

152211

INMATE ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE DURING SHOCK INCARCERATION

Doris Layton MacKenzie

National Institute of Justice
and
Louisiana State University

James W. Shaw

Louisiana State University

152211

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by
Public Domain/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

NCJRS

JAN 5 1995

ACQUISITION

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Chicago, Ill., 1988.

This investigation was supported in part by Grant #87-IJ-CX-0020 from the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice to the Louisiana State University for a cooperative project with the Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections (LDPSC). Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Thanks are expressed to LDPSC personnel who served on the Advisory Board and who helped with data collection and to the offenders who volunteered to participate in the study.

INMATE ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE DURING SHOCK INCARCERATION

Abstract

The prison adjustment, expectations, and attitudes of offenders participating in a shock incarceration program were compared to offenders who dropped out of the program and to a comparable group of offenders serving their sentence in a regular prison. There was some evidence that prior to beginning the program dropouts from shock incarceration had less prosocial attitudes than those who continued in the program. Shock incarceration offenders differed from those in the regular prison in their adjustment to prison, in their attitudes, and in the changes in these over time. In comparison to regular prison inmates, they were more positive about their prison experience, their ability to make positive changes in their lives and in general prosocial attitudes. It was concluded that for those who voluntarily continued in the program there was evidence of positive change during shock incarceration. Future research should examine whether these changes are related to performance during parole.

INMATE ADJUSTMENT AND CHANGE DURING SHOCK INCARCERATION

Shock incarceration is an alternative to a standard prison sentence in which offenders spend a short period of time in prison in a "boot camp" type atmosphere. The similarity among various shock incarceration programs is the short period of time served in prison in an environment emphasizing discipline, military drills and physical training. The specific components, such as the length of stay, counseling and educational programs, release decision-making, and follow-up surveillance vary widely among jurisdictions with shock incarceration programs (Parent, 1988; MacKenzie, Gould, Riechers and Shaw, 1988). Although the specific components vary there is some consistency in the goals of the programs. The major goal is a reduction in overcrowding in prisons. A second goal is to change offenders; the major change desired is a reduction in criminal behavior.

The first shock incarceration programs began in the early 1980s in Georgia and Oklahoma. By 1987, approximately 40 percent of the state correctional jurisdictions either had programs, were in the process of developing programs, or were seriously considering programs (Parent, 1988). The popularity of these programs appears to be the result of several forces. Foremost is the serious prison overcrowding now occurring in a majority of the states. The shorter period of time in prisons for those entering shock incarceration programs gives hope for a reduction

in the numbers of offenders in prison. Another reason for the general acceptance of these programs is the expectation that the future criminal behavior will be reduced for those experiencing shock incarceration. Some people believe this reduction in criminal behavior will occur because of the punishment and retributive aspects of shock incarceration. Others believe the programs have positive benefits which will lead to a reduction in offending. From the latter perspective it is assumed that the offender will change as a result of experiences during shock incarceration, and this change will be demonstrated by fewer criminal activities upon release.

The study reported here is part of a larger study of shock incarceration in Louisiana examining changes, occurring at both the system and the individual level, which can be attributed to shock incarceration. This paper examines the changes that occur in offenders participating in the shock incarceration program during their time in prison and compares these to a similar group of offenders who are serving their sentences in a regular prison. It is anticipated that prior to any changes in behavior upon release, there will be internal changes occurring during the incarceration phase. If shock incarceration is to have an influence on later behavior and be an improvement over regular prison, the changes during incarceration for those in the programs should be different than for those serving regular sentences. A follow up to this study will examine the performance of these offenders once they are released on parole.

There are several differences between inmates in prison and those in shock incarceration programs which might be hypothesized in regard to their adjustment and reactions to the experience. Previous research with prison inmates suggests that prison adjustment might be characterized by four major factors: (1) anxiety, (2) prisonization, (3) misbehavior and (4) passivity (MacKenzie, Goodstein and Blouin, 1987). Differences might be expected among shock incarceration inmates and others in the first three of these factors.

For example, there is evidence that offenders in prison experience a higher level of stress early during their imprisonment than they do later (Sapsford, 1978; Zamble and Porporino, 1988). Shock incarceration programs are modelled after military boot camps, and are assumed to be demanding both physically and emotionally. Therefore it is anticipated that in comparison to offenders serving their time in a regular prison environment, offenders in shock incarceration programs will experience higher levels of stress early during their incarceration. This distress should be reflected in higher levels of reported anxiety for those in shock incarceration and, for both groups, this anxiety should decline with increased time in prison.

Increased conflicts with other offenders is another variable that may be associated with stress. In previous research, offenders reported a lower level of conflicts with others (MacKenzie and Goodstein, 1986) and fewer angry episodes (Zamble

and Porporino, 1988) early during their confinement in comparison to the level they reported three or four months later. In these studies, the level of conflicts and angry episodes remained the same for the next year or two of incarceration. The consistency in reports of conflicts with others from three months to two years led MacKenzie and Goodstein (1986) to conclude that the uncertainty of the early period of time in prison may act to inhibit the normal level of conflicts for this population in this situation.

Since the behavior of offenders in the shock incarceration programs is carefully controlled, they are not expected to have high levels of conflict with others in comparison to the levels reported by regular prison inmates. In contrast, those serving regular prison sentences are expected to have lower levels of conflict early in their time in prison but to exhibit an increase in conflicts with increased time in prison.

Another change that is expected to be associated with length of time in prison for the shock incarceration inmates is in their attitudes toward the prison and staff. Early in the program it is anticipated that these offenders will be extremely negative towards the staff and the program, later they are expected to become more positive about the program which should be reflected in their attitudes about prison and their experiences. This would be in direct contrast to findings from previous studies of prisonization in which offenders became more prisonized with increased time in prison (Goodstein and Wright, in press).

