 32:18-37.**

### **Arbuthnot, J.B.**

- 1984     **Moral Reasoning Development Programmes in Prison: Cognitive-developmental and critical reasoning approaches. Journal of Moral Education 13 (2):112-123.**

### **Arbuthnot, J.B. and D. Faust**

- 1981     **Teaching Moral Reasoning: Theory and Practice. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.**

### **Arbuthnot, J.B. and D.A. Gordon**

- 1986     **Behavioral and cognitive effects of a moral reasoning development intervention for high-risk behavior disordered adolescents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 54 (2): 108-216.**

### **Arbuthnot, J.B., D.A. Gordon and G.J. Jurkovic**

- 1987     **Personality, in Handbook of Juvenile Delinquency, H. C. Quay (ed.). New York: Wiley and Sons.**

### **Arbuthnot, J.B., D. Gordon, D. Martin and G. Gotthardt**

- 1983     **Immediate and long-term effectiveness of a sociomoral development program with behavior-disordered adolescents. Paper presented to the 10th Annual Meeting of the Society of Police and Criminal Psychology, Cincinnati, OH.**

### **Aspy, D.**

- 1972     **Toward a technology for humanizing education. Champaign, IL: Research Press.**

### **Bachara, G.H.**

- 1976     **Empathy in learning disabled children. Perceptual and Motor Skills 43: 541-542.**

**Bandura, A.**

- 1969 Social learning of moral judgements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 11: 275-279.

**Bandura, A.**

- 1973 *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

**Blasi, A.**

- 1980 Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin* 88: 1-45.

**Bonacich, P.**

- 1976 Secrecy and solidarity. *Sociometry* 39: 200-208.

**Borke, H.**

- 1971 Interpersonal perception of young children: Egocentrism or empathy. *Developmental Psychology* 5: 262-269.

**Braswell, M., S. Dillingham, and R. Montgomery (eds)**

- 1985 *Prison Violence and America*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.

**Brock, T.C. and A.H. Buss**

- 1962 Dissonance, aggression and evaluation of pain. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 65: 197-202.

**Bukstel, L.H. and P.R. Killmann**

- 1980 Psychological effects of imprisonment on confined individuals. *Psychological Bulletin* 88: 469-493.

**Campbell, D.T. and J.C. Stanley**

- 1963 Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching, in N.L. Gage (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

**Chandler, M.J.**

- 1980 Egocentrism and antisocial behavior: The assessment and training of social perspective-taking skills. In R.R. Ross and P. Gendreau (eds.), *Effective Correction Treatment*. Toronto: Butterworths.

**Chandler, M., S. Greenspan and C. Barenboim**

- 1973 Judgments of intentionality in response to videotaped and verbally presented moral dilemmas: The medium is the message. *Child Development* 44: 315-332.

**Chandler, M.J.**

- 1972 Egocentrism in normal and pathological child development. In F. Monks, W. Hartup and J. DeWitt (eds.) *Determinants of Behavioral Development*. NY: Academic Press.

- Coulton, R.  
1981 Person-environment fit. *Social Work* 26: 26-35.
- Crowne, D.P. and D. Marlowe  
1964 *The Approval Motive: Studies in Evaluative Dependence*. New York: Wiley
- deCharms, R.  
1968 *Personal Causation: The Internal Affective Determinants of Behavior*. NY: Academic Press.
- Deutsch, F. and R.A. Madle  
1975 *Empathy: Historical and current conceptualizations and a cognitive theoretical perspective*. *Human Development* 18: 267-287.
- Deutsch, M.  
1973 *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Deutsch, M.  
1980 *Fifty years of conflict*. In L. Festinger (ed.) *Retrospections on Social Psychology*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Deutsch, M.  
1983 *The prevention of World War III: A psychological perspective*. *Political Psychology* 4 (1): 3-31.
- Eisenberg, N.  
1982 *The development of reasoning about prosocial behavior*. In N. Eisenberg (ed.) *Development of Prosocial Behavior*. NY: Academic Press.
- Eisenberg, N. and P.A. Miller  
1987 *The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors*. *Psychological Bulletin* 101 (1): 91-119.
- Elkind, D.  
1967 *Egocentrism in adolescence*. *Child Development* 4: 1025-1034.
- Elms, A.C.  
1967 *Role playing, incentive, and dissonance*. *Psychological Bulletin* 68: 132-148.
- Feffer, M.H.  
1970 *A developmental analysis of interpersonal behavior*. *Psychological Review* 77: 197-214.
- Fleetwood, R.S. and T.S. Parish  
1976 *Relationship between moral development test scores of juvenile delinquents and their inclusion in a moral dilemma discussion group*. *Psychological Reports* 39: 1075-1080.

