

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 951

AC 014 123

AUTHOR Burt, Lesta Norris
 TITLE Bibliotherapy: Effect of Group Reading and Discussion on Attitudes of Adult Inmates in Two Correctional Institutions. Final Report.
 INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison.
 SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Regional Research Program.
 BUREAU NO BR-2-E-054
 PUB DATE Oct 72
 GRANT OEG-5-72-0049 (509)
 NOTE 214p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$9.87
 DESCRIPTORS *Adult Reading Programs; *Attitude Tests; Behavioral Objectives; *Bibliotherapy; *Changing Attitudes; Corrective Institutions; Females; Group Discussion; Group Reading; Librarians; Males; *Prisoners; Reading Interests; Research Methodology; Research Reviews (Publications); Statistical Analysis; Test Results

ABSTRACT

Fifty-nine inmates, men and women, from two correctional institutions were randomly assigned to eight groups to test the effect of book discussion on attitudes. The four experimental groups read and discussed weekly a series of six titles during the 12-week program. The four control groups met three times to participate in a reading interest survey. Each leader team, composed of two librarians, led one experimental and one control group. Pretest and posttest scores on Socialization Scale of the "Personal Values Abstract" and on a "Semantic Differential" test of attitudes related to persons and behaviors were subjected to analysis of covariance and the F test. Covariance analyses revealed that the experimental groups were less accepting of Dope Addiction and Stealing, the two behavioral concepts, than were the control groups, while no significant difference was found on attitudes toward concepts relating to persons. Analysis of interactions showed that those in the experimental groups who had served more time, had more time to serve, or were Black were affected more positively by bibliotherapy than their fellows. Conclusions: For those inmates who wish to participate and can read and comprehend, the group discussion form of bibliotherapy may supplement the correctional program: (1) by improving attitudes related to behavior for all groups, (2) by additionally improving attitudes related to persons for certain groups, and (3) when conducted by librarians working with small inmate groups. (Author)

2 E - 054

Discussion
Final

Final

Final Report

Project No. 2-E-054
Grant No. OEG-5-72-0049 (509)

Lesta Norris Burt, Principal Investigator
Dr. Margaret E. Monroe, Project Director
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Behavioral
Issues;
Discussion;
Reading
News
Results

Steps to

Titles
Times

Control
The
Best of
Analysis
at the

Groups,

That
More

Issues who
Discussion
(1) by

and
1

BIBLIOTHERAPY: EFFECT OF GROUP READING AND DISCUSSION ON ATTITUDES
OF ADULT INMATES IN TWO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

October 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

National Center for Educational Research and Development
(Regional Research Program)

ACC 14118 3

ED 070951

Final Report

Project No. 2-E-054
Grant No. OEG-5-72-0049 (509)

BIBLIOTHERAPY: EFFECT OF GROUP READING AND DISCUSSION ON ATTITUDES
OF ADULT INMATES IN TWO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Lesta Norris Burt

University of Wisconsin

Madison, Wisconsin

October 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant in part to a research grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

ABSTRACT

BIBLIOTHERAPY: EFFECT OF GROUP READING AND DISCUSSION ON ATTITUDES OF ADULT INMATES IN TWO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Fifty-nine inmates, men and women, from two correctional institutions were randomly assigned to eight groups to test the effect of book discussion on attitudes. The four experimental groups read and discussed weekly a series of six titles during the twelve-week program. The four control groups met three times to participate in a reading interest survey. Each leader team, composed of two librarians, led one experimental and one control group.

Pretest and posttest scores on Socialization Scale of the Personal Values Abstract and on a Semantic Differential test of attitudes related to persons and behaviors were subjected to Analysis of Covariance, and the F test. Covariance analyses revealed that the experimental groups were less accepting of DOPE ADDICTION and STEALING, the two behavioral concepts, than were the control groups, while no significant difference was found on attitudes toward concepts relating to persons. Analysis of interactions showed that those in the experimental groups who had served more time, had more time to serve, or were Black were affected more positively by bibliotherapy than their fellows.

Conclusions: For those inmates who wish to participate and can read and comprehend, the group discussion form of bibliotherapy may supplement the correctional program:

- 1) by improving attitudes related to behavior for all groups,
- 2) by additionally improving attitudes related to persons for certain groups, and
- 3) when conducted by librarians working with small inmate groups.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1
The Problem	1
Literature Review	2
The Rationale for the Use of Bibliotherapy to Modify Behavior and Attitudes	2
Theoretical Framework of Bibliotherapy	2
Individual Versus Group Bibliotherapy	2
Bibliotherapy as the Province of Librarianship	3
Review of the Literature of Bibliotherapy Related to Correctional Institutions	3
Experimental Research Studies	4
II. HYPOTHESES, RESEARCH DESIGN AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	46
Hypotheses	46
Objective	46
Null and Alternative Hypotheses	46
Definition of Terms	48
Assumptions	50
Research Design	51
The Sample	52

Group Book Discussion Procedures	64
Criteria for Book Discussion Leaders	67
Criteria for Selection of Materials for Discussion	68
Measurement Instruments and Testing Procedures	73
<u>Personal Values Abstract</u>	73
<u>The Semantic Differential</u>	74
Testing Procedures	77
Statistical Analysis	79
III. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	84
Findings	84
Summary of Findings	84
Detailed Report of Findings	85
Hypothesis I	86
Findings Related to Hypothesis I	87
Hypothesis II	87
Findings Related to Hypothesis II	88
Hypothesis III	88
Findings Related to Hypothesis III	93
Findings Related to Assumption Tested	116
Discussion of Findings	118
Conclusions	126
Implications for Librarianship	127

Implications for Further Research	128
Problems of Conducting Bibliotherapy Research in Correctional Institutions	132
BIBLIOGRAPHY	135
APPENDIX I: TESTING INSTRUMENTS	146
A. <u>Semantic Differential</u>	146
B. <u>Personal Values Abstract</u>	152
APPENDIX II: GROUP BOOK DISCUSSION LEADERS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR DISCUSSION LEADERS	157
A. Group Book Discussion Leaders	157
B. Guiding Principles for Discussion Leaders	158
APPENDIX III: ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE TABLES	160

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. PERCENTAGE COMPAPISON OF SAMPLE WITH TOTAL POPULATION BY POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS	53
2. THE SAMPLE DIVIDED BY INSTITUTION AND BACKGROUND CHAPACTEPISTICS	60
3. THE SAMPLE: EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS DIVIDED BY BACKGROUND CHARACTEPISTICS	61
4. THE SAMPLE: CONTROL GROUPS DIVIDED BY BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS	62

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE

5. MAIN EFFECTS: "STEALING"--EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	89
6. MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PPETEST AND EPROR: "STFALING"--EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	90
7. MAIN EFFECTS: "DOPE ADDICTION"--EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS.	91
8. MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PPETEST AND EPROR: "DOPE ADDICTION"--EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	92
9. INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "SOCIALIZATION"	94
10. MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND EPROR: "SOCIALIZATION" BY NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED	95
11. INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "SOCIALIZATION"	96
12. MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PPETEST AND EPROR: "SOCIALIZATION" BY RACE	96
13. INTIFRACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "WOMEN"	100
14. MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND EPROR: "WOMEN" BY NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED	101

15.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "WOMEN" BY RACE	101
16.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "WOMEN"	102
17.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "MEN"	104
18.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "MEN" BY NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED	104
19.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "MOTHERS"	106
20.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "MOTHERS" BY RACE	106
21.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "FATHERS"	107
22.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "FATHERS" BY NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED	108
23.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "PAROLE OFFICER"	110
24.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "PAROLE OFFICER" BY RACE	111
25.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "TOTAL CONCEPTS"	113
26.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "TOTAL CONCEPTS" BY RACE	114
27.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "TOTAL CONCEPTS"	115
28.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "TOTAL CONCEPTS" BY NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED	115
29.	EFFECT OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "WHITE RACE"	117
30.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "WHITE RACE"—EFFECT OF LEADERS BY RACE AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED	118
31.	MAIN EFFECTS: "SOCIALIZATION"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	161

32.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "SOCIALIZATION"	162
33.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "WHITE RACE"	162
34.	MAIN EFFECTS: "WHITE RACE"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	163
35.	MAIN EFFECTS: "WOMEN"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	164
36.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "WOMEN"	165
37.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "MEN"	165
38.	MAIN EFFECTS: "MEN"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	166
39.	MAIN EFFECTS: "MOTHERS"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	167
40.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "MOTHERS"	168
41.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "FATHERS"	168
42.	MAIN EFFECTS: "FATHERS"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	169
43.	MAIN EFFECTS: "BLACK RACE"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	170
44.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "BLACK RACE"	171
45.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "PAROLE OFFICER"	171
46.	MAIN EFFECTS: "PAROLE OFFICER"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	172
47.	MAIN EFFECTS: "GOD"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	173
48.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "GOD"	174
49.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "MYSELF"	174

50.	MAIN EFFECTS: "MYSELF"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	175
51.	MAIN EFFECTS: "TOTAL CONCEPTS"—EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	176
52.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS: "TOTAL CONCEPTS"	177
53.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "SOCIALIZATION"	178
54.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "TOTAL CONCEPTS"	178
55.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "STEALING"	179
56.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "STEALING"	179
57.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "STEALING" BY RACE, NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED	180
58.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "STEALING"	181
59.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "DOPE ADDICTION"	181
60.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "DOPE ADDICTION"	182
61.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "DOPE ADDICTION"	182
62.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "DOPE ADDICTION" BY RACE, NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED	183
63.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "WHITE RACE"	184
64.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "WHITE RACE"	184
65.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "WHITE RACE" BY RACE AND NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED	185
66.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "WHITE RACE"	186

67.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "WOMEN"	186
68.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "MEN"	187
69.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "MEN"	187
70.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "MOTHERS"	188
71.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "MOTHERS"	188
72.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "FATHERS"	189
73.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "FATHERS"	189
74.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "BLACK RACE"	190
75.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "BLACK RACE" BY RACE	190
76.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "BLACK RACE"	191
77.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "BLACK RACE" BY NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED	191
78.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "BLACK RACE"	192
79.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "PAROLE OFFICER"	192
80.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "PAROLE OFFICER"	193
81.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "GOD"	193
82.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT: "GOD"	194
83.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "GOD"	194

84.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT: "MYSELF"	1
85.	INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TPE "MYSELF"	1
86.	INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT: "MYSELF"	1
87.	MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR: "MYSELF" BY RACE	1
88.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "SOCIALIZATION"	1
89.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "STEALING"	1
90.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "DOPE ADDICTION"	1
91.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "TOTAL CONCEPTS"	1
92.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "WOMEN"	1
93.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "WHITE RACE"	1
94.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "MEN"	20
95.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "MOTHERS"	20
96.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "FATHERS"	20
97.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "BLACK RACE"	20
98.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "PAROLE OFFICER"	20
99.	EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: "GOD"	20

. . . 195

. . . 195

. . . 196

. . . 196

D: . . . 197

D: . . . 197

D: . . . 198

D: . . . 198

D: . . . 199

D: . . . 199

D: . . . 200

D: . . . 200

D: . . . 201

D: . . . 201

D: . . . 202

D: . . . 202

100. EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED:

"MYSELF" 20

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The Problem

The rationale for the existence of correctional institutions has shifted from one of punishment to one of rehabilitation. It has changed from the idea of separating the criminal from the rest of the population, a custodial function, to preparing him to return to society, a rehabilitative function.