This change to positive attitudes reflects a general trend that is expected in the shock inmates, a trend towards more prosocial attitudes. Not only are the offenders expected to become more positive towards the program but also they are expected to generally become more positive in their attitudes towards other people and to society in general. There are several reasons for expecting a positive change in the offenders who remain in the shock program. First, they have elected to complete a difficult program, thus, in some sense, it might be expected that they have come to believe in the program.

There are also some components of the program that might be expected to bring about this change. For one, the program may take advantage of the disruption and stress experienced early during incarceration. Zamble and Porporino (1988) argue this time period may be when the offender is particularly vulnerable and susceptible to outside influences. In fact during the early period of time in prison when they reported high levels of emotional discomfort, the offenders in the Zamble and Porporino (1988) study also expressed a desire to change their lives and take advantage of new opportunities. With time in the regular prisons this desire for change, like the symptoms of stress, declined. Programs such as shock incarceration which begin early in the offenders career in prison may take advantage of this opportunity to change the offender.

The type of change will, of course, depend upon the components of the program (MacKenzie, et al, 1988; Parent, 1988).

However, as mentioned, a goal of the shock incarceration programs appears to be an effort to induce a positive change in the attitudes of the participants. One factor that seems to be related to successful adjustment outside of prison is an increase in prosocial attitudes (Cullen and Gendreau, in press). A change toward more prosocial attitudes may be particularly important if the changes that occur during shock incarceration are to be continued after release and are associated with a reduction in recidivism.

Louisiana's Shock Incarceration Program

Shock incarceration programs differ widely, therefore, any evaluation of a program must begin with a description of the specific program being examined. The Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Correction's (LDPSC) Intensive Motivational Program of Alternative Correctional Treatment (IMPACT) is a two-phase shock incarceration program begun in 1987 (LDPSC, 1987). In the first phase of IMPACT offenders are incarcerated for 90 to 180 days in a rigorous boot camp-type atmosphere. Following this period of incarceration, offenders are placed under intensive parole supervision for the second phase of the program.

Those eligible for the program must be first felony offenders, have sentences of seven years or less, and be recommended by the Division of Probation and Parole, the sentencing court and a designee of the LDPSC. Offenders are sentenced to a regular prison term and then may be recommended

for the program. They must volunteer and they may decide at any time to withdraw from the program. They may also be removed from the program for insufficient progress or misbehavior. An offender who leaves the program must serve his or her sentence in the regular prison.

Along with the military training, drill and physical exercise, the incarceration phase of IMPACT involves treatment programs such as ventilation therapy, reeducative therapy, substance abuse education and prerelease education. The staff, who are primarily responsible for the offenders, are called "drill instructors." They are expected to act as models, counselors, and as agents of behavior change through positive reinforcement and support (MacKenzie, Gould, Riechers, Shaw, 1988). Offenders are required to gradually move through stages in the program until they are judged to be ready for graduation, after which they are released to intensive parole supervision.

METHODS

Subjects

There were two groups of subjects used in the present study: An IMPACT group and an incarcerated group.

IMPACT. All 90 offenders entering IMPACT from October 25, 1987 until February 28, 1988 who volunteered to participate in the study were included in the IMPACT sample. (All offenders

asked were willing to participate in the study.) Prior to the end of the IMPACT program 50% of the offenders dropped out (Dropouts) of the program. A total of 86 inmates were tested prior to entering IMPACT, 40 inmates were tested prior to entry and again after 85 days in the program. Offenders were included in the analysis for this report only as long as they remained in the program.

Incarcerated. Forty inmates who were legally eligible for IMPACT but who had received a regular prison sentence were asked to participate in the study. Two (5%) of these refused to participate, and one did not participate because he was being punished. The remaining thirty seven inmates made up the incarcerated sample. Questionnaires were administered to the incarcerated offenders at the diagnostic center at Time 1 and/or if they were in one of the state prisons at Time 2 or Time 3. Nine offenders (24%) were not included in all testings because they were either paroled (11%), being punished (5%), had medical problems (5%) or had been transferred to a community corrections center (3%). A total of 28 of the incarcerated sample were tested at both Time 1 and Time 3 and a total of 20 of the incarcerated sample were tested at both Time 2 and Time 3.¹ Since the small number of women admitted to the IMPACT program prohibited statistical comparisons, only men were chosen for the incarcerated sample.

Procedure

From March until April in 1988, records of all offenders entering the LDPSC diagnostic and reception center were reviewed by the researchers to identify the incarcerated sample. Those who were legally eligible for IMPACT but who had not received the legally required recommendations from any or all three reviewers (see program description) were included in the sample.

Information on demographics, present sentence and crime, and prior criminal justice system experience for both samples was collected from LDPSC inmate records. The demographic information collected was: race, sex, age, IQ and highest grade completed in school. Sentence length, sentence type (probation violation versus new criminal conviction) and current offense type (e.g., burglary, drugs, etc.) of the crime carrying the longest sentence were the variables related to the present sentence. Prior experience with the criminal justice system was categorized using records indicating: Some prior criminal history (yes or no), number of prior incarcerations and age at first arrest.

Self-report information from the samples was collected at three points in time: Time 1 -- immediately upon entrance to the diagnostic center (prior to beginning IMPACT for the IMPACT sample); Time 2 -- two weeks later (approximately week two of IMPACT for the IMPACT sample and after transfer out of the diagnostic center to a prison for the incarcerated sample); and Time 3 -- approximately 85 days later (near the end of the IMPACT program for the IMPACT sample and in a regular prison for the

incarcerated sample). At the last testing offenders in the incarcerated sample, who were in various prisons throughout the state, were brought to several central locations for testing.