**Friedman, P.H.**

- 1972     **The effects of modeling, roleplaying and participation on behavior change.**  
           In B.A. Maher (ed.), *Progress in Experimental Personality Research*, Vol.  
           VI. New York: Academic Press.

**Frodi, A. J. Macaulay, and R. Thome**

- 1977     **Are women always less aggressive than men? A review of the experimental**  
           **literature. *Psychological Bulletin* 84: 634-660.**

**Fromme, Erich**

- 1956     **The Art of Loving. New York: Harper and Row**

**Gabarro, J.J.**

- 1978     **The development of trust, influence, and expectations. In A.G. Athos and J.J.**  
           **Gabarro (eds.) *Interpersonal Behavior: Communications and Understanding***  
           **in Relationships. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.**

**Gardner, H.**

- 1972     **The Quest for Mind. NY: Alfred A. Knoph.**

**Gavaghan, M.P., K.D. Arnold and J.C. Gibbs**

- 1983     **Moral judgment in delinquents and nondelinquents: Recognition vs. produc-**  
           **tion measures. *Journal of Psychology* 114:267-274.**

**Gelles, R.J. 1973**

- Child abuse as psychopathology: A sociological critique and reformulation.**  
           ***American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 43: 611-621.**

**Gendreau, P. and R.R. Ross**

- 1987     **Revivification of rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980s. *Justice Quarterly***  
           **4 3: 349-396.**

**Gibbs, J.**

- 1977     **Kohlberg's stages of moral judgment: A constructive critique. *Harvard***  
           **Educational Review 77: 43-61.**

**Gibbs, J., K.D. Arnold, H.A. Ahlborn and F.L. Cheesman**

- 1987     **Facilitation of sociomoral reasoning in delinquents. *Journal of Consulting***  
           **and Clinical Psychology**

**Gibbs, J.C. and K.F. Widaman**

- 1982     **Social Intelligence: Measuring the Development of Sociomoral Reflection.**  
           **Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.**

**Gil, D.C.**

- 1968     **Incidence of child abuse and demographic characteristics of person involved. In R.E. Helfer and C.H. Kempe (eds.), The Battered Child. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.**

**Gil, D.C.**

- 1970     **Violence Against Children. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.**

**Gilligan, C.**

- 1974     **Fostering moral development in children. Educational Development Center News 4: 7-10.**

**Gittleman, M.**

- 1965     **Behavior rehearsal as a technique in child treatment. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry 6: 251-255.**

**Glaser, D.**

- 1976     **Correctional Research: An Elusive Paradise. In R.M. Carter and L.T. Wilkins (eds.), Probation, Parole and Community Corrections. NY: Wiley.**

**Glass, D.C. and J.E. Singer**

- 1972     **Urban Stress: Experiments on Noise and Social Stressors. NY: Academic Press.**

**Glass, D.C., J.E. Singer and L. Friedman**

- 1969     **Psychic cost of adaptation to an environmental stressor. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 12: 200-210.**

**Gottfredson, S.D. and S. McConville (eds)**

- 1987     **America's Correctional Crisis. NY: Greenwood Press.**

**Gouldner, Alvin W.**

- 1970     **The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. New York: Basic Books, Inc.**

**Gough, H.G.**

- 1948     **A sociological theory of psychopathology. American Journal of Sociology 53: 359-366.**

**Griffore, R.J. and D.D. Samuels**

- 1978     **Teaching medical ethics: The cognitive-developmental approach. Journal of Psychology 100: 3-7.**

**Hackler, J.C.**

- 1978     **Dangers of political naivete and excessive complexity in evaluating delinquency prevention programs. Evaluation and Program Planning 1: 178-283.**

**Hagan, F.E.**

- 1982      **Research Methods in Criminal Justice and Criminology.** NY: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc.