The cost of maintaining an inmate in prison, the court costs, his non-contribution to the tax rolls, not to mention the cost of his destructiveness in terms of personal and property damage, is enormous. Add to this the loss of a potentially valuable human being, and the cost is inestimable.

Any procedure which may contribute to an inmate's rehabilitation rather than his recidivism is worth the expenditure of funds and effort. Bibliotherapy, defined here as directed group reading and discussion for guidance in the solution of personal problems, may be one of the procedures for promoting social purpose, reducing social cost, and helping an individual to come to terms with himself. This study hopes to provide objective evidence that books and librarians may perform a therapeutic as well as a recreational and educational function.

Literature Review

The Rationale for the Use of Bibliotherapy to Modify Behavior and Attitudes

The practice of bibliotherapy to modify attitude and behavior has been justified in the literature in terms of its helping the client to overcome problems, develop insight into the feelings of others, identify with characters or experiences so that the client might think more constructively and synthesize what he has learned about himself.^{2, 3, 41, 60, 80, 82, 96, 97, 101, 126, 139, 145}

Theoretical Framework of Bibliotherapy

A theoretical framework for the practice of bibliotherapy has been developed over the years by a number of practitioners. The most widely accepted philosophical justification is the "psycho-physical-social interactionism" concept. This concept propounds that the whole person must be treated. Literature covers all elements of the human situation and the vicarious experiences and models presented provide an opportunity for emotional involvement, experimental interaction and reappraisal of the environment in which actual situations must be met.^{17, 34, 71, 137, 144, 151}

Individual Versus Group Bibliotherapy

Studies on group bibliotherapy report that this method seems to have all the advantages of individual bibliotherapy plus reaching more

people. Group bibliotherapy provides a common ground for sharing viewpoints, an opportunity for evaluating behavior and testing values. The members learn from each other, learn how to adjust to a social situation, and how to express themselves more clearly.^{1, 3, 5, 7, 22, 33, 41, 61, 80, 103, 111, 112, 124, 137, 139}

Bibliotherapy as the Province of Librarianship

The role of librarianship as one of the professions qualified to practice bibliotherapy seems justified. Psychiatrists, psychologists, educators, and librarians are professionals who have shown the most interest in bibliotherapy. For many years, according to the literature, librarians have felt a responsibility to bring the right books and the right persons together and to explore the meaning of the books with those persons. Psychiatrists and psychologists practice explicit bibliotherapy, while the roles of educators and librarians seem to lie in the practice of implicit therapy--a resource of the culture. Support of the librarians' role comes from practitioners in each of the concerned fields.^{2, 10, 27, 40, 60, 64, 73, 96, 98, 100, 104, 120, 124, 133, 141, 145}

Review of the Literature of Bibliotherapy Related to Correctional Institutions

Few studies have been reported using bibliotherapy with inmates of correctional institutions. Generally favorable reports have been made. The inmates view the authors of books as being uncontaminated by correctional institution authorities and will accept the impersonality of a

"book consultation" when they balk at discussing a problem with a counselor. Inmates gain release from hostile feelings; reading stimulates self-study; bibliotherapy helps them through periods of discouragement, stress, and temptation; and it improves their psychological psyche enabling them to learn more effectively in all areas.

Experimental Research Studies

This small body of experimental research studies probing the effect of bibliotherapy provides the foundation for and direction of this study. Shrodes¹²⁷ and Hartman's⁵⁵ works point to the fact that identification, projection, catharsis, and insight take place in some individuals who have participated in a program of bibliotherapy. Katz (1965), an authority on attitude change, has identified catharsis and insight as constituting some of the essential change conditions necessary for attitude change.⁷¹ This conclusion is basic to the continuation of research on the effect of bibliotherapy on attitudes.

Positive changes in personality and social adjustment, decrease in extra-punitive responses, less anti-social aggression, an increase in positive themes,⁵⁸ increase in the ability to solve problems,⁹⁴ and improvement in behavior¹¹ have been the positive conclusions drawn by this body of experimental research. These findings encourage deeper exploration into the effects of bibliotherapy.

McClaskey (1970)⁸⁷ and Alexander and Ruggie (1967)¹ both found no change in attitude according to the measures and analyses used, although

both studies reported significant behavior improvement for the experimental groups. Whipple (1968), described earlier as being an experimental study involving inmates, used the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) as a pretest-posttest measure of personality. The personality of the experimental groups studying biology with one-third of the time devoted to bibliotherapy was compared to the personality of the control groups who studied biology only.¹⁴⁴ To the extent that the MMPI may be considered an attitude measure, one experimental study can be said to have found attitude change.

This present study, therefore, explored further into the effect of bibliotherapy on attitudes. Despite the negative findings of previous research in relation to attitude change, this study hypothesized that the effect of bibliotherapy on inmate attitudes, positive evaluations on which are helpful for social adjustment, would change in the positive direction. It was further contended that these changes would be positive, regardless of the inmate's age, sex, offense, race, group, achievement, recidivism, the number of months served, or the number of months to be served.

The design of this research was chosen to:

- 1) determine the effect of bibliotherapy on those who have participated in group reading and discussion as compared with those who have not,
- 2) to determine if there were change in some attitudes if not all,
- 3) to determine if some variable, such as recidivism, were masking

the effect of bibliotherapy, and

- 4) to determine if the use of two different measures, one specifically designed for this study, the other a standardized test, would result in data which would lend insight into the attitude change.

These purposes and design of the study will be fully discussed in Chapter II.

CHAPTER II

HYPOTHESES, RESEARCH DESIGN AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Hypotheses

Objective

The literature appears to lay an adequate foundation for further research in this area. This present study was built on this foundation. The general objective was to test the prediction that bibliotherapy would affect positively the attitudes of inmates in correctional institutions, and would do so for all inmates regardless of age, recidivism, sex, race, achievement, offense, number of months served, or number of months to be served. Two measures of attitude, the Semantic Differential and the Socialization Scale of the Personal Values Abstract (PVA) were used. The Semantic Differential was employed to measure degree of change, ranging from a strongly negative to a strongly positive degree, while the Socialization Scale was employed to measure more socially acceptable attitudes as reflected by higher scores on the test. For purposes of statistical analysis, the following specific null and alternative hypotheses were derived.

Null and Alternative Hypotheses

Null Hypothesis I

The mean posttest scores (adjusted for the pretest scores)

for the experimental groups will not be statistically different from the control groups on any of the eleven concepts of the Semantic Differential or the combination of all eleven concepts (TOTAL CONCEPTS).

Alternative Hypothesis I

The mean posttest scores (adjusted for the pretest scores) for the experimental groups will be statistically different from the control groups on each of the eleven concepts of the Semantic Differential and the combination of the eleven concepts (TOTAL CONCEPTS).

Null Hypothesis II

The mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest scores) for the experimental groups will not be statistically different from those of the control groups on the Socialization Scale of the Personal Values Abstract.

Alternative Hypothesis II

The mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest scores) for the experimental groups will be statistically different from those of the control groups on the Socialization Scale of the PVA.

Null Hypothesis III

1. There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest) on either attitude test related to differences in attitude by differences in individual factors: Sex, Offense, Race, Recidivism, Achievement,

Number of Months Served, Number of Months to be Served, or Age.

2. There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest and error) on either attitude test of the experimental groups and those of the control groups when interaction between Number of Months Served, Race, or Number of Months to be Served, and Group Treatment is analyzed.

Alternative Hypothesis III

1. There will be a statistically significant difference between the mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest) on each attitude test related to differences in attitude by differences in individual factors: Sex, Offense, Race, Recidivism, Achievement, Number of Months Served, Number of Months to be Served, or Age.
2. There will be a statistically significant difference between the mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest) on each attitude test of the experimental groups and those of the control groups when interaction between Number of Months Served, Race, or Number of Months to be Served, and Group Treatment is analyzed.

Definition of Terms

The following operational definitions were employed:

THERAPY: The treatment administered to inmates to improve social-adjustment and self-adjustment and thus bring about rehabilitation.

BIBLIOTHERAPY: Specific library treatment including the group

reading and discussion of literature to bring about improved attitude toward self and others. The unique characteristics of bibliotherapy as a process are:

- a) The reading materials may provide a context of non-threatening objectivity through which the participant may project personal problems and come to grips with them.
- b) New insights may be gained from ideas of an outside mind available through reading.
- c) The projection of individual group members into the experiences of creative literature has the potential to create insight as the problems encountered parallel their own.

ATTITUDE: A tendency or disposition to evaluate an object or symbol of that object in a certain way.

DEGREE OF ATTITUDE DIFFERENCE: The difference between the test means of the experimental groups and control groups on a Semantic Differential.

NATURE OF ATTITUDE DIFFERENCE: The difference between test means of the experimental and control groups on the Socialization Scale of the Personal Values Abstract which reflects socially acceptable attitudes.

RECIDIVISM: The return to correctional institution after having served an earlier sentence, demonstrating that rehabilitation has not been complete.

ACHIEVEMENT: The G score on the General Aptitude Test Battery which measures the ability to understand instructions and underlying

principles, to reason, and to make judgments.

NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED: The number of months which were served by the participants prior to January 1, 1972, for the present term of incarceration.

NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED: The maximum number of months to be served by the participant after January 1, 1972, for the present term of incarceration.

RACE: The racial identification listed on the official inmate data sheet.

SEX: The identification of sex listed on the official inmate data sheet.

AGE: The age of the inmate as of January 1, 1972, as ascertained from the birth date listed on the official inmate data sheet.

GROUP: The inmate's membership in one of the eight divisions of participants in the study: four experimental groups and four control groups.

OFFENSE: The crimes for which the participant has been incarcerated, categorized by crimes against person and crimes against property, as listed on the official inmate data sheet.

Assumptions

1. It is assumed that the inmate respondent knows what he thinks and is competent to describe his orientation, and therefore, sufficiently capable of responding to tests to produce valid data. The validity of

this assumption was supported by the achievement scores for those who participated.

2. It is assumed that book discussion can be standardized as a procedure to rule out the particular group discussion leader team as a variable. This assumption was tested and substantiated. See pages 116, 117, and 118 and Tables 88 through 100 in Appendix III.

Research Design

The classical experimental research design for determining attitude change has been employed. A pretest and posttest were administered to both the twenty-nine experimental subjects and the thirty control subjects, randomly assigned. A program of bibliotherapy (group reading and discussion) was conducted in weekly sessions for a twelve-week period with the experimental groups while the control groups met three times in this period to take part in a reading interest survey. The control group meetings were held to offset the "Hawthorne effect" and to assure that the findings of difference between the two groups would be related to the bibliotherapy and not solely to the group experience.