The data collected for this study was part of a larger questionnaire administered at the three time periods. The majority of the questions were tape recorded as a public service by a professional radio broadcaster.² For the present study, at Time 1 the questionnaire included the Jesness personality scales and the expectations toward IMPACT scales, at Time 2 the questionnaire included the attitudes toward prison/IMPACT scales and anxiety, conflicts, and aggressiveness scales. The Jesness, the attitudes toward prison/IMPACT, anxiety, conflicts and aggressiveness scales were again administered at Time 3. Each of these instruments is described below.

Instruments

Expectations about IMPACT. Fifteen Likert-type items (response choices strongly agree to strongly disagree) were written to reflect general expectations about the IMPACT program (see Appendix). Two additive scales were formed from these items based on the results of a factor analysis using a varimax rotation. Examination of the eigenvalues and a Scree plot indicated two factors: (1) Beneficial Expectations and (2) Easy Time. Items loading above .40 on each factor were used to form the two additive scales.

The Beneficial Expectations Scale (9 items) reflected expectations that IMPACT would benefit the respondent, a high score on this scale indicates high expectations of obtaining positive benefits from the IMPACT program. The coefficient alpha for this scale was .78, and the inter-item correlation was .28.

Items on the Easy Time scale indicated that electing to enter IMPACT was a choice resulting in an easier sentence whether this was because it was safer, shorter or in general just easier. A high score on this scale indicates a belief that IMPACT is an easy way to do time. Coefficient alpha and the mean inter-item correlation for this scale were .64 and .22, respectively.

Adjustment to Prison. Three scales were used to measure adjustment to prison: State-trait Anxiety, Conflicts with Others and Aggressiveness. Anxiety was used as an indicator of the degree of distress experienced by the offenders. Conflicts and aggressiveness were used to reflect adjustment to prison. There is some indication that conflicts, like anxiety, reflects stress and distress in the offender populations (MacKenzie and Goodstein, 1986; MacKenzie, Goodstein, and Blouin, 1987).

Anxiety was measured with the state version of the State-trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, Gorsuch and Lushene, 1979), a 20 item Likert-type scale with four response choices (not at all to very much so). A high score indicates a high level of reported anxiety.

The Conflicts with Others Scale indicates the frequency and amount of conflict the respondent has had with other prisoners in the past three months. It is a Guttman scale developed by Shoemaker and Hillery (1980) and previously used with prison inmates (Goodstein and Hepburn, 1985; MacKenzie, et. al., 1987; MacKenzie and Goodstein, 1986). Offenders were asked to respond how often in the past week they had been in certain conflict situations with another prisoner. The first situation was: "A discussion in which some disagreement occurred;" items became progressively more serious until the final one: "A situation in which weapons were used or where someone was killed." After each statement there were three response choices (never, once or twice, and daily or almost daily). A high score indicates a high level of conflicts.

Aggressiveness was measured with a 9-item Likert-type scale with five response choices (strongly agree to strongly disagree) which had been identified in factor analyses in previous research with prisonization items (Goodstein and MacKenzie, 1984). Items in this scale are similar to items contained in many prisonization scales (Goodstein and Wright, in press). A high score indicates high aggressiveness in interactions with others (e.g, " You can't let someone push you around because if you do you'll get pushed around from then on" or "You can't really expect people to think much of you if you're willing to back away from trouble.").

Program Attitudes. At Time 2 and Time 3, Likert-type items (strongly agree to strongly disagree) developed by the researchers were given to the inmate volunteers. These items included the previously described expectations about IMPACT. The additional items were written to be general enough to refer to either the prison or the IMPACT experience. For items that included the words "IMPACT" or "in IMPACT" the words were changed to read "prison" or "in here" for the incarcerated sample. Factor analyses of these items for Time 2 indicated three scales (eigenvalues and Scree plots): Victimization, Personal Change, and Staff and Program Attitudes (see Appendix). Items loading above .40 on any factor were used as items in each scale except if an item loaded below .5 on one factor and above .5 on another it was omitted from the factor on which it loaded lower. The eight items in the Victimization Scale refer to fear of getting hurt, safety, and the stress of prison life. The coefficient alpha and mean inter-item correlations for this scale were .76 and .29, respectively.

There were eight items loading above .40 on the personal change factor. A high score on this scale means the offender expects the prison or IMPACT experience to change him or her in a positive manner. For this scale the coefficient alpha = .85 and the mean inter-item correlation = .42.

The third attitude toward prison/IMPACT scale reflected general Staff and Program Attitudes (11 items). A high score on this scale indicated positive attitudes toward the program

(prison or IMPACT) and, in particular, the staff. Coefficient alpha = .82 and the mean inter-item correlation = .34 for this scale.

Prosocial Attitudes. The Jesness Inventory was used to measure the prosocial attitudes of the offenders (Jesness 1983; Jesness and Wedge, 1985). There are 155 true-false Jesness items making up 10 personality scales: Social Maladjustment, Value Orientation, Immaturity, Autism, Alienation, Manifest Aggression, Withdrawal, Social Anxiety, Repression, Denial and Asocial Attitudes Scale. These scales were developed by Jesness to be used with adolescents, however, subsequent research has found that they can be successfully used with adults. The scales were designed to be indexes to measure tendencies predictive of social and personality problems and, in particular, to distinguish delinquents from others in a wide variety of settings. They were specifically designed to be valid measures of short time changes in attitudes. In the present research the items were used to calculate simple additive scales scored so that high values were more prosocial. The items making up each scale are described in Jesness (1983).