**Hagel-Seymour, J.**

- 1982      **Environmental sanctuaries for susceptible prisoners.** In R. Johnson and H. Toch (eds.), **The Pains of Imprisonment.** Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

**Hall, R.T. and J.U. Davis**

- 1975      **Moral Education in Theory and Practice.** Buffalo: Prometheus.

**Heise, D.R.**

- 1975      **Causal Analysis.** NY: Wiley.

**Hickey, J.F.**

- 1972      **The effects of guided moral discussion upon youthful offenders' level of moral judgment.** Dissertation Abstracts 33: 1551A (University Microforms No.72-25438).

**Higgins, A., C. Power and L. Kohlberg**

- 1984      **The relationship of moral atmosphere to judgments of responsibility.** In W. Kurtines and J. Gewirtz (eds.), **Morality, Moral Behavior, and Moral Development.** NY: John Wiley & Sons.

**Hoffman, M.L.**

- 1977      **Moral internalization: Current theory and research.** In L. Berkowitz (ed.), **Advances in Experimental Social Psychology**, Vol 10. NY: Academic Press.

**Hogan, R.**

- 1969      **Development of an empathy scale.** *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 33: 307-316.

**Huston, T.L.**

- 1983      **Power.** In H.H. Kelley et al., **Close Relationships.** New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

**Iannotti, R.J.**

- 1975      **The nature and measurement of empathy in children.** *The Counseling Psychologist* 5: 21-25.

**Iannotti, R.J.**

- 1985      **Naturalistic and structural assessments of prosocial behavior in preschool children: The influence of empathy and perspective taking.** *Developmental Psychology* 21: 46-55.

**Ilfeld, F.W.**

- 1970      **Environmental theories of environment. In D.N. Daniels, M.S. Filula, and F.M. Ochberg (eds.), Violence and the Struggle for Existence. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.**

**Into, E.C.**

- 1969      **Some possible childrearing antecedents of interpersonal trust. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Connecticut.**

**Jaffe, Y., N. Malamuth, J. Feingold and S. Feshback**

- 1974      **Sexual arousal and behavioral aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 30: 759-764.**

**Jennings, W., A. Higgins, and C. Power**

- 1980      **Centerpoint Regional Adolescent Program, Preliminary Program Evaluation: Resident Behavior and Thinking Program Atmosphere, and Parent Perceptions, Center for Moral Education, Harvard University.**

**Jennings, W.S., R. Kilkenney, and L. Kohlberg**

- 1983      **Moral development theory and practice for youthful and adult offenders. In W.S. Laufer and J.M. Day (eds.), Personality Theory, Moral Development, and Criminal Behavior. Toronto: Lexington Books.**

**Jennings, W.S. and L. Kohlberg**

- 1983      **Effects of a just community program on the moral development of youthful offenders. Journal of Moral Education 12: 35.**

**Johnson, R.**

- 1987      **Hard Time: Understanding and Reforming the Prison. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.**

**Johnson, R. and H. Toch**

- 1982      **The Pains of Imprisonment. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.**

**Jones, R.A.**

- 1985      **Research Methods in the Social and Behavioral Sciences. Sunderland, Mass: Sinauer Associates, Inc.**

**Jurkovic, G.J.**

- 1980      **The juvenile delinquent as a moral philosopher: A structural- developmental perspective. Psychological Bulletin 88: 709-727.**

**Kantner, J.E.**

- 1976      **The relationship between moral judgment and personality variables in adult offenders. Dissertation Abstracts International (36): 5262B-5263N (Univeristy Microfilms No. 76-7088).**

**Katz, H.A. and J.B. Rotter**

- 1969 Interpersonal trust scores of college students and their parents. *Child Development* 40: 657-661.

**Kazdin, A.E., E. Esveltd-Dawson, N.H. French and A.S. Unis**

- 1987 Problem-solving skills training and relationship therapy in the treatment of antisocial child behavior. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 55: 76-85.

**Keasey, C.B.**

- 1973 Experimentally induced changes in moral opinions and reasoning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 26 (1): 30-38.