This design has had much praise in that it controls for history, maturation, and reactive measures. One factor, the possible sensitizing effect of the pretest, has caused criticism. Kerlinger (1964) said that the classical design for measuring change is an excellent one if the pretest does not have an unduly sensitizing effect as when attitudes on specific issues and problems are measured.⁷⁴ The Semantic Differential, as

developed for this study, measured more general concepts; therefore, there were no specific issues and problems to which to sensitize subjects.

Campbell (1957) argued for a posttest-only design which relies on random assignment to control for comparability between the experimental and control groups.²⁰ Insko (1967) stated that the drawbacks to the posttest-only design are 1) that researchers feel more confident of actually having produced attitude change if it can be directly measured and 2) there is no proof that the groups were comparable at any time. He concluded that the before-after design may be the only solution if the sample for the after-only design cannot be large enough to assure comparability.⁶³

The statistical analysis of the data in this study, Analysis of Covariance, tested the significance of the difference between means of posttests by taking into account and adjusting pretest differences between the experimental and control groups.

The Sample

Bibliotherapy is a method of therapy which can be used only with those willing and able to read and discuss the reading material. The sample, therefore, was drawn from the population of those willing and able to read and understand the reading and discussion at each institution whose term of imprisonment would not expire prior to the end of the experiment.

As may be noted in Table 1, page 53, the sample was quite comparable with the total institution population. The statistics for the population

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF SAMPLE WITH TOTAL POPULATION BY POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

	Offense		Recidivism		Race		Age		Achievement		Number of Months Served		Number of Months to be Served	
	Against Persons	Against Property	Yes	No	Black	White & Other	25 & Under	26 & Over	Under Mean	Over Mean	15 & Under	16 & Over	36 & Under	37 & Over
WPI**														
Sample	32%	68%	32.3%	67.7%	38.7%	61.3%	64.5%	35.5%	71%	29%	72.9%	27.1%	51.3%	48.7%
Population	27.5	72.5	30.2	69.8	49.2	50.8	43.2 ^a	56.8 ^b	50.1	49.9	75.8 ^c	24.2 ^d	36.2 ^e	63.8 ^f
WCI**														
Sample	33.3	66.7	51.9	48.1	38	62	44.9	55.1	44.8	55.2	44.8	55.2	34.5	65.5
Population	24.5	75.5	37.2	62.8	38.2	61.5	43.2 ^a	56.8 ^b	41.7	58.3	60.8 ^c	39.2 ^d	17 ^e	83 ^f
Total (WPI & WCI)														
Sample	32	68	42.2	57.8	39	61	55.9	44.1	57.6	42.4	59.3	40.7	44	56
Population	21.1	78.9	38.9	61.1	32	68	43.8 ^a	56.2 ^b	43.4 ^a	57.6 ^b	66 ^c	34 ^d	29.2 ^e	70.8 ^f

LEGEND:

- a = 24 & under
- b = 25 & over
- c = 17 & under
- d = 18 & over

- e = 35 & under
- f = 36 & over
- g = for all males

^aWPI = Wisconsin Home for Women
^aWCI = Wisconsin Correctional Institution

52
 fore, there
 icts.
 relies on
 erimental
 o the after-
 ally having
 there is
 luded that
 for the
 63
 y.
 ysis of
 eans of the
 nces between
 only with
 . The
 ng and able
 tuton and
 the exper-
 ce comparable
 population



used for comparison with the sample statistics were taken from Offenders Resident in Wisconsin Adult Correctional Institutions on June 30, 1971 except for statistics on the achievement variable. The divisions of the background data reported in this bulletin differ slightly from the divisions made for this study in a few instances. The twenty-five-year-old inmates are included with the younger inmates in the present study, while they are included with those over 25 in the material consulted. The background statistics divide the time served at 17 months rather than 15 months the division point for this study, and the time to be served at 35 months rather than the 36 month division point made herein. It was of interest to discover if there were an effect on the attitudes of those with short-term incarceration as well as of those with long-term incarceration. The fifteen month division represents the shortest period of time which included enough of the sample to make a realistic division. Conversely, thirty-six months represents the longest length of time into which enough of the sample fell to warrant a division.*

The major difference, however, is in the achievement comparison. The G, General Learning Ability score, of the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) had to be compared with the "Admission's Intelligence Estimate" from Offenders Admitted to Adult Correctional Institutions Calendar 1970. The mean grade achievement equivalency was 8.1 for those admitted in 1970. Achievement is not reported in the bulletin consulted for the other variables. The figures reported for men are for the entire male population, not for the Wisconsin Correctional Institution (WCI) at Fox Lake alone.

nders

971

of the

divi-

-old

while

e back-

5 months,

months

erest

short-

. The

includ-

thirty-

of the

son.

Bat-

nti-

endar

tted

the

le

Fox

The women in the sample are younger, have a lower achievement level, have more Whites and others, and are serving longer sentences than the population as a whole. The men in the sample have a higher percentage of recidivists, have served more months, and have less to serve than the total population in the WCI.

Although the total sample is comparable to the total population, those in the sample are committed for more offenses against persons, have a higher proportion of Blacks, are younger, have lower achievement scores, and have longer sentences to serve than the population from which the sample was drawn. A difference has been reported when there was a ten percentage point difference between the sample and the population. Few of the variations range over four or five percentage points over the ten percent.

The results of this study may be generalized to the inmate population of Wisconsin only. However, statistics do not indicate that Wisconsin inmates differ substantially from inmates in other states. For example, the average number of months the sample had been incarcerated was 18.5 months, while the national average was 19.8 months for inmates in 1970.*

The remainder of the comparisons of the sample of Wisconsin inmates with a census of those of other states must be made from 1960 statistics for prisoners in the United States.** The 1960 report is the latest

*U. S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1970 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 158.

**U. S. Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Prisons.

comprehensive compilation of statistics relating to state correctional institution inmates.

Ninety-six percent of correctional institution inmates were men and four percent were women in both Wisconsin and the United States.

	Wisconsin Sample 1972	United States Inmate Population (except Alaska and New Jersey) 1960
<u>Offense</u>		
Against persons	32%	Against persons 30%
Against property	68%	Against property 70%
<u>Recidivists</u>		
Yes	42%	Yes 57%
No	58%	No 43%
<u>Race</u>		
Black	39%	Non-White 39%
White	61%	White 61%
<u>Age</u>		
Mean	27.1 years of age	Median 30.8 years of age

It may be seen from these statistics that the Wisconsin inmate sample was not substantially different from the inmates in other states on the characteristics for which it was possible to secure national figures.

Because of the general comparability, it may be deduced that the results of this study may be generalized to those adult men and women in correctional institutions who volunteer for group reading and discussion,

National Prisoner Statistics; Characteristics of State Prisoners, 1960
(Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), pp. 57-58.

are able to read and understand what they read, and will be available for the entire period of the program.

The sample as drawn consisted of 64 inmates, 32 from the WCI at Fox Lake, a medium security unit for men, and 32 from the Wisconsin Home for Women (WHW) at Taycheedah, a maximum security unit. Sixteen were randomly assigned to the control group and sixteen to the experimental group at each institution and were further randomly subdivided into groups of 8 each.

A flyer announcing the program was given to each woman at WHW personally by the institution librarian. Thirty-six of the 109 women then resident volunteered. Flyers were placed at strategic locations at WCI and the librarian made announcements in classes. Personal contact with each inmate was not possible due to the size of the population, 550 men, and restrictions as to where the female librarian could go to reach the men. Thirty-six men volunteered for the project.

Effects of Attrition on Sample

There was attrition of 5 inmates, four men and one woman, three from experimental groups and two from control groups. One inmate was paroled, two were transferred, and two withdrew before the completion of the program.

The attrition of these inmates should not have influenced the findings of the study greatly. The composition of the transferees' groups remained relatively stable in that one transferee completed the program

except for the posttest and the other completed most of the project. These two did not refuse to take the tests; they were transferred before there was an opportunity to administer the tests to them.

A profile of those drawn in the original sample but not completing the program follows:

	Attrition from Experimental Groups	Attrition from Control Groups
<u>Sex</u>	3 men -----	1 man 1 woman
<u>Offense</u>	1 against persons 2 against property	1 against persons 1 against property
<u>Recidivists</u>	2 recidivists 1 non-recedivist	----- 2 non-recidivists
<u>Race</u>	2 White 1 Black	2 White -----
<u>Age</u>	1 under 25 2 over 25	----- 2 over 25
<u>Achievement</u>	1 under mean 2 over mean	----- 2 over mean
<u>Number of Months Served</u>	1 less than 15 months 2 more than 16 months	1 less than 15 months 1 more than 16 months
<u>Number of Months to be Served</u>	----- 3 had over 37 months to serve	2 had less than 36 months to serve -----

The elimination of the parolee could be considered a loss of one who could be assumed to have a rather positive attitude. This loss could partially balance the attrition of the two who withdrew, who might be assumed to have somewhat negative attitudes.

L. The Final Sample

Tables 2, 3, and 4 (pages 60, 61, and 62) identify the characteristics of the sample by the number of inmates in each group and in each institution and then by total sample experimental and control group make-up. It may be seen that the groups were quite comparable except that there was a disproportionate number under the mean in achievement in the control groups. This situation was partially attributable to the fact that both the transferees from the control groups were above the mean in achievement.

The ages of those in the experimental groups ranged from 22 to 41 for men and 20 to 34 for women. The ages of those in the control groups ranged from 23 to 46 for men and 20 to 42 for women. The average age for the experimental groups was 26.4 and 27.9 for the control groups.