Although all 11 of the Jesness scales were administered, of particular interest to this study were the four scales that are most indicative of antisocial attitudes: Social Maladjustment, Alienation, Manifest Aggression and the Asocial Attitudes Scale. The Social Maladjustment Scale is made up of 65 items that

reflect attitudes associated with "inadequate socialization, as defined by the extent to which individuals share the attitudes of persons who do not meet environmental demands in socially approved ways (Jesness, 1983, p3)." The 26 items in the Alienation Scale reflect attitudes of distrust of others and especially towards authority. There are 31 items in the manifest Aggression Scale which reflect "an awareness of unpleasant feelings, especially of anger and frustration; a tendency to react readily with these emotions; and an obvious discomfort concerning the presence and control of these feelings (Jesness, 1983, p4)."

The fourth scale of interest is the Asocial Attitudes Scale formed from the 31 items that are given additional weights in Jesness' Asocial Index. Jesness' work suggests that these are particularly important items reflecting antisocial attitudes. The items also appear to have face validity for antisocial attitudes. For these items coefficient alpha = .79 and the mean inter-item correlation = .11.

RESULTS

The IMPACT offenders were compared with those who dropped out of the program and with the incarcerated to examine whether those who remained in IMPACT were different from the other groups at the first testing.

For the demographic variables there were no significant differences between dropouts and IMPACT nor between the incarcerated and IMPACT in race (32% white, 68% black), sex (97.5% male), IQ ($\underline{M}=78.1$, $\underline{SD}=13.3$), age ($\underline{M}=23.9$, $\underline{SD}=4.4$). There were no differences between IMPACT ($\underline{M}=10.8$, $\underline{SD}=1.5$) and the incarcerated ($\underline{M}=10.1$, $\underline{SD}=1.7$) in education, but there was a borderline difference between the IMPACT group and the dropouts ($\underline{M}=10.1$, $\underline{SD}=1.8$), $t(82.0)=1.92$, $p<.06$ in education.

Approximately the same number of each group entered as probation violators as entered with new criminal convictions (31.9% probation violators). The majority of the entrants entered with convictions of burglary (45%), drug-related offenses (25.4%), or theft (13%) for the crime carrying the longest sentence and this was similar for all three groups. There were no differences between IMPACT ($\underline{M}=49.8$, $\underline{SD}=19.6$) and the incarcerated ($\underline{M}=43.0$, $\underline{SD}=18.2$) but the dropouts had significantly shorter sentences than the IMPACT group ($\underline{M}=41.1$, $\underline{SD}=13.6$), $t(75)=2.37$, $p<.05$.

There were no differences between dropouts and IMPACT nor between the incarcerated and IMPACT in prior history (17.4% had no previous experience with the criminal justice system), nor were there differences in the number who had previously been incarcerated (70.1% had never been in jail or prison before) nor were there differences in the age at first arrest ($\underline{M}=19.5$, $\underline{SD}=3.3$).

In summary, overall the three groups were very similar in demographic and sentence characteristics, and in prior experiences with the criminal justice system. Probably the most notable difference is that those who dropped out of IMPACT had significantly shorter sentences than those who remained in IMPACT.

Expectations about IMPACT

In order to examine whether the dropouts and the IMPACT groups differed prior to entry in their expectations about the IMPACT program, the groups were compared on the two expectation scales. There were no significant differences between the groups on the Easy Time Scale ($\underline{M}=18.7$, $\underline{SD}=4.4$) but on the Beneficial Expectations Scale there was a borderline difference, $t(84)=1.79$, $p<.10$. In comparison to the IMPACT group ($\underline{M}=37.9$, $\underline{SD}=4.8$) the dropouts ($\underline{M}=35.8$, $\underline{SD}=5.8$) expected the experience to be less beneficial.

Adjustment to Prison Analyses¹

MANOVA repeated-measures analyses were run separately with Time as the repeated measure (Time 2 and Time 3), Group (incarcerated versus IMPACT), and the interaction for the three adjustment variables (see Tables 1 and 2). In the analysis with anxiety as the dependent variable there was a significant interaction of time and sample but neither of the main effects were significant (see Table 1 and Table 2). Follow-up univariate

F-tests comparing the groups for level of anxiety at each time period indicated only a borderline difference between the groups at Time 2, $F(1,57)=2.73$, $p<.104$. The IMPACT group tended to be more anxious at this time. There were no differences between groups at Time 3. T-tests of the mean difference between Time 2 and Time 3 for each group indicated no significant change in anxiety for either group.

The interaction of time and group was not significant for conflicts, the main effect of group was significant and the main effect for time was borderline in significance, $F(1,56)=3.35$, $p<.10$. The IMPACT group reported more conflicts than the incarcerated group and, for both groups, the reported conflicts tended to increase with time in prison.

The analysis with aggressiveness as the dependent variable indicated a significant interaction between time and group, and a significant main effect of group, but there was no main effect of time. Overall the IMPACT offenders had less aggressive attitudes than the Incarcerated. Follow-up tests to examine the significant interaction revealed that the difference in aggressive attitudes between the groups was borderline in significance at Time 2, $F(1,58)=3.65$, $p=.061$, and significant at Time 3, $F(1,58)=23.32$, $p<.001$. The test of the mean difference between Time 2 and Time 3 for each group indicated a borderline significant change in aggressiveness for the IMPACT group, $t(39)=-1.75$, $p<.09$, and no significant change in aggressiveness for the incarcerated group.

Program Attitudes

Manova repeated-measures analyses with time as the repeated measure (Time 2 and Time 3), group (IMPACT versus incarcerated) and the interaction were completed separately for the three program attitude scales (see Table 1 and Table 2). The offender groups differed in their program attitudes on the Personal Change Scale and the Staff and Program Scale (see Table 1 and Table 2). The IMPACT group believed more in a possibility of positive personal change while they were in the program and had a more positive attitude toward the staff and the program.