**Keilitz, I. and N. Dunivant**

- 1986 The relationship between learning disability and juvenile delinquency: Current state of knowledge. *Remedial and Special Education* 7 (3): 18-26.

**Kelley, H.H., E. Bercheid, A. Christensen, J.H. Harvey, T.L. Huston, G. Levinger, E. McClintock, L.A. Peplau, and D.R. Peterson**

- 1983 *Close Relationships*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

**Kelman, H.C.**

- 1961 Processes of attitude change. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 25: 57-78.

**Kerlinger, F.N.**

- 1973 *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. 2nd Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

**Kohlberg, L.**

- 1958 The development of modes of moral thinking and choice in the ages ten to sixteen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago.

**Kohlberg, L.**

- 1969 Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (ed), *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

**Kohlberg, L.**

- 1970 The moral atmosphere of the school. In N. Overly (ed.), *The Unstudied Curriculum: Its Impact on Children*. Washington, D.C. Monograph of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

**Kohlberg, L.**

- 1972 *Proceedings of the Conference on Psychology and the Process of Schooling in the Next Decade: Alternative Conceptions Leadership Training Institute*. U.S. Office of Education. M.C. Reynolds.



**Kohlberg, L.**

- 1972a A cognitive-developmental approach to moral education. *The Humanist* 32 (6): 13-16.

**Kohlberg, L.**

- 1973 Moral development workshop. Laboratory of Human Development, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

**Kohlberg, L.**

- 1976 Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (ed.), *Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues*. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

**Kohlberg, L.**

- 1981 *Essays on Moral Development: The Philosophy of Moral Development, Vol. 1*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

**Kohlberg, L., K. Kaufmann, P. Schard and J. Hickey**

- 1975 The just community approach to corrections: A theory. *Journal of Moral Education* 4 (3): 243-260.

**Kohlberg, L. and R. Kramer**

- 1969 Continuities and discontinuities in childhood and adult moral development. *Human Development* 12: 93-120.

**Kohut, H.**

- 1971 *The Analysis of Self*. NY: International Universities Press.

**Kronick, D.**

1978

- An examination of psychosocial aspects of learning disabled adolescents. *Learning Disability Quarterly* 1: 86-93.

**Kuhn, D.**

- 1976 Short-term longitudinal evidence for the sequentiality of Kohlberg's early stages of moral judgment. *Developmental Psychology* (12): 162-166.

**Kurtines, W. and E.B. Grief**

- 1974 The development of moral thought: Review and evaluation of Kohlberg's approach. *Psychological Bulletin* 81: 453-470.

**Laing, R.D.**

- 1969 *The Divided Self*. New York: Pantheon

**Larson, K.A.**

- 1988 Remediating problem solving skills. *Journal of Correctional Education* 39 (2): 70-74.

**Larson, K.A.**

- in press A review and alternative explanation of the link between learning disabilities and delinquency. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*.

**Larson, K.A. and M.M. Gerber**

- 1987 Effects of social metacognitive training for enhancing overt social behavior in LD and low-achieving delinquents. *Exceptional Children* 54 (3): 210-211.

**Lee, F.**

- 1976 A study of sex differences in locus of control, tennis, expectancy for success and tennis achievement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon.

**Lefcourt, H.M.**

- 1982 *Locus of Control: Current Trends in Theory and Research* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

**Lerner, J.W.**

- 1981 *Learning Disabilities: Theories, Diagnosis, and Teaching Strategies* (3rd ed.). Dallas: Houghton Mifflin Co.

**Lerner, R.M.**

- 1986 *Human Development. Second Edition.* New York: Random House.

**Levenson, H.**

- 1973 Perceived parental antecedents of internal, powerful others, and chance locus of control orientations. *Developmental Psychology* 9:260-265.

**Levenson, H.**

- 1974 Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of internal-external control. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 38: 377-383.

**Levenson, H.**

- 1981 Differentiating among internality: Powerful others and chance. In H.M. Lefcourt (ed.), *Research with the Locus of Control Construct*. New York: Academic Press.

**Levine, L., and M.L. Hoffman**

- 1975 Empathy and cooperation in 4-year-olds. *Developmental Psychology* 11: 533-534.