The achievement scores are the G scores of the GATB. The G measures the ability to understand instructions and underlying principles, to reason and make judgments. The average G score for the sample was 100. The G scores for the experimental groups at Fox Lake ranged from 60 to 129 and from 69 to 123 for the women in the experimental groups at Taycheedah. The G scores ranged from 69 to 153 for the control groups at

TABLE 2

THE SAMPLE DIVIDED BY INSTITUTION AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS, N=59

	Men's Institution (WCI)		Women's Institution (WHW)		Total (WCI and WHW)					
	Experimental (13)	Control (15)	Experimental (16)	Control (15)	Experimental (29)	Control (30)				
Offense	Against Persons 3	Prop. 10	Against Persons 6	Prop. 9	Against Persons 5	Prop. 10	Against Persons 8	Prop. 21	Against Persons 11	Prop. 19
Recidivists	Yes 7	No 6	Yes 8	No 7	Yes 4	No 12	Yes 11	No 18	Yes 14	No 16
Race	Black 4	White 9	Black 7	White 8	Black 6	White 10	Black 10	White 19	Black 13	White 17
Age	25 & Under 6	26 & Over 7	25 & Under 7	26 & Over 8	25 & Under 11	26 & Over 5	25 & Under 9	26 & Over 6	25 & Under 17	26 & Over 14
Achievement	Under Mean 4	Over Mean 9	Under Mean 9	Over Mean 6	Under Mean 10	Over Mean 6	Under Mean 11	Over Mean 4	Under Mean 14	Over Mean 15
Number of Months Served	15 or Less 7	16 or More 6	15 or Less 6	16 or More 9	15 or Less 11	16 or More 5	15 or Less 11	16 or More 4	15 or Less 18	16 or More 11
Number of Months to Be Served	16 & Less 3	17 & More 10	16 & Less 7	17 & More 8	16 & Less 9	17 & More 7	16 & Less 7	17 & More 8	16 & Less 12	17 & More 17

TABLE 3

THE SAMPLE: EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS DIVIDED BY BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS, N=29

	Group 1 (WCI)		Group 2 (WCI)		Group 3 (WHW)		Group 4 (WHW)	
	Men (7)		Men (6)		Women (8)		Women (8)	
Offense	Against Persons 1	Against Property 6	Against Persons 2	Against Property 4	Against Persons 4	Against Property 4	Against Persons 1	Against Property 7
Recidivists	Yes 4	No 3	Yes 3	No 3	Yes 3	No 5	Yes 1	No 7
Face	Black 2	White 5	Black 2	White 4	Black 3	White 5	Black 3	White 5
Age	25 and Under 3	26 and Over 4	25 and Under 3	26 and Over 3	25 and Under 4	26 and Over 4	25 and Under 7	26 and Over 1
Achievement	Under Mean 1	Over Mean 6	Under Mean 3	Over Mean 3	Under Mean 7	Over Mean 1	Under Mean 3	Over Mean 5
Number of Months Served	Fifteen or Less 4	Sixteen or More 3	Fifteen or Less 3	Sixteen or More 3	Fifteen or Less 6	Sixteen or More 2	Fifteen or Less 5	Sixteen or More 3
Number of Months to Be Served	36 and Less 2	37 and More 5	36 and Less 1	37 and More 5	36 and Less 5	37 and More 3	36 and Less 4	37 and More 4

TABLE 4

THE SAMPLE: CONTROL GROUPS DIVIDED BY BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS, N=30

Offense	Group 5 (WCI)		Group 6 (WCI)		Group 7 (MHW)		Group 8 (MHW)	
	Men (8)		Men (7)		Women (8)		Women (7)	
Against Persons	2	4	3	4	4	1	6	
Against Property	6	3	4	3	4	6	3	
Yes	5	3	4	2	6	4	3	
No	3	4	4	2	4	3	4	
Race	Black 4	White 4	Black 3	White 4	Black 3	White 5	Black 3	White 4
Age	25 and Under 2	26 and Over 6	25 and Under 5	26 and Over 2	25 and Under 4	26 and Over 4	25 and Under 5	26 and Over 2
Achievement	Under Mean 5	Over Mean 3	Under Mean 4	Over Mean 3	Under Mean 7	Over Mean 1	Under Mean 4	Over Mean 3
Number of Months Served	Fifteen or Less 3	Sixteen or More 5	Fifteen or Less 3	Sixteen or More 4	Fifteen or Less 7	Sixteen or More 1	Fifteen or Less 4	Sixteen or More 3
Number of Months to Be Served	36 and Less 3	37 and More 5	36 and Less 4	37 and More 3	36 and Less 4	37 and More 4	36 and Less 3	37 and More 4

Fox Lake and from 63 to 115 for the women in the control groups.

The average number of months the sample had been incarcerated was 18 for the experimental groups and 19 for the control groups. The number of months served by the men in the experimental groups ranged from 4 months to 120 months and the number of months served by the women in the experimental groups ranged from 2 to 66 months. The men in the control groups had served sentences ranging from 2 to 60 months, while the women in the control groups had served from 2 to 132 months.

The number of months to be served by the sample was based on the maximum sentence that had been given because it was not known when the inmates would actually be paroled. They must be paroled prior to their full term, however. Therefore, the number of months to be served given here is much longer than the men and women will actually remain incarcerated. The number of months to be served by men in the experimental groups at Fox Lake ranged from 7 to 208, not including one life sentence. The range of months to be served by the women in the experimental groups was from 6 to 381 months. The men in the control groups were to serve from 7 to 152 months; while the women in the control groups were to serve from 7 to 168 months, not including two life sentences.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 (pages 60, 61, and 62) identify the number in the sample who had been incarcerated for crimes against persons and those imprisoned for crimes against property. Crimes against persons committed by the sample included murder, assault, sex crimes, and use or sale of drugs. Crimes against property included the remainder of offenses. The

sale or use of drugs is placed under crimes against the state by statute, but clinical services for the institutions usually classify this under crimes against persons. Many of those in the sample who are known narcotics users and pushers were incarcerated for theft, burglary, or forgery and are, therefore, listed under crimes against property.

There were 35 Whites, 22 Blacks, 1 Indian, and 1 Mexican-American in the sample. The Indian and Mexican-American were classified with the Whites. Tables 2, 3, and 4 (pages 60, 61, and 62) identify the group racial make-up.

There were a total of 11 recidivists in the experimental groups and 14 recidivists in the control groups.

Group Book Discussion Procedures

The books to be discussed were selected cooperatively by the group leaders and the research staff. An initial list of books was suggested by leaders and research staff. The leaders were asked to judge the books on the basis of the books' having relevance to inmate lives, their possible reading interest appeal, and upon their containing important, discussable ideas. The books were also evaluated by the selection criteria presented later in this paper (page 67). A revised list was presented to the leaders for final selection. The agreed upon list of 6 books was used by all groups in the same sequence.

Copies of books used in discussion groups were held in a central pool for the duration of the experiment when not in active use by the

experimental groups so that the control group members would not have more than normal access to these particular titles. Participants were encouraged to underline passages in the books and to write notes in the margins as the books were given to the inmates.

Some standardization was effected among the four book discussion groups. A workshop was held in December to orient the eight leaders to the program and to standardize approach. "Implicit" bibliotherapy, as reflected in "Guiding Principles for Discussion Leaders" under "Process", Appendix II, was the style chosen for this study, as it is the closest to the usual library style of book discussion. Book discussion ideas were sent to the leaders each week by the investigator, from which the leaders were free to use what they wished. The leaders were not aware of the background of their group members unless the inmates themselves revealed the information. Of course, the institution librarians knew a portion of the backgrounds of some of the inmates, but they did not share this knowledge with the other group leaders.

Each session was tape-recorded with the consent of the inmates. The investigator's feedback to the discussion leaders was effected through the monitoring of the tapes of the sessions and the subsequent discussion of the tapes with the group leaders. The tapes also provided insight when the interpretation of the findings was made. The feedback consisted of suggestions for keeping the discussions book-oriented, of moving to the next book when fruitful discussion of a book seemed exhausted, and suggestions as to issues which might be included. The leaders provided the

investigator with information about the emotional climate of the group, problems encountered, and concerns of the inmates. Individual follow-up consultations were conducted with the book discussion group leaders and the principal investigator. The leaders were brought together at the conclusion of the program so that they might share insights gained during the book discussions and synthesize experiences into an integrated picture of the project as a whole and come to a consensus of opinion as to the value of bibliotherapy and the impact of a research study upon it.

Each experimental group was led by a team of two leaders. Two of the leaders were librarians in the institutions and six were librarians from surrounding areas. One alternate filled in when emergencies prevented the attendance of one of the leaders. An effort was made to use the capabilities from team to team. The leaders did not make judgments as to inmate opinions, but did require documentation of statements. Their role was a question-asking and explaining role.

Each experimental group met in two-hour sessions once a week for twelve weeks. The groups began on January 3, 1972, and ended March 2, 1972, at the Wisconsin Home for Women. The Wisconsin Correctional Institution's program began January 9, 1972, and ended March 26, 1972. The groups met in classrooms near the library in each institution.

Each team of leaders also lead one control group's activities. They met for one hour three times during the twelve-week period. The sessions were devoted to answering, in sections, an adaptation of the Reader Interest Survey developed by the Library Materials Research Project.

the group,
 1 follow-up
 eaders by the
 the conclu-
 during the
 d picture of
 to the mean-
 it.
 rs. Two of
 librarians
 cies pre-
 ade to match
 judgments
 ments. Theirs
 a week for
 March 20,
 ional Insti-
 972. The
 ivities.
 od. The
 n of the
 earch Project

of the Library School, University of Wisconsin, Madison.¹⁵⁰ Discussion
 in the control groups was limited to reading interests. Care was exerc
 not to engage in book discussion of issues and problems. Both experime
 and control groups had a soft drink intermission when their respective
 groups met.

The reading interest survey, while ~~seemed~~ an important project,
 was a placebo and not a part of this research. The responses to this
 reading interest survey will be separately analyzed.

Criteria for Book Discussion Leaders

The personal characteristics and requirements of discussion lead
 which established a minimal degree of uniformity for the groups include

1. The attainment of the basic curriculum courses required by
 most graduate library schools.
2. The ability to relate to those in correctional institutions
 either by experience in working with the institutionalized or disadvant
 or by sharing the cultural heritage of some of the inmates.
3. A warm, understanding personality capable of handling variou
 reactions of the participants to bibliotherapy in both affective and co
 nitive areas.
4. Team structure of two discussion leaders for each group that
 paired by sex and/or by race, and provided at least one leader experien
 in book discussion for three of the four experimental groups. There we
 3 teams in which a man was paired with a woman and 3 teams in which a

discussion
 as exercised
 experimental
 objective

project,

to this

on leaders

included:

ed by

utions

advantaged

g various

and cog-

up that

xperienced

here were

ich a

Black librarian was paired with a White librarian.

5. A librarian's level of knowledge of books and people, providing the ability to estimate the positive relevance of a particular book for a particular reader.

6. A basic introduction to the process of bibliotherapy provided through an orientation workshop.

7. Regular communication between leaders and the investigator.

A list of the book discussion leaders may be found in Appendix III.

Criteria for Selection of Materials for Discussion

A mixture of creative and didactic literature was chosen for reading and discussion because:

- 1) Reading interest research points to the fact that some readers prefer fiction while others prefer non-fiction. (McElroy, 1968)
- 2) McClaskey (1970)⁸⁷ found that there was no significant difference in behavior improvement between those who read and discussed didactic literature and those who read and discussed creative literature. It might, therefore, be assumed that both would be effective in improving attitudes.

The principal goals of bibliotherapy established the basis for selection of reading materials: (a) to increase self-understanding so that the inmate might become more independent and self-directive as he attempts to cope with his environment; (b) to increase understanding and appreciation of others; (c) to encourage examination of old attitudes and positions in

providing

for a

vided

or.

reading

eaders

y, 1968)⁸⁸

iffer-

dis-

sed

at both

or selec-

hat the

pts to

lation

ons in

order to weed out those which are not helpful and substitute those which are, thus building a workable value system; and (d) to foster the acceptance of reality and make discriminating judgments.

Each title was selected and evaluated for its potential ability to foster change of attitude in problem areas common to most inmates. These concepts, used in the construction of the Semantic Differential test, were chosen for their relevance to inmate concerns: MYSELF, MOTHER, FATHER, MEN, WOMEN, STEALING, DOPE ADDICTION, PAROLE OFFICER, WHITE RACE, BLACK RACE, GOD.