However, for all three program attitude scales there was an interaction between group and time. In each case the IMPACT offenders became significantly more positive in attitudes from Time 2 until Time 3. That is, they believed they would be less victimized, $t(40)=-3.29$, $p<.01$; they would change in a positive way as a result of their experience in the program, $t(40)=-2.8$, $p<.01$; and they felt more positive about the staff and the program, $t(39)=-2.08$, $p<.05$. In contrast during the same time period those in the regular prison tended to feel more victimized, $t(19)=1.88$, $p<.08$ (borderline); they believed even less that anything positive would result from their prison experience, $t(19)=2.17$, $p<.05$; and they felt somewhat more negative about the staff and the programs, $t(19)=1.96$, $p<.07$ (borderline). At Time 2 the groups did not differ on the Personal Change Scale nor on the Victimization Scale but at Time 3 the IMPACT group had significantly more hope for personal

change, $F(1,58)=22.85$, $p<.001$, and were less fearful of being a victim, $F(1,59)=12.66$, $p<.001$. The groups were significantly different in staff and program attitudes at both time periods, $F(1,57)=13.11$, $p<.001$ and $F(1,57)=58.04$, $p<.001$, respectively.

Prosocial Attitudes

Shown in Table 3 are the scores on the 11 Jesness scales for the Dropout, IMPACT and Incarcerated samples at Time 1 (within two weeks of entry to the diagnostic center). One-way ANOVA results for four of the scales (Immaturity, Withdrawal, Social Anxiety, Repression) showed no significant differences in scores for the groups. For six of the scales (Social Maladjustment, Asocial, Value Orientation, Alienation, Manifest Aggression, Denial), including the four scales considered in this study to be the most indicative of antisocial attitudes, there were significant differences between the IMPACT group and both the Dropouts and the Incarcerated. In all of these cases, except for the Denial Scale, the IMPACT group had significantly more prosocial attitudes than the other groups but the Incarcerated and the Dropouts did not differ from each other. For one scale, Autism, the IMPACT group differed significantly only from the Incarcerated. Dropouts were not different from either of the other groups on the Autism scale.

Shown in Table 4 are the scores on the 11 Jesness scales for the incarcerated and the IMPACT inmates at Time 1 (taken immediately upon entry to the diagnostic center) and Time 3

(approximately 85 days later). The results of separate MANOVA repeated-measure analyses with time as the repeated measure (Time 1 and Time 3), group (IMPACT versus incarcerated) and the interaction are shown in Table 5.

As shown in the tables, for seven of the 11 prosocial scales the samples had significantly different attitudes. In all but one of these scales, the Denial, the attitudes of the IMPACT group was more prosocial. There was a significant main effect for time for only the Alienation Scale.

For four scales (Asocial Attitudes, Alienation, Value Orientation and Denial) there were significant interactions between Group and Time and there was a borderline significant interaction for the Social Maladjustment scale, $F(1,64)=3.68$, $p<.06$. From Time 1 to Time 3 the IMPACT group became more prosocial on Asocial Attitudes, $t(39)=2.73$, $p<.05$, Alienation, $t(39)=4.98$, $p<.001$, Value Orientation, $t(39) = 3.22$, $p<.01$ and Social Maladjustment, $t(39)=2.65$, $p<.05$. The IMPACT group changed in the opposite direction (less prosocial) on the Denial Scale. In comparison there were no significant changes during this time period in any of these attitudes in the incarcerated group. As indicated in the previously described tests at Time 1, the IMPACT and the Incarcerated differed in scores on the Asocial Attitudes, Value Orientation, Alienation, Denial, and Social Maladjustment. Univariate F-tests comparing the samples at Time 2 for the scales which had significant interactions indicated that the groups also differed at Time 2 in Asocial Attitudes,

$F(1,64)=20.8$, $p<.001$, Value Orientation, $F(1,65)=23.4$, $p<.001$, Alienation, $F(1,65)=31.1$, $p<.001$, Denial, $F(1,65)=13.0$, $p<.001$ and Social Maladjustment, $F(1,64)=18.02$, $p<.001$.

DISCUSSION

The demographic and criminal history comparisons of the Dropouts, Incarcerated and IMPACT groups suggested the groups were similar on most of these characteristics. However, the prosocial attitude scales indicated some interesting differences in the attitudes of the groups. Those who stayed in the IMPACT program for at least 85 days differed from the incarcerated sample and those who dropped out of IMPACT. Those who stayed in the program had more prosocial attitudes even before they entered. These scales were completed by the offenders a few days before they were either transferred to a prison or entered the IMPACT program. The difference between the incarcerated and the IMPACT samples suggest the possibility that these groups differed before they were chosen for IMPACT. Decision makers who selected offenders for the program may have recognized subtle differences in offenders and given priority to those who were more prosocial. However, this does not explain why the Dropouts also had less prosocial attitudes before they entered the program. They were similar to the incarcerated offenders in having more antisocial attitudes than the IMPACT group on five of the scales. These Dropouts had also been selected for the program, yet they

differed in their attitudes even before they started the program. It may be those who can complete the program must be committed to change and believe in the program in some way that is reflected in more prosocial attitudes. Yet this difference was reflected only marginally on Beneficial Expectations from the program and not at all in the Easy Time Scale.