**Levitt, L. and W. Viney**

- 1973 Inhibition of aggression against the physically disabled. *Perceptions of Motor Skills* 36: 255-258.

**Lickona, T. (ed.)**

- 1976 *Moral Development and Behavior: Theory, Research, and Social Issues.* NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

**Lickona, T.**

- 1983 *Raising Good Children from Birth Through The Teenage Years.* NY: Bantam Books.

**Lindskold, S., B. Betz, and P.S. Walters**

- 1986 Transforming competitive or cooperative climates. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 30 (1): 99-114.

**Lipinski, D.P., J.L. Black, R.O. Nelson and A.R. Ciminero**

- 1975 Influence of motivational variables on the reactivity and reliability of self-recording. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 43: 637-646.

**Lochman, J.E., J.B. Lampron, P.R. Burch, and J.F. Curry**

- 1985 Client characteristics associated with behavior change for treated and untreated aggressive boys. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 13: 527-538.

**MacKenzie, D.L. and L.I. Goodstein**

- 1986 Stress and the control belief of prisoners: A test of three models of control-limited environments. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 16: 209-228.

**Mackenzie, D.L., L.I. Goodstein, and D.C. Blouin**

- 1987 Personal control and prisoner adjustment: An empirical test of a proposed Model. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 24 (1): 49-68.

**Mahoney, M.J.**

- 1971 A residential program in behavior modification. Paper presented at the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy. Washington, D.C., September.

**Maier, H.**

- 1969 *Three Theories of Child Development.* NY: Harper & Row.

**Mann, L. & I.L. Janis**

- 1968 A follow-up study on the long term effects of emotional role playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 8: 339-342.

**Marcus, R.F., E.J. Roke and C. Bruner**

- 1985 Verbal and nonverbal empathy and prediction of social behavior in young children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 60: 199-309.

**Martin, M.**

- 1968 A Role-taking Theory of Psychopathy. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1968, No. 68-11, 957).

**Maskin, M.B.**

- 1976 The differential impact of work-oriented vs. communication- oriented juvenile correction programs upon recidivism rates in delinquent males. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 32 (2): 432-433.

**McDougal,**

- 1985 Foreword. In M.S. Braswell et al., *Prison Violence and America*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Company.

**Megargee, E.I., and B. Cadow**

- 1980 The ex-offender and the 'monster' myth. *Federal Probation* 44 (1): 24-37.

**Mehrabian, A. and N. Epstein**

- 1972 A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality* 40: 523-543.

**Mischel, W. and R. Mischel**

- 1976 A cognitive social-learning theory approach to morality and self-regulation. In T. Lickona (ed.), *Morality: Theory, Research, and Social Issues*. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

**Moir, J.**

- 1974 Egocentrism and the emergency of conventional morality in preadolescent girls. *Child Development* 45: 299-304.

**Moos, R.**

- 1975 *Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings*. NY: John Wiley and Sons.

**Muson, H.**

- 1979 Moral thinking: Can it be taught? *Psychology Today* (Feb).

**Neil, T.C.**

- 1980 *Interpersonal Communications for Criminal Justice Personnel*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

**Ostrom, T.M., C.M. Steele, L.K. Roosenblood, and H.L. Mirels**

- 1980 Modification of delinquent behavior. In R.R. Ross and P. Gendreau (eds.), *Effective Correctional Treatment*. Toronto: Buttersworth.

**Ouderkirk, W.**

- 1984      **Developmental Problems in Adolescence.** In W. Ouderkirk (ed.), **On the Line of Child Care: An Entry Level Training Curriculum for Residential Child Care Workers.** State Univeristy of New York at Albany.

**Papalia, E.E.**

- 1972      **The status of several conservation abilities across the life span.** *Human Development* 15: 229-243.

**Patchen, M.**

- 1987      **Strategies for eliciting cooperation from an adversary.** *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 31 (1): 164-185.

**Parlett, T.A., J.D. Ayers and D.M. Sullivan**

- 1975      **Development of morality in prisoners.** In *The Teaching of Values in Canadian Education*, Yearbook of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, June.