99

The average inmate is said to have a low self-concept. Each title was selected for content elements which might promote improved self-concept. Creative literature with characters having problems common to many inmates was sought. Characters who overcome problems in realistic ways and emerge as stronger people were elements desired in the titles to be read.

The non-fiction books were specifically chosen to promote an improved self-concept. These books were to offer the way of securing self-actualization, esteem, and love needs. Routes to a healthy self-concept which, in turn, would promote better relations with others were sought.

Titles were sought which would:

- (1) picture those associated with institutions realistically.

The good as well as the bad were to be presented, giving opportunity for insight that it is a mistake to categorize any person. Positive adjustment outside institution walls, a

major concern of inmates, was one aspect sought in the selection of books.

- (2) portray crime and drug addiction in its actuality in fiction titles and analyzed in the non-fiction to promote insight as to consequences and provide alternatives.
- (3) depict a greater range of sound relationships between men and women than is common in the lives of many inmates.
- (4) lend insight into the mother and father roles and the consequences of those roles on the children.
- (5) foster acceptance and understanding between races. This understanding is not only socially and humanly desirable, it is especially expedient and practical in a closed environment.
- (6) portray those sincerely struggling with philosophical problems and the concept of God.

Books were selected which would have relevance to those who were youthful, had few living and work skills,⁹¹ came from a low socio-economic background,⁵⁰ were hostile, had a poor self-concept, had many personal, social, and emotional problems, a low educational level, a fear of facing reality,⁹⁹ and those from minority groups.⁹⁵ The above characteristics are those identified in correctional institutional literature as being those typical of most inmates in correctional institutions. Reading interest studies indicate that educational level, sex, age, socio-economic background, racial and ethnic backgrounds are important factors in determining reading interests.

All the titles were selected for a specific contribution to the enhancement of the self-concept. In Tell Me That You Love Me, Junie Moon and Down These Mean Streets the self-concept of the reader could be enhanced by the characters' pride in their adjustment to and accomplishments in life outside the institution in the face of physical and emotional disabilities. Non-fictional books, I'm O. K., You're O. K. and Games People Play, offer practical perspectives for viewing one's self and methods for improving the self and, thus, self-concept. The stress on facing reality and on making discriminating choices may cause the subjects who responded at the extreme ends of the scale on the pretest to move to more discriminative levels on the Semantic Differential posttest. Therefore, even though attitudes reflected by evaluations on the positive side of the scale are sought, a move from the most extreme position to one slightly less favorable, might indicate a more desirable (realistic) evaluation.

Three titles pictured institution life, Tell Me That You Love Me, Junie Moon, a hospital; Down These Mean Streets, a correctional institution in the United States; and One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch, a prison camp in Siberia. All realistically depict institution life and offer points for comparison, and a variety of specific potential insights for those in correctional institutions.

Down These Mean Streets and Daddy Was a Number Runner provided the opportunity to become involved through identification and projection in the life experiences of those in minority groups, while Tell Me That You Love Me, Junie Moon provided the opportunity to live through those of a

majority group. Research indicates that those groups exposed to one another in a positive way come to understand and accept one another.

Tell Me That You Love Me, Junie Moon, Down These Mean Streets, and Daddy Was a Number Runner depict a wide range of relationships between men and women. Male and female points of view, practical problems faced by each, and feelings and emotions unique to each sex are explored.

Families and their disintegration is pictured in Down These Mean Streets and Daddy Was a Number Runner. The influence parents have on children is also presented in I'm O. K., You're O. K. and, to some extent, Games People Play, giving rise to the possibility of the development of an understanding of parents because of insight gained as to why parents behave as they do.

Crime and drug addiction and the consequences of these crimes are described in Down These Mean Streets and Daddy Was a Number Runner. I'm O. K., You're O. K. describes why some become criminally oriented, and what they may do to change. Games People Play identifies the games played, why they are played, the "pay-off", and the antitheses of playing games which are the honest transactions with others.

The autobiographical, Down These Mean Streets, explores two religions and the influence that belief in a higher being may have on an individual. I'm O. K., You're O. K. analyzes the relationship between moral values and religion. The several philosophies offer alternative styles of thinking about moral values.

The pooled judgment of the leaders based on their having read the

materials was used to determine whether the books recommended had relevance to inmate lives, met their reading interests, and contained important, discussable ideas. The research staff determined that the books met specific criteria given above. The leaders were not provided the specific criteria nor the contents of the tests in order that they might not unduly influence attitudes or inadvertently "teach the test".

The purpose of the study, to determine whether bibliotherapy can precipitate change in the attitudes of adult correctional institution inmates, determined both the criteria for selection of materials for reading and discussion but also the instruments used to measure attitudes. The instruments had to measure the attitudes toward the concepts read about and discussed.

Measurement Instruments and Testing Procedures

Personal Values Abstract

Two instruments, the Personal Values Abstract and an adaptation of the Semantic Differential, were used to measure attitude difference between the experimental and control groups at the beginning and conclusion of the discussion series.

The Personal Values Abstract (PVA), selected for its capacity to measure commonly accepted principles of social and personal adjustment, was administered by the institutional research staffs. The PVA contains three scales drawn from the California Psychological Inventory (CPI): Modernity (32 items), Socialization (32 items), and Femininity (38 items).

Harrison Gough, the author of the CPI, chose certain scales from that instrument to construct the PVA, a test taking the respondents only ten to twenty minutes to complete.⁴⁵

The CPI from which the PVA was abstracted has been validated in America and a variety of foreign countries (Gough, 1965,⁴² 1965,⁴⁴ 1966,⁴³ and Gough, Chun, and Chung, 1968⁴⁶). Norms were established for the PVA on 529 males and 431 females. Appendix II contains additional information on the PVA.

The Semantic Differential

An adaptation of the Semantic Differential, used to measure the degree of the subjects' negative or positive evaluations of an object, was administered by the institutional staffs. It was designed for use with a wide variety of research problems to measure generality of reading.

Insko (1967) in Theories of Attitude Change stated:

. . . much attitude change research has relied and does rely on poorly conceived assessment procedures despite the known availability of many sophisticated psychometric techniques. Perhaps part of the problem in the past has been the labor involved in constructing Thurstone, Likert, or Guttman attitude scales. Now, however, with the development of the easily applicable semantic differential technique, there is less reason for using more sophisticated procedures.^{83:345}

This assessment of the Semantic Differential was given by Carter, Ruggles, and Chaffee (1969):

Since its introduction by Osgood and his associates, the semantic differential has become one of the most popular methods of measuring opinions. It offers many advantages--ease and speed of administration, manifest numerical equivalences, reliability, sensitivity, versatility--and has passed a number of validity tests.^{23:666}

Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) described the Semantic Differential:

What is meant by "differentiating" the meaning of a concept?
When a subject judges a concept against a series of scales, e. g.

	Father													
Happy	_____	:	_____	:	x	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	Sad
Hard	_____	:	x	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	Soft
Slow	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	_____	:	x	:	_____	:	_____	Fast

etc.

each judgment represents a selection among a set of given alternatives and serves to localize the concept as a point in the semantic space. 106:26

Rationale for Concept Choice

The concepts which have been chosen for this study were chosen because they represent the relationships or contacts which inmates have or have had at some point in their past. These concepts are dealt with in the reading materials which the inmates read and discussed in their discussion groups.

For the most part, general concepts rather than specific ones were chosen because attitudes toward a general concept might change as the literature exposes readers to persons and relationships different from those encountered in the participants' living experiences. Attitude toward a specific "my Mother" might not change because that person did not change, but the attitude toward the broad concept, "Mothers", could change as the reader develops insight into the interpersonal relationships possible as portrayed in the literature read and discussed.

Measurement concepts were chosen which were relevant to the broad concepts to be measured and which are sensitive to change. Measurement

concepts to measure attitude change were chosen as important in terms of evaluation of the worth of a concept.

Attitudes were considered to be positive when the plus side of the scale was checked except for "stealing" and "dope addiction" where attitudes were considered positive when the minus side of the scale was checked. The twelfth concept listed below, "total concepts", is a combination of the mean scores on all the concepts.

Concepts

- | | |
|-------------|--------------------|
| 1. Mothers | 7. Fathers |
| 2. God | 8. White race |
| 3. Myself | 9. Dope addictior |
| 4. Stealing | 10. Black race |
| 5. Men | 11. Parole officer |
| 6. Women | 12. Total concepts |

Measurement Terms

- | + | - |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Sincere | Insincere |
| 2. Smart | Dumb |
| 3. Love | Hate |
| 4. Kind | Cruel |
| 5. Dependable | Undependable |
| 6. Helpful | Hurtful |
| 7. Reasonable | Unreasonable |
| 8. Confident | Fearful |
| 9. Good | Bad |
| 10. Responsible | Not responsible |
| 11. Unselfish | Selfish |

Selection of Measurement Terms

By factor analysis Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) isolated

three factors in the semantic space: evaluation, potency, and activity.¹⁰⁶

In developing measurement terms to measure concepts for this study, there was an attempt to measure only the evaluative factor. Authorities in the field of attitude and opinion research agree that the evaluative factor is the most important one. Insko (1967) stated:

The two remaining more recent definitions focus on the affective tendency to favorably or unfavorably evaluate objects and entirely discard the notion that any overt behavior is implied. The most common contemporary usage seems to follow this example, thus regarding the evaluative dimension as the single defining dimension for attitudes.^{63:2}

Carter, Ruggles, and Chaffee's findings concurred with Insko's synthesis of the literature on attitude change research:

The one inference that seems inescapable from our findings is that the first, and overwhelming, factor is a general evaluative one. This is consistent with Osgood's main findings, and with our theoretical idea that the main affective response a person can give for an object denotes its total utility for him.^{23:673}

"Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes," by J. P. Robinson and P. R. Shaver (1969)^{115:712} was consulted for aid in selection of measurement terms. A number of tests appear in this volume which measure attitudes. The twelve affective measurement terms which appeared to have the most relevance to the concepts being measured were selected for preliminary testing.

Testing Procedures

Preliminary Testing

A preliminary test of the Semantic Differential was given to a

sample of thirty Wisconsin Correctional Institution inmates not involved in the project. The test consisted of fifteen concepts measured by twelve measurement terms.

A properly marked sample page of the test was shown on the overhead projector. Subjects given the preliminary tests were permitted to respond to a "Doesn't Apply" to a measurement term on a concept.

On the basis of the results of the preliminary tests, 11 measurement terms were chosen. The terms which were checked "Doesn't Apply" most often were eliminated from each concept page until there were only nine terms for each concept. Therefore nine affective terms which were most relevant to each concept were selected from the eleven measurement terms and eleven of the fifteen concepts were chosen on the basis of the response of the preliminary test group. The final version of the Semantic Differential test was administered as a thirty minute test. A sample of the Semantic Differential test and the PVA may be found in Appendix I.