After 85 days, when the IMPACT offenders have remained in the program and the Incarcerated offenders have been in prison, overall the IMPACT offenders had become more prosocial. During this same time period the Incarcerated group had not changed. Thus they enter prison with more antisocial attitudes and their experience does not change them. The question is whether or not the experience of shock incarceration changed the IMPACT offenders. They were more prosocial than the dropouts and the incarcerated before entering the program and they became even more prosocial during their time in the program. One possibility is that this change would have happened without any influence from the program. From this perspective these offenders were in the process of changing and would continue with or without shock incarceration. Equally or more plausible is the possibility that shock incarceration acted as a catalyst to accelerate the change. If this is true than the self selection through voluntary participation may be an important component of the program. That is, those offenders who are ready to change or are already beginning to become more prosocial in their attitudes may be able to learn what is required of them in the program.

The results of these analyses strongly suggest that the experience of those in the shock incarceration program is different from the experience of those serving their sentence in a regular prison. In comparison to the latter, the shock incarceration inmates are somewhat more anxious at the start of their time in the program, they have more conflicts with others, and they have less aggressive attitudes. They are approximately the same as the others in their fear of being a victim but they are more hopeful about making positive personal changes, and they feel more positive about the staff and program.

Between the time they first enter the program and approximately three months later the inmates in shock incarceration become somewhat less aggressive, and they are less fearful of becoming a victim. At the same time they are more positive about the possibility of personal change and about the staff and program. The inmates serving regular sentences also change in aggression, personal change, and staff and program attitudes, but their change is exactly the opposite of the shock inmates. Those in the regular prison believe less that their experiences will lead to positive personal changes, and they have become somewhat more negative in their attitudes towards the staff and program and in their fear of victimization.

Overall then, for the moment leaving aside the conflicts with others, the experience of the shock inmates appears to be constructive. At the least they are leaving prison with stronger positive feelings about their experiences. In comparison, those

leaving the regular prison appear to have developed more negative attitudes toward their experience in prison. This difference between the groups may indicate an important difference between shock incarceration and other programs involving a short period of incarceration. If the offenders were locked up and mixed with the general population they may develop more negative attitudes during their time in prison. In contrast, shock incarceration, a program which separates participants from others, in a program involving them fully from morning to night, which emphasizes discipline and self change, may result in a more constructive experience and positive change.

Another issue of importance is the higher stress the shock inmates appear to experience early during the program. Rather than interpreting this as a disadvantage, as proposed by Zamble and Porporino (1988) this stress may actually facilitate the other changes that occurred. Thus one successful aspect of shock incarceration may be that the program does begin when offenders are in a period of emotional distress when they are susceptible to change.

The prison adjustment of the incarcerated inmates was measured once when they first moved from the diagnostic center to a prison and again approximately three months later when they were still in the regular prison. Between these two time periods their level of anxiety increased. This was in contrast to Zamble and Porporino's (1988) finding of a decrease in anxiety with increased time in prison. Their concomitant negative changes

toward their prison experience may demonstrate a difficult situation that becomes progressively worse early during their prison stay particularly for these nonviolent, first-felony offenders.

Surprisingly in comparison to the regular prisoners the IMPACT offenders report more conflicts with others, both groups reported more conflicts over time, but the IMPACT inmates continued to have more conflicts than the incarcerated. The one similarity between the two groups in their adjustment to prison and attitudes toward their experience is the tendency toward an increase in conflicts with others over the three month period.

It must be noted that the level of conflicts varies from disagreements between the responder and other prisoners once or twice in a three month period to "discussions in which some anger occurred". Thus these are relatively minor conflicts with others. It may be that because of the tension created by the strict atmosphere of the IMPACT program there are more disagreements between inmates. The initial newness of the situation for both groups may inhibit some of the conflicts.

The results of this research can be tentatively interpreted as indicating positive changes for offenders participating in shock incarceration. Those who leave shock incarceration have more positive attitudes in regard to their experience in prison, towards society in general and toward their ability to make positive personal change. This is not the experience of those who spend their time in a regular prison as has been shown in

previous research and with the incarcerated in this research. It would appear that the shock offenders are leaving prison with a much better chance of being successful on parole. That, of course, will be our focus in future research with these samples.

REFERENCES

- Cullen, J. and P. Gendreau, In press. Inmate adjustment to prison. In The American Prison: Issues in Research and Policy, L.I. Goodstein and D.L. MacKenzie (eds). New York: Plenum.
- Goodstein, L.I. and J. Hepburn. 1985. Determinate Sentencing and Imprisonment: A Failure of Reform. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Goodstein, L.I. and D.L. MacKenzie, 1984. Racial Differences in adjustment patterns of prison inmates: Prisonization, conflict, stress and control. In The Criminal Justice system and Blacks, D.E. Georges-Abeyie (Ed). New York: Clark Boardman.
- Goodstein, L.I. and K. Wright. In press. Inmate adjustment to prison. In The American Prison: Issues in Research and Policy, L.I. Goodstein and D.L. MacKenzie (eds). New York: Plenum.
- Jesness, C.F. 1983. The Jesness Inventory (rev. ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Jesness, C.F. and R.F. Wedge. 1985. Jesness Inventory Classification System. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections. 1987. IMPACT: Purposes, Policies and Procedures. Baton Rouge, LA.
- MacKenzie, D.L. and L.I. Goodstein. 1986. Stress and control beliefs 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.S. Blouin. 1987. Personal control and Prisoner adjustment: An empirical test of a proposed model. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 24: 49-68.
- MacKenzie, D.L., L. Gould, L. Riechers and J.W. Shaw. 1988. Shock Incarceration in Louisiana: A Review of the First Year. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, San Francisco, CA.
- Parent, D. 1988. Shock incarceration programs. Address to the American Correctional Association Winter conference, Phoenix, AZ.
- Sapsford, R.J. 1978. Life-sentence prisoners: psychological changes during sentence. British Journal of Criminology 18:128-145.
- Shoemaker, D.J. and G.A. Hillery Jr. 1980. Violence and commitment in custodial settings. Criminology 18:94-102.