**Peck, M.S.**

- 1978      **The Road Less Traveled.** New York: Simon and Schuster.

**Peters, R.S.**

- 1971      **Moral developments: A plea for pluralism.** In T. Mischel (ed.), *Cognitive Development and Epistemology.* NY: Academic Press.

**Peterson, D.R.**

- 1983      **Conflict.** In H.H. Kelley et al., *Close Relationships.* New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

**Phares, E.J.**

- 1976      **Locus of Control in Personality.** Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

**Phares, E.J.**

- 1988      **Introduction to Personality.** Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.

**Piaget, J.**

- 1932      **The Moral Judgment of the Child.** NY: Keegan Paul Trench.

**Piaget, J.**

- 1970      **Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child.** NY: Grossman Publishers.

**Pruitt, D.G. and M.J. Kimmel**

- 1977      **Twenty years of experimental gaming: Critique, synthesis, and suggestions for the future.** *Annual Review of Psychology* 28:363-392.

**Raven, B.H.**

- 1965      **Social influence and power.** In I.D. Steiner & M. Fishbein (eds.), *Current Studies in Social Psychology*. New York: Holt.

**Ravitch, D.**

- 1973      **Moral education and the schools.** *Commentary* 56: 62-70.

**Reimer, J. and C. Power**

- 1978      **Moral atmosphere: An educational bridge between moral judgment and moral action.** In W. Damon (ed.), *Moral Development: New Directions for Child Development*, No. 2. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

**Rest, J.**

- 1969      **Hierarchies of Comprehension and Preference on a Developmental Stage Model of Moral Thinking,** Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.

**Rest, J.R.**

- 1986      **Moral Development Advances in Research and Theory.** NY: Praeger.

**Rest, J., M.L. Davison and S. Robbins**

- 1978      **Age trends in judging moral issues: A review of cross- sectional, longitudinal and sequential studies of the defining issues test.** *Child Development* (49): 263-279.

**Rest, J.R., E. Turiel, and L. Kohlberg**

- 1969      **Level of moral development as a determinant of preference and comprehension of moral judgments made by others.** *Journal of Personality* (37): 225-252.

**Rickel, A., A.K. Eshelman, and G.A. Loigman**

- 1986      **Prescriptions for a new generation: early life interventions.** *American Journal of Community Psychology* 14: 1-15.

**Rivlin, A.M.**

- 1971      **Systematic Thinking for Social Action.** Washington, D.C. Brookings Institution.

**Rogers, C.R.**

- 1975      **Empathic: An unappreciated way of being.** *Journal of Counseling Psychology* (5): 2-10.

**Rosenkoetter, L., S. Landman and S. Mazak**

- 1980      **Use of moral discussion as an intervention with delinquents.** *Psychological Reports* (16): 91-94.

**Rosenthal, T.L. and B.J. Zimmerman**

1977      **Social Learning and Cognition. NY: Academic Press.**

**Ross, R.R. and E.A. Fabiano**

1985      **Time to Think: A Cognitive Model of Delinquency Prevention and Offender Rehabilitation. Johnson City, Tenn: Institute of Social Sciences and Arts, Inc.**

**Ross, R. R. and P. Gendreau**

1980      **Effective Correctional Treatment. Toronto: Butterworths.**

**Rotter, J.B.**

1966      **Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs 80, Whole No. 609.**

**Rotter, J.B.**

1967      **A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. Journal of Personality 35: 651-665.**

**Rotter, J.B.**

1971      **Generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. American Psychologist 26: 443-452.**

**Rotter, J.B.**

1975      **Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 43: 56-67.**

**Rucker, L.**

1986      **Moral judgments of responsibility within an adolescent detention facility. Unpublished Master's thesis. Michigan State University.**

**Sarbin, T.R.**

1954      **Role theory. In G. Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley.**

**Satir, V.**

1972      **Peoplemaking. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, Inc.**

**Schaeff, Anne Wilson**

1987      **When Society Becomes Addict. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers**

**Schlaefli, A. J.R. Rest and J.J. Thoma**

1985      **Does moral education improve moral judgement? A meta-analysis of intervention studies using the Defining Issues Test. Review of Educational Research, (55): 319-352.**