Final Testing

The psychologists and staff members conducted the tests at each institution. The investigator was present at the posttest at the Wisconsin Home for Women at the request of the psychologist and librarian. The week prior to the testing had been a very unsettled one at the institution. Also, the parole board was to meet the next day. Emotional tension was very high. Many of the respondents refused to answer the tests until the investigator explained that the tests were for a study unrelated to the

correctional institution and the investigator had come in order to collect the tests. The same classroom was used for the posttest as the pretest at the Wisconsin Correctional Institution. The posttest was administered in the library at the Wisconsin Home for Women. The pretests were administered in the week prior to the first meeting of the groups, and the posttests were administered during the week immediately following the last meeting of the groups. The instructions given to the respondents appear in Appendix I.

Statistical Analysis

Analysis of Covariance was used to analyze the significance of the differences between means of the posttests on the Socialization Scale of the Personal Values Abstract and the concepts of the Semantic Differential by taking into account and adjusting pretest differences between the experimental and control groups. An F test was used to test the significance of the findings. An .05 probability level of significance was chosen.

Insko (1967), after describing the most popular experimental design in the field of attitude change, i. e., the before-after design in which both the pretest and posttest are administered to the experimental and control groups, but the treatment given to the experimental group only, said:

The results are typically analyzed by comparing the difference between the pretest and posttest in the experimental group with the comparable difference in the control group. The results, however, can be more elegantly analyzed by comparing the posttest scores for the two groups after the analysis of covariance has been used to eliminate that portion of the variance which is attributable to the pretests.^{63:7}

The concepts which were tested were: MYSELF, WHITE RACE, WOMEN, MOTHERS, MEN, GOD, FATHERS, STEALING, DOPE ADDICTION, PAROLE OFFICE, BLACK RACE, and TOTAL CONCEPTS. In addition, the Personal Values A was administered and the Socialization Scale used.

The effect of these variables (Individual Factors) were tested by Group, Sex, Offense, Race, Achievement, Recidivism, Number of Months to be Served, Number of Months Served, and Age.

One of the Analyses of Covariance, with the use of the F test, was constructed to answer three basic questions while taking into account and adjusting for pretest differences.

1. Is there a significant difference on a concept (such as SELF) between the experimental and control groups?

2. Is there a significant difference on a concept (such as SELF) related to differences on some other variable as "Sex"?

3. Is there a significant difference on some concept (such as SELF) due to an interaction between treatment and "Sex"?

The Analysis of Covariance makes use of both analysis of variance and of regression. Steel and Torrie (1960) give these uses of the Analysis of Covariance:

1. To assist in the interpretation of data, especially with respect to the nature of treatment effects.
2. To partition a total covariance or sum of cross products into component parts.
3. To control error and increase precision.
4. To adjust treatment means of the dependent variable for differences in sets of values of corresponding independent variables.
5. To estimate missing data.

129:305

RACE, WOMEN,
OFFICER,
Values Abstract

ere tested:
of Months to
ne F test,

g into account
such as MYSELF)

such as MYSELF)

(such as MY-

s of variance

of the Analysis

lly with regard

products into

ble for dif-
pendent vari-

The formulas used in the Analysis of Covariance are:

$$Y_{ij} = \mu + \delta_i + \beta_j + \epsilon_{ij}$$

$$Y_{ij} = \mu + \beta_j + \epsilon_{ij}$$

The variable being analyzed, the dependent variable (the posttest score in this study), is denoted by Y while the variable used in the control of error and adjustment of means, the covariate (the pretest score in this study), is denoted by X. By use of the first formula the Analysis of Variance of values which have been adjusted for regression on an independent variable can be carried out. By use of the second formula the measurement of the regression of Y on X without the interference of treatment (bibliotherapy in this study) and block effects may be carried out.

The residual variance is estimated on the basis of estimating values for μ , the δ 's, the β 's, and ϵ , indicated by $\hat{\cdot}$'s, such that this formula holds:

Definitional formula: $\sum_{i,j} [Y_{ij} - \hat{\mu} - \hat{\delta}_i - \hat{\beta}_j - \epsilon_{ij}]^2 = \text{minimum}$

Computational formula: $\hat{\beta}_j = \frac{E_{xy}}{E_{xx}} = \frac{\sum Y_{ij} - \frac{(\sum X_{ij})^2}{E_{xx}}}{E_{xx}}$

The estimates of the parameters are termed least-squares estimates:

$$\sum_{i,j} [Y_{ij} - \hat{\mu} - \hat{\delta}_i - \hat{\beta}_j - \epsilon_{ij}] = 0$$

These equations define the estimates and give the residual variance.

1. $\hat{\mu} = \bar{y}_{..} = \bar{y}_{..} - b(\bar{x}_{..} - x_{..})$
2. $\hat{\beta}_j = b = \frac{E_{xy}}{E_{xx}}$

E_{xx} , E_{xy} and E_{yy} are sums of products for error, for example E_{xx} is the error sum of squares for X, and f_e is error degrees of freedom. "It is seen from the second of Eqs. . . . that, in order to estimate the treatment effect γ_i , the deviation of any treatment mean from the general mean must be adjusted by the quantity $t(\bar{x}_{i.} - \bar{x}_{..})$. This adjustment removes any effect that is attributable to the variable X. It is the adjusted treatment means that are comparable."^{129:310}

This table from Steel and Torrie (1960)^{129:310} gives the Analysis of Covariance for a randomized complete-block design:

TESTING ADJUSTED TREATMENT MEANS
The analysis of covariance for the randomized complete-block design

Source	df	Sums of products of			df	Adjusted Σ^2	MS
		x,x	x,y	y,y			
Total	$rt - 1$	Σx^2	Σxy	Σy^2			
Blocks	$r - 1$	R_{xx}	R_{xy}	R_{yy}			
Treatments	$t - 1$	T_{xx}	T_{xy}	T_{yy}			
Error	$(r - 1)(t - 1)$	E_{xx}	E_{xy}	E_{yy}	$(r - 1)(t - 1) - 1$	$L_{yy} - \frac{(L_{xy})^2}{E_{xx}}$	S_{yy}^*
Treatments + error	$r(t - 1)$	S_{xx}	S_{xy}	S_{yy}	$r(t - 1) - 1$	$S_{yy} - \frac{(S_{xy})^2}{S_{xx}}$	
Treatments adjusted					$t - 1$	$\left[S_{yy} - \frac{(S_{xy})^2}{S_{xx}} \right] - \left[E_{yy} - \frac{(E_{xy})^2}{E_{xx}} \right]$	

STATJOB Regan 2: Multiple Linear Regression Analysis of the University of Wisconsin Computing Center, Madison, was employed to perform the Analysis of Covariance for this study. Regan 2 is a standard

is the
It is
treat-
ral
removes
sted
alysis

least-squares program employed to partition the sums of squares. Funds for computer time and STATJOB consulting were provided by the Research Committee of the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

An Analysis of Covariance, main effects was performed first to determine which of the background variables were significant. Further Analysis of Covariance was done on these significant variables to determine what part of the difference found in the main effects tables was due to bibliotherapy treatment, to the background variable, or to an interaction between bibliotherapy treatment and the variable.

The findings from the use of Analysis of Covariance, the interpretation of these findings, the conclusions drawn, and the implications for the field and further study will be discussed in Chapter III.

e Uni-
rform

83
ds
h
r
er-
due
r-
pre-
for

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Findings

Summary of Findings

The following findings are products of the design, testing, and Analysis of Covariance discussed in the previous chapter. The general objective to which this study was directed predicted that bibliotherapy would affect positively the attitudes of inmates in correctional institutions. When the null hypotheses as well as the alternative hypotheses were tested on eleven concepts and the combination of mean scores on all eleven concepts (TOTAL CONCEPTS) on the Semantic Differential and the Socialization Scale of the Personal Values Abstract, some of the null hypotheses were supported and a few of the alternative hypotheses were sustained. All findings reported as significant are at the .05 probability level or beyond.

The Analysis of Covariance and the F test showed statistically significant difference at the .01 level between the experimental and control groups on attitude toward DOPE ADDICTION and STEALING, the only behavioral attitudes measured. The experimental groups registered a much less accepting attitude toward these two behavioral attitudes than did the control groups. On the other hand, no significant difference between

these two groups as a whole was found on attitudes toward concepts relating to persons or on the Socialization Scale of the PVA.

There was statistically significant interaction at the .05 level between Race, Number of Months to be Served, or Number of Months Served and Group Treatment on ten analyses. In 8 of the 10 analyses, the posttest scores made by those in the experimental groups who were either in the group of those (1) who had 16 months or more to serve, (2) who had served 37 months or more, or (3) Black inmates were higher than those of their group members and were equal to or higher than all those in the control groups on the concepts WOMEN, MOTHERS, FATHERS, and TOTAL CONCEPTS, and on the Socialization Scale of the PVA. It is of importance that half of these eight interactions were on TOTAL CONCEPTS, a combination of the mean scores on all 11 concepts, and on the Socialization Scale of the PVA, a standardized test. There was interaction significant at beyond the .10 level between Race and Treatment on MYSELF and between Number of Months Served and Treatment on the Socialization Scale of the PVA. Again, the Black inmates and those who had 37 months or more to serve in the experimental groups registered the more positive attitudes.

Detailed Report of Findings

The Analysis of Covariance statistical procedure does not indicate whether there is a positive or negative change, only that there is significant difference. The interpretation of direction must be done by looking at the data. Tables which show the posttest scores for all statistically

significant findings have been presented following the relevant Analysis of Covariance tables.

Basic findings are reported in the Analysis of Covariance tables. These tables show the degrees of freedom, the Sum of Squares, Mean Square, and F values. The error is the variance between the subjects from the mean--the ordinary fluctuation in scores occurring between individuals in the absence of treatment effects. The column for the F values are headed in such a way as to show the value necessary for a finding to be significant. The asterisk denotes significance at the .05 level; double asterisks indicate significance at the .01 level of significance; triple asterisks indicate significance at the .005 level of significance.

Hypothesis I

Null Hypothesis I

The mean posttest scores (adjusted for the pretest scores) for the experimental groups will not be statistically different from the control groups on any of the eleven concepts of the Semantic Differential or on the combination of all eleven concepts (TOTAL CONCEPTS).

Alternative Hypothesis I

The mean posttest scores (adjusted for the pretest scores) for the experimental groups will be statistically different from the control groups on each of the eleven concepts of the Semantic Differential and on the combination of the eleven concepts (TOTAL

CONCEPTS).

Findings Related to Hypothesis I

H I (STEALING): The null hypothesis was rejected, thus there was support for the alternative hypothesis. The scores on attitude toward STEALING achieved by the experimental groups demonstrated a significant degree of difference at the .01 level from those of control groups. See Tables 5 and 6 in the text.

H I (DOPE ADDICTION): The null hypothesis was rejected, thus there was support for the alternative hypothesis. The scores on attitude toward DOPE ADDICTION achieved by the experimental groups demonstrated a significant degree of difference at the .01 level from those of control groups. See Tables 7 and 8 in the text.

H I ((3) WHITE RACE, (4) WOMEN, (5) MEN, (6) MOTHERS, (7) FATHERS, (8) BLACK RACE, (9) PAROLE OFFICER, (10) GOD, (11) MYSELF, and (12) TOTAL CONCEPTS): The null hypothesis was accepted. The scores on a Semantic Differential test for attitudes achieved by the experimental groups did not demonstrate a significant degree of difference from those of the control groups on the concepts 3-12. See Tables 33 to 52 in Appendix III.

Hypothesis II

Null Hypothesis II

The mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest scores) for the experimental groups will not be statistically different from

those of the control groups on the Socialization Scale of the Personal Values Abstract.

Alternative Hypothesis II

The mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest scores) for the experimental groups will be statistically different from those of the control groups on the Socialization Scale of the Personal Values Abstract.

Findings Related to Hypothesis I:

H II (SOCIALIZATION SCALE): The null hypothesis was accepted. Inmates who participated in a program of bibliotherapy did not show a significant difference in socially acceptable attitudes as reflected by higher scores on the Socialization Scale of the Personal Values Abstract from those achieved by their control groups. See Tables 31 and 32 in Appendix III.

Hypothesis III

1. There will be no statistically significant difference between the mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest) on either attitude test related to difference in attitude by differences in individual factors: Sex, Offense, Race, Recidivism, Achievement, Number of Months Served, Number of Months to be Served, or Age.
2. There will be no statistically significant difference between

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE, MAIN EFFECTS

TABLE 5

"STEALING"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 48, .05} = 4.048$
Error	48	3849.76	80.20	
Error + Sex	49	4110.68		
Sex	1	260.92	260.92	3.25
Error + Offense	49	3895.16		
Offense	1	45.40	45.40	.56
Error + Race	49	3865.80		
Race	1	16.04	16.04	.20
Error + Achievement	49	3920.66		
Achievement	1	70.90	70.90	.88
Error + Recidivism	49	3854.48		
Recidivism	1	4.72	4.72	.05
Error + Months to be Served	49	3849.81		
Months to be Served	1	.05	.05	.00
Error + Months Served	49	3857.70		
Months Served	1	7.94	7.94	.09
Error + Age	49	3855.46		
Age	1	5.70	5.70	.07
Error + Group	49	4435.95		
Group (Experimental vs. Control)	1	586.19	586.19	7.30**

TABLE 6

"STEALING"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PPETEST AND ERROR

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	30.96
Female	35.64
Offense	
Against Persons	30.96
Against Property	33.07
Race	
Black	30.96
White	29.60
Achievement	
Above Mean	30.96
Below Mean	27.96
Recidivism	
Yes	30.96
No	30.33
Months to be Served	
15 or less	30.96
16 or more	30.89
Months Served	
36 or less	30.96
37 or more	32.07
Age	
25 or less	30.96
26 or more	31.69
Group	
Experimental	30.96
Control	24.38

TABLE 7

"DOPE ADDICTION"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 48, .05} = 4.048
Error	48	4456.26	92.83	
Error + Sex	49	4531.36		
Sex	1	75.10	75.10	.80
Error + Offense	49	4505.65		
Offense	1	49.39	49.39	.53
Error + Race	49	4456.28		
Race	1	.02	.02	.00
Error + Achievement	49	4610.62		
Achievement	1	154.36	154.36	1.66
Error + Recidivism	49	4506.52		
Recidivism	1	50.26	50.26	.54
Error + Months to be Served	49	4459.29		
Months to be Served	1	3.03	3.03	.03
Error + Months Served	49	4534.44		
Months Served	1	78.18	78.18	.84
Error + Age	49	4485.31		
Age	1	29.05	29.05	.31
Error + Group	49	5233.34		
Group (Experimental vs. Control)	1	777.08	777.08	8.37**

TABLE 8

"DOPE ADDICTION"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	55.05
Female	57.56
Offense	
Against Persons	55.05
Against Property	57.25
Race	
Black	55.05
White	57.30
Achievement	
Above Mean	55.05
Below Mean	50.70
Recidivism	
Yes	55.05
No	53.03
Months to be Served	
15 or less	55.05
16 or more	55.68
Months Served	
36 or less	55.05
37 or more	58.53
Age	
25 or less	55.05
26 or more	56.65
Group	
Experimental	55.05
Control	47.49

the mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest and error) on either attitude test of the experimental groups and those of the control groups when interaction between the factors of Number of Months Served, Race, or Number of Months to be Served, and the factor of Group Treatment is analyzed.

Alternative Hypothesis III

1. There will be a statistically significant difference between the mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest) on each attitude test related to differences in attitude by differences in individual factors: Sex, Offense, Race, Recidivism, Achievement, Number of Months Served, Number of Months to be Served, or Age.
2. There will be a statistically significant difference between the mean posttest scores (adjusted for pretest) on each attitude test of the experimental groups and those of the control groups when interaction between the factors of Number of Months Served, Race, or Number of Months to be Served, and the factor of Group Treatment is analyzed.

Findings Related to Hypothesis III

H III 1 (SOCIALIZATION: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypothesis was accepted. There were no significant differences on SOCIALIZATION by the individual background factors. See Tables 32 and 33 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (SOCIALIZATION: Interaction Between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was rejected, the alternative hypothesis was supported. When the Analysis of Covariance was performed, an interaction was found between the Number of Months to be Served and Bibliotherapy Treatment. See Tables 9 and 10.

TABLE 9
"SOCIALIZATION"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	54	555.42	10.28	41.54
Error + Interaction	55	602.15		
Interaction	1	46.73	46.73	4.55
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	608.54		
Group Treatment	1	6.39	6.39	.62
Error + Interaction + Months to be Served	56	603.09		
Months to be Served	1	.94	.94	.09

Those who had 16 months or more to serve in the experimental groups responded more positively to Bibliotherapy Treatment than those who had 15 months or less to serve in the experimental groups, as well

er of Months to
 ted, thus the
 of Covariance
 er of Months to
 10.

AND TREATMENT

1, 54, .05 = 4.024

41.53

4.03*

.62

.09

xperimental groups

n those who had

s well as those

who had 16 or more months to serve in the control groups.

The figures in this table represent mean posttest scores adjusted for error and pretest.

TABLE 10
 "SOCIALIZATION"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Number of Months to be Served	
	15 Months or less	16 Months or more
Experimental	14.34	16.62
Control	16.73	15.64

H III 2 (SOCIALIZATION: Interaction Between Race and Treatment):

The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

Interaction on SOCIALIZATION between Race and Treatment showed

that the Black inmates in the experimental groups reacted more positively to Bibliotherapy Treatment than the White inmates. The White inmates in the control groups registered higher scores than the Black inmates in the control groups. See Tables 11 and 12 on page 96.

H III 2 (SOCIALIZATION: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment):

The null hypothesis was accepted. See Tables 11 and 12 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (STEALING: Effect of Individual Factors):

The null hypothesis III 1 was accepted. A significant difference on attitudes toward STEALING was not due to individual background factors other than Group

cores adjusted

RROR

Served

16 Months
or more

16.62

15.64

and Treatment):

thesis supported.

ment showed

more positively

te inmates in

inmates in the

of Months

See Table 53

The null hypoth-

udes toward

than Group

TABLE 11
"SOCIALIZATION"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	54	539.39	9.98	1, 54, .05
Error + Interaction	55	580.24		
Interaction	1	40.85	40.85	4.09*
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	584.42		
Group Treatment	1	.18	.18	.01
Error + Interaction + Race	56	603.09		
Race	1	22.85	22.85	2.28

TABLE 12
"SOCIALIZATION"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Race	
	Black	White
Experimental	16.21	15.70
Control	13.56	16.49

Treatment. See Tables 5 and 6 on pages 89 and 90.

H III 2 (STEALING: Interaction Between Race and Treatment): null hypothesis was accepted. All those in the experimental groups more positively to the treatment than the control groups, although the Black inmates in the experimental groups responded more favorably than the rest. This effect was significant at the .005 level. See Tables 55 and 57 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (STEALING: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. All those in the experimental groups responded more favorably to the treatment than those in the control groups, although those who had served 37 months or more responded more favorably than any of the other participants. This effect was significant at the .005 level. See Tables 56 and 57 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (STEALING: Interaction Between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. All those in the experimental groups responded more favorably to the treatment than those in the control groups. However, those who had 16 or more months to serve responded more favorably than any of the other participants. This main effect was significant at the .005 level. See Tables 57 and 58 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (DOPE ADDICTION: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypothesis was accepted. See Tables 5 and 6 on pages 89 and 90.

H III 2 (DOPE ADDICTION: Interaction Between Race and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. All those in the experimental groups reacted more favorably than those in the control groups. However, the

54, .05 = 4.024
4.09*
.01
2.28
OR
hite
15.70
16.49

ment): The
 groups reacted
 though the
 rably than the
 ables 55 and
 chs Served
 e in the exper-
 n those in the
 ore responded
 ect was signif-
 I.
 hs to be
 l those in
 ment than
 ore months
 cipants. This
 and 58 in
): The null
 90.
 Treatment):
 tal groups
 ever, the

Black inmates in the experimental groups responded more favorably than any other group. This main effect was significant at the .005 level. See Tables 59 and 62 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (DOPE ADDICTION: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. All those in the experimental groups responded more favorably to Bibliotherapy Treatment than those in the control groups. However, those who had 37 or more months yet to serve responded more favorably than any other group. This main effect was significant at the .005 level. See Tables 60 and 61 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (DOPE ADDICTION: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. All those in the experimental groups responded more favorably to Bibliotherapy Treatment on this concept than those in the control groups. However, those who had 37 or more months to serve responded more favorably than those who had served 36 months or less in the experimental groups and all those in the control groups. This was significant at the .005 level. See Tables 61 and 62 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (WHITE RACE: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis accepted. Race and Number of Months Served had a significant effect on attitude toward WHITE RACE. The White inmates responded more positively to WHITE RACE than the Black inmates, and those who had served 37 months or more responded more favorably to WHITE RACE than those who had served 36 months or less.

avorably than
 .005 level.
 r of Months to
 d. All those
 liotherapy
 e who had 16
 any other group.
 ables 60 and 62

r of Months
 All those in
 therapy Treat-
 however, those
 y than those
 s and all of
 .005 level.

: The null
 cepted. Both
 on attitudes
 ively to WHITE
 onths or more
 served 36 months

or less. See Tables 33 and 34 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (WHITE RACE: Interaction Between Race and Treatment):
 The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no statistically significant
 interaction between Race and Treatment. See Tables 63 and 65 in Appendix
 III.

H III 2 (WHITE RACE: Interaction Between Number of Months Served
 and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no signifi-
 cant interaction between Number of Months Served and Treatment on the con-
 cept WHITE RACE. However, Table 65 demonstrates that the White inmates
 in the control groups had a higher mean posttest score than any other
 group, and that those who had served 37 months or more in the experimental
 groups had higher mean posttest scores than any other group in both exper-
 imental and control. This interaction was significant beyond the .10
 level. See Tables 64 and 65 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (WHITE RACE: Interaction Between Number of Months to be
 Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no
 significant interaction between Number of Months to be Served and Treat-
 ment. See Table 66 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (WOMEN: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypoth-
 esis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was
 a statistically significant different effect related to differences in
 Number of Months Served on the concept WOMEN. Those who had served 37
 months or more had noticeably higher posttest scores than those who had
 served 36 months or less. See Tables 35 and 36 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (WOMEN: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was an interaction between Number of Months Served and Treatment on the concept WOMEN.

TABLE 13

"WOMEN"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	3451.98	63.92	
Error + Interaction	55	3783.67		
Interaction	1	331.69	331.69	5.18*
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	3796.44		
Group Treatment	1	12.77	12.77	.03
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	4096.17		
Number of Months Served	1	396.49	396.49	4.79*

Table 14, page 101, shows that those who had served 37 months or more in the experimental groups registered a more positive attitude than

those who had served 36 months or less in the experimental and control groups and those who had served 37 months or more in the control groups.

TABLE 14

"WOMEN"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Number of Months Served	
	36 Months or less	37 Months or more
Experimental	37.88	52.58
Control	37.88	39.02

H III 2 (WOMEN: Interaction Between Race and Treatment): The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was a statistically significant interaction between Race and Treatment on the concept WOMEN. See Table 15, below, and Table 16, page 102.

TABLE 15

"WOMEN"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Race	
	Black	White
Experimental	43.88	37.13
Control	37.13	40.50

100

and

hypothesis

Served

=4.024

or

than

rol
roups.

Table 15 reveals that the Black inmates in the experimental groups responded more favorably to the Bibliotherapy Treatment than the White inmates in the control groups. The White inmates in the control groups responded more favorably than the Black control groups inmates on the concept WOMEN, although the Black inmates in the experimental groups had a higher mean posttest score than any in the control groups.

TABLE 16

"WOMEN"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.02*
Error	54	3752.30	69.48	
Error + Interaction	55	4070.60		
Interaction	1	318.30	318.30	4.58*
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	4081.47		
Group Treatment	1	10.87	10.87	.15
Error + Interaction + Race	56	4090.16		
Race	1	19.56	19.56	.28

H III 2 (WOMEN: Interaction Between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no

e null
here
nt on

statistically significant interaction between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment on the concept WOMEN. See Table 67 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (MEN: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant difference related to differences in Race and Achievement on the concept MEN. The White inmates and those below the mean on Achievement had higher posttest scores than the Black inmates or those above the mean on Achievement. See Tables 47 and 48 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (MEN: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. Groups of inmates who volunteered for a program of bibliotherapy showed an interaction on the concept MEN between Number of Months Served and Treatment. See Tables 17 and 18, page 104.

Table 18, page 104, reveals that those who had served 37 months or more in the experimental groups and those who had served 36 months or less in the control groups made higher posttest scores than their corresponding group members. Those in the control groups who had served the least amount of time had higher posttest scores than any other group.

H III 2 (MEN: Interaction Between Race and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no statistically significant interaction between Race and Treatment on the concept MEN. See Table 68 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (MEN: Interaction Between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment): There was no statistically significant interaction between

TABLE 17

"MEN"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p
Error	54	2262.73	41.90		
Error + Interaction	55	2864.15			
Interaction	1	601.42	601.42	14.35*	
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	3012.30			
Group Treatment	1	148.15	148.15	3.53	
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	2943.00			
Number of Months Served	1	78.85	78.85	1.88	

TABLE 18

"MEN"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Number of Months Served	
	36 Months or less	37 Months or more
Experimental	34.03	37.21
Control	39.90	35.05

Number of Months to be Served and Treatment on the concept MEN. See Table 69 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (MOTHERS: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no statistically different attitude toward MOTHERS by the individual background factors. See Tables 39 and 40 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (MOTHERS: Interaction Between Race and Treatment): The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was a statistically significant interaction between Race and Treatment on the concept MOTHERS. See Tables 19 and 20 on page 106.

Table 20, page 106, reveals that the Black inmates in the experimental groups reacted more positively toward MOTHERS than the rest of the sample.

H III 2 (MOTHERS: Interaction Between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no interaction between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment. See Table 70 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (MOTHERS: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis is accepted. There was no interaction between Number of Months to Serve and Bibliotherapy Treatment. See Table 71 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (FATHERS: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean posttest scores on the concept FATHERS related to

TABLE 19

"MOTHERS"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 54, .05} = 4.024$
Error	54	5704.84	105.64	
Error + Interaction	55	6175.82		
Interaction	1	470.98	470.98	4.45*
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	6284.14		
Group Treatment	1	108.32	108.32	1.02
Error + Interaction + Race	56	6395.79		
Race	1	219.97	219.97	2.08

TABLE 20

"MOTHERS"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Race	
	Black	White
Experimental	58.13	47.99
Control	48.26	49.78

differences in attitude by individual background factors. See Tables 41 and 42 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (FATHERS: Interaction Between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was a statistically significant interaction between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment on the concept FATHERS.

TABLE 21
"FATHERS"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	5183.96	95.99	
Error + Interaction	55	5625.59		
Interaction	1	441.63	441.63	4.60*
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	5639.94		
Group Treatment	1	14.35	14.35	.14
Error + Interaction + Months to be Served	56	5897.74		
Months to be Served	1	272.15	272.15	2.83

Table 22, page 108, reveals that those who had 16 or more months

TABLE 22

"FATHERS"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Number of Months to be Served	
	15 Months or less	16 Months or more
Experimental	35.68	47.0
Control	44.16	42.5

to serve in the experimental groups made higher posttest scores than the other group in the whole sample. Those who had served 15 months or less had the higher scores in the control groups.

H III 2 (FATHERS: Interaction Between Race and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no statistically significant difference due to interaction between the mean posttest scores of the treatment groups and Race on the concept FATHERS. See Table 72 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (FATHERS: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no statistically significant difference related to interaction between the mean posttest scores of the treatment groups and Number of Months Served on the concept FATHERS. See Table 73 in Appendix III.

ERROR

be Served

16 Months or more	47.00
	42.17

scores than any

5 months or less

treatment). The

y significant

scores of the

Table 72, Appendix

Months Served and

is no statistically

the mean posttest

red on the concept

H III 1 (BLACK RACE: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was a significant difference between the mean posttest scores on the concept BLACK RACE related to differences in attitude by Race. The Black inmates registered a more positive attitude toward the concept BLACK RACE than did the White inmates. See Tables 43 and 44 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (BLACK RACE: Interaction Between Race and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. The Black inmates in both the experimental and control groups were more positive in their response to BLACK RACE than the White inmates of either group. See Tables 74 and 75 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (BLACK RACE: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. Those who had served 37 months or more in both the experimental and control groups rated BLACK RACE more positively than those who had served 36 months or less. The Black inmates who had served 37 months or more in the experimental groups rated BLACK RACE more positively than any other group. See Tables 76 and 77 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (BLACK RACE: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant interaction between Number of Months Served and Treatment on the concept BLACK RACE, nor was there a significant difference between those who had served 15 months or less and those who had served 16 months or more on their response to this concept. Table 78 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (PAROLE OFFICER: Effect of Individual Factors):

The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was a statistically significant difference on attitude toward PAROLE OFFICER related to differences in Race. The White inmates rated PAROLE OFFICER more positively than the Black inmates. See Tables 45 and 46 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (PAROLE OFFICER: Interaction Between Race and Treatment): The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was an interaction between Race and Group Treatment related to the concept PAROLE OFFICER. See Table 23, below.

Months Served

who had served

ups rated BLACK

r less. However,

groups responded

7 in Appendix

Months to be

There was no

on the concept

those who had

s or more on

ors): The null

hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was a statistically significant difference on attitude toward PAROLE OFFICER related to differences in Race. The White inmates rated PAROLE OFFICER more positively than the Black inmates. See Tables 45 and 46 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (PAROLE OFFICER: Interaction Between Race and Treatment)

The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was an interaction between Race and Group Treatment related to the concept PAROLE OFFICER. See Table 23, below.

TABLE 23

"PAROLE OFFICER"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	3274.82	60.64	
Error + Interaction	55	3559.24		
Interaction	1	284.42	284.42	4.69*
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	3580.05		
Group Treatment	1	20.81	20.81	.34
Error + Interaction + Race	56	3890.17		
Race	1	330.93	330.93	5.45*

TABLE 24

"PAROLE OFFICER"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Race	
	Black	White
Experimental	34.09	34.17
Control	29.55	39.45

This table demonstrates that an unknown variable or variables in the environment was related to the White inmates in the control groups responding in a more positive manner on the concept PAROLE OFFICER than the Blacks in the control groups or either race in the experimental group.

H III 2 (PAROLE OFFICER: Interaction Between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. Table 79 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (PAROLE OFFICER: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. Table 80 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (GDP: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no effect on the attitude toward GDP by the individual background factors. See Tables 47 and 48 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (GDP: Interaction Between Race and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. Table 81 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (GDP: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and

Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. See Table 82 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (GOD: Interaction Between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. See Table 83 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (MYSELF: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypothesis was accepted. See Tables 49 and 50 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (MYSELF: Interaction Between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. See Table 84 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (MYSELF: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. See Table 85 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (MYSELF: Interaction Between Race and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. However, there was an interaction beyond the .10 level. The Black inmates in the experimental groups responded more favorably to the concept MYSELF than did any other group, experimental or control. See Tables 86 and 87 in Appendix III.

H III 1 (TOTAL CONCEPTS: Effect of Individual Factors): The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported. There was a difference in attitude toward TOTAL CONCEPTS by the individual background factor, Number of Months Served. Those who had served 37 months or more rated all the concepts more highly at the end of the program than those who had served less time. See Tables 51 and 52 in Appendix III.

H III 2 (TOTAL CONCEPTS: Interaction Between Race and Treatment)

The null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis supported. Inmates who volunteered for a program of bibliotherapy showed an interaction between the Race of the respondents and Treatment on TOTAL CONCEPTS a combination of mean scores on all concepts.

TABLE 25

"TOTAL CONCEPTS"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F	P
Error	54	108030	2000.6		
Error + Interaction	55	120890			
Interaction	1	12860	12860		6.42*
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	122990			
Group Treatment	1	2100	2100		1.04
Error + Interaction + Race	56	121110			
Race	1	220	220		.10

The interaction of attitudes toward TOTAL CONCEPTS between Race and Treatment revealed that the Black inmates in the experimental groups

reatment):

upported.

inter-

CONCEPTS.

TABLE 26

"TOTAL CONCEPTS"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group	Race	
	Black	White
Treatment		
Experimental	504.64	468.33
Control	455.32	493.17

and the White inmates in the control group registered higher posttest scores than their corresponding group members. However, the Black inmates in the experimental group had higher scores than any other group in the total sample.

H III 2 (TOTAL CONCEPTS: Interaction Between Number of Months Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis supported.

The interaction or difference toward the Alternative Hypothesis between Number of Months Served and Treatment, also indicated that those who had served 37 months or more in the experimental group responded positively to the Treatment than