Spielberger, C.D., R.L. Gorsuch and R.E. Lushene 1970 Manual for the State-trait Anxiety Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Zamble E. and F.J. Porporino. 1988. Coping, Behavior, and Adaptation in Prison Inmates. New York: Springer-Verlag.

NOTES

¹ Fewer were tested at Time 2 because they were being transferred to various locations throughout the state. At Time 3, offenders were brought by LDPSC to several central locations for testing.

² Special thanks are extended to Dave Prince and radio station WJBO for their help in recording questions used in this study.

³ No data from Dropouts were included in the analyses of changes from Time 2 to Time 3 because most of those who dropped out did so before Time 2 data collection.

Table 1. Mean scores on the adjustment to prison scales and the program attitude scales for the IMPACT and the Incarcerated samples at two time periods.

	IMPACT		Incarcerated	
	Time 2 M(SD)	Time 3 M(SD)	Time 2 M(SD)	Time 3 M(SD)
Adjustment to Prison				
Anxiety ^a	50.6(9.6)	48.1(9.2)	46.2(10.0)	49.8(11.1)
Conflicts ^c	8.8(2.0)	9.3(1.9)	7.6(1.5)	8.2(2.2)
Aggressiveness ^{ac}	26.8(5.8)	28.3(5.2)	23.6(6.5)	21.7(4.5)
Program Attitudes				
Victimization ^c	20.7(5.8)	17.7(4.4)	19.7(4.6)	22.6(6.1)
Personal Change ^{ac}	13.8(4.4)	11.9(3.7)	16.1(6.2)	19.1(8.0)
Staff & Program ^{ac}	22.9(6.4)	20.8(4.4)	29.9(8.0)	33.6(8.6)

Note: High scores on aggressiveness mean low levels of aggressiveness.

- a Interaction of Time X Sample significant at $p < .05$
- b Time main effect significant at $p < .05$
- c Sample main effect significant at $p < .05$

Table 2. Results of separate MANOVA repeated-measures analyses with Group (IMPACT vs. Incarcerated), Time and the Interaction for the program attitude scales and adjustment to prison scales.

Dependent Variable	Group		Time		Interaction	
	MS	F(df)	MS	F(df)	MS	F(df)
<u>Adjustment to Prison</u>						
Anxiety	48.7	.35(1,57)NS	9.0	.18(1,57)NS	246.3	4.8 (1,57)*
Conflicts	36.5	6.6 (1,56)*	6.6	3.4 (1,56)NS	.13	.07(1,56)NS
Aggressiveness	630.5	13.8 (1,58)***	1.2	.08(1,58)NS	77.7	5.1 (1,58)*
<u>Program Attitudes</u>						
Victimization	97.6	2.6(1,58)NS	.005	.00(1,58)NS	227.7	13.7(1,58)***
Personal Change	576.8	14.2(1,58)***	8.2	.58(1,58)NS	161.0	11.4(1,58)**
Staff & Program	2531.0	42.6(1,57)***	15.2	.60(1,57)NS	219.2	8.7(1,57)**

* Significant at $p < .05$
 ** Significant at $p < .01$
 *** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 3. Mean scores and F ratios on prosocial scales for the IMPACT, Dropout, and Incarcerated Groups.

Scales	Dropouts n=45	IMPACT n=40	Incarcerated n=35	F(df)	P<
Social					
Maladjustment ^a	98.4	103.9	97.2	5.64(2,117)	.01
Asocial ^a	43.5	46.6	42.6	6.46(2,118)	.01
Value					
Orientation ^a	60.3	64.2	58.9	5.77(2,119)	.01
Immaturity	74.3	74.3	74.1	NS	—
Autism ^b	46.0	47.3	45.1	3.92(2,118)	.05
Alienation ^a	39.5	41.8	38.7	5.78(2,119)	.01
Manifest					
Aggression ^a	47.9	50.9	48.0	3.6 (2,119)	.05
Withdrawal	34.2	35.7	34.1	2.74(2,119)	.07
Social Anxiety	35.5	36.0	36.2	NS	—
Repression	23.9	23.9	24.0	NS	—
Denial ^a	28.8	26.4	28.5	6.13(2,118)	.01

^a Both Dropout and Incarcerated Samples are significantly different from IMPACT at $p < .05$

^b The only significant difference ($p < .05$) is between IMPACT and the Incarcerated.

Table 4. Mean scores on prosocial scales for IMPACT and Incarcerated samples prior to entering shock incarceration or prison and approximately 85 days later.

	IMPACT		Incarceration	
	Time 1 M(SD)	Time 3 M(SD)	Time 1 M(SD)	Time 3 M(SD)
Prosocial Attitudes				
Social				
Maladjustment ^c	103.9(8.9)	106.4(8.2)	97.3(10.5)	96.7(10.3)
Asocial ^{ac}	46.6(5.2)	48.2(4.5)	42.6(6.1)	42.3(5.8)
Alienation ^{abc}	41.8(3.9)	44.4(3.7)	38.8(4.8)	38.9(4.2)
Manifest				
Aggression ^{ac}	50.9(5.3)	50.9(4.7)	48.1(6.5)	47.6(5.3)
Value				
Orientation ^c	64.2(6.7)	66.6(5.4)	59.4(7.9)	59.3(7.1)
Immaturity	74.3(3.9)	75.5(3.8)	74.9(4.2)	75.3(3.2)
Autism ^c	47.3(3.5)	47.5(2.7)	44.9(3.5)	45.0(4.1)
Withdrawal	35.7(3.4)	35.7(3.1)	34.1(3.3)	34.6(3.6)
Social Anxiety	36.0(3.7)	36.1(3.7)	36.2(4.2)	36.5(4.6)
Repression	23.9(3.0)	23.7(2.9)	24.5(3.3)	24.7(3.0)
Denial ^{ac}	26.4(3.0)	25.4(2.7)	28.3(3.9)	28.6(4.5)

- a Interaction of Time X Sample significant at $p < .05$
 b Time main effect significant at $p < .05$
 c Sample main effect significant at $p < .05$

Table 5. Results of separate MANOVA repeated-measures analyses with Group (IMPACT vs. Incarcerated), Time and the Interaction for the prosocial attitude scales.

Dependent Variable	Group		Time		Interaction	
	MS	F(df)	MS	F(df)	MS	F(df)
<u>Prosocial Attitudes</u>						
Social						
Maladjustment	2093.3	13.7 (1,64)***	31.9	1.56(1,64)NS	75.2	3.68(1,64)NS
Asocial	787.7	15.9 (1,65)***	13.2	1.88(1,65)NS	28.2	4.0 (1,65)*
Alienation	596.0	22.0 (1,66)***	61.0	9.7 (1,66)**	54.8	8.7 (1,66)**
Manifest						
Aggression	304.5	5.9 (1,65)*	1.6	.24(1,65)NS	1.6	.24(1,65)**
Value						
Orientation	1196.3	15.3 (1,65)***	40.9	3.6 (1,65)NS	52.3	4.61(1,65)NS
Immaturity	1.99	.10(1,65)NS	20.5	2.2 (1,65)NS	5.9	.63(1,65)NS
Autism	192.4	10.4 (1,65)**	1.7	.36(1,65)NS	.06	.01(1,65)NS
Withdrawal	60.8	3.3 (1,65)NS	1.3	.37(1,65)NS	1.3	.37(1,65)NS
Social Anxiety	4.0	.14(1,65)NS	1.0	.25(1,65)NS	.20	.05(1,65)NS
Repression	20.0	1.37(1,64)NS	.10	.01(1,64)NS	.78	.21(1,64)NS
Denial	210.8	9.97(1,65)**	3.7	1.2 (1,65)NS	13.0	4.3 (1,65)*

APPENDIX

Expectations Scales

Easy Time. Scored so that high scores indicate the expectations of getting off easier in IMPACT.

		<u>Factor</u>	
		<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>
1.	IMPACT is an easy way to do time.	-.01	.71
2.	I will be safer in IMPACT than in regular prison.	-.08	.66
3.	IMPACT is a game I will play to get out of prison quicker.	.36	.42
4.	The work in IMPACT will not be hard.	.39	.60
5.	A shorter time in IMPACT will be easier than my longer sentence.	-.07	.61
6.	I will learn things about my self here.	-.41	.41

Beneficial Expectations. Scored so that high scores indicate greater expectations of positive benefits from the IMPACT program.

		<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>
1.	There is nothing in this place that will help me.	.80	.19
2.	IMPACT will not help me get a 'job.	.52	.10
3.*	I am tough enough to handle IMPACT.	-.56	.25
4.	This experience will not change me.	.64	.12
5.*	IMPACT will help me learn self-discipline.	-.64	.15
6.	The drill instructors put on a big show, but that is all it is.	.64	.33
7.	This place would never help me in any way.	.69	.20
8.*	A good drill instructor deserves a lot of respect.	-.52	.31
9.*	I will learn things about myself in here.	-.41	.42

* Denotes reversals

Attitudes toward Prison/IMPACT

Personal Change. Scored so that high scores indicate a belief that no positive changes change will occur.

		<u>Factor</u>		
		<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>
1.*	There is nothing in this place that will help me.	.53	-.24	.41
2.	I am becoming a better person here.	-.62	.20	-.13
3.*	The programs in this place will never help me in any way	.67	-.48	.22
4.	I will learn things about myself here.	-.67	.19	-.16
5.*	This experience will not change me.	.63	.19	.13
6.	I am becoming more mature here.	-.67	.43	.26
7.	Because of my experience here, I will probably not get in trouble again.	-.55	-.09	.04
8.*	This place would never help me in any way.	.71	-.35	.23

The Victim. Scored so that high scores indicate the belief that one is being victimized.

		<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>
1.	There is no place safe in prison.	-.28	-.36	.40
2.	If I have problems here, I do not ask staff for help.	.31	.12	.55
3.	I am afraid I will be hurt while I am here.	.05	.05	.70
4.	This place is unfair.	.44	-.27	.64
5.	Staff in this place try to hurt inmates.	.03	-.32	.61
6.	I am so tired, I think I could die.	.08	.01	.76
7.	I try not to talk to staff here.	.02	.17	.55
8.	I do not think I can take this anymore.	.03	-.17	.44

Attitudes toward Prison/IMPACT (con't.)

Staff and Program Attitudes. Scored so that high scores indicate negative attitudes about the staff and programs.

		<u>Factor</u>		
		<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>
1.	I would like to be like some of the staff here.			
2.*	This place is entirely unnecessary.	-.14	.57	-.35
3.*	Staff here are stupid.	.29	-.51	.34
4.*	I am very unhappy here.	-.01	-.64	.39
5.*	This is a terrible experience.	.17	-.54	.27
6.	There are some staff I can talk to here.	.20	-.43	.12
7.*	This place does more harm than good.	.05	.53	.11
8.	Staff here are helpful.	.39	-.53	.24
9.	There are programs here that will help inmates	-.37	.58	-.30
10.	The work here is making me stronger.	-.32	.68	.04
11.	The staff set an example for neatness and order.	-.37	.52	.15
		-.42	.65	.06

* Denotes reversals