**Seguin-Tremblay, G. and M. Kiely**

- 1979     **Development du jugement moral chez l'adolescente en reeducation. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science 11: 32-44.**

**Seeman, M.**

- 1963     **Alienation and social learning in a reformatory. American Journal of Sociology 69: 170-284.**

**Seeman, M. and J.W. Evans**

- 1962     **Alienation and learning in a hospital setting. American Sociological Review 27: 772-783.**

**Selman, R.L.**

- 1971     **The Relevancy of Role Taking to the Development of Moral Judgment in Children. Child Development 42: 79-91.**

**Seymour, J.**

- 1977     **Niches in prison. In H. Toch (ed.), Living in Prison: The Ecology of Survival. NY: Free Press.**

**Seymour, J.**

- 1980     **Niches in prison: Ameliorative environments within maximum security correctional institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, Albany.**

**Staub, E.**

- 1978     **Positive Social Behavior and Morality: Social and Personal Influences, Vol. 1. NY: Academic Press.**

**Stewart, J.S.**

- 1975     **The school as a just community: A transactional-developmental approach to moral education. Presentation to the Moral Educational Division of the Philosophy of Education Society annual meeting, Kansas City, MO.**

**Strickland, B.R.**

- 1977     **Internal-external control of reinforcement. In T. Bass (ed.), Personality Variables in Social Behavior. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.**

**Sutton, L.E.**

- 1972     **An investigation of invariant sequence in a cognitive- developmental theory of moral development. Masters thesis, Connecticut College.**

**Thompson, L.A.**

- 1968     **Role playing ability and social adjustment in children. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1968, No. 69-4547.**



- Toch, H.  
1975 **Men in Crisis: Human Breakdowns in Prison.** Chicago: Aldine.
- Toch, H.  
1977 **Living in Prison.** NY: Free Press.
- Toch, H. (ed.)  
1980 **Therapeutic Communities in Corrections.** NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Toch, H.  
1981 **Inmate classification as a transaction.** *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 14: 931-946.
- Tomlinson-Keasey, C.  
1972 **Formal operation in females from eleven to fifty-four years of age.** *Developmental Psychology* 6: 364.
- Turiel, E.  
1966 **An experimental test of the sequentiality of developmental stages in the child's moral judgments.** *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 3: 611-618.
- Turiel, E., C. Edwards and L. Kohlberg  
1978 **Moral development in Turkish children, adolescents and young adults.** *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 9: 75-85.
- Turiel, E. and G.R. Rothman  
1972 **The influence of reasoning or behavioral choices at different stages of moral development.** *Child Development* 43: 741-756.
- Valzelli, L.  
1981 **Psychobiology of Aggression and Violence.** New York: Raven Press.
- Ventis, W.L.  
1976 **Moral development in delinquent and non-delinquent males and its enhancement.** Paper presented to Southeastern Psychological Association, 1976. Available from author, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.
- Wallston, K.A., B.S. Wallston & R. DeVellis  
1978 **Development of the multidimensional health locus of control (MHLC) scales.** *Health Education Monographs* 6:160-170.
- Walton, R.E.  
1968 **Social and Psychological Aspects of Verification, Inspection and International Assurance.** Lafayette: Purdue University.

**Wertham, F.**

- 1966     **A Sign for Cain: An Exploration of Human Violence. NY: The MacMillan Company.**

**Wormith, J.S.**

- 1984     **Attitude and behavior change of correctional clientele. Criminology 22 (4): 595-618.**

**Wright, N.**

- 1979     **An Organizational Approach to Correctional Effectiveness. Johesboro, TN: Pilgrimage.**

**Wright, K.N.**

- 1985     **Developing the prison environment inventory. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 22 (3): 257-277.**

**Wright, K.N.**

- 1986     **An exploratory study of transactional classification. Journal of Research in crime and Delinquency 25 (4): 326-348.**

**Wright, T.L., T. Holman, W. Steele and G. Silverstein**

- 1980     **Locus of control and mastery in a reformatory: A field study of defensive externality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 38: 1005-1013.**

**Zukotynski, G.E. and H. Levenson**

- 1976     **Perceptions of control by the elderly in a relocation environment. Unpublished manuscript.**

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293009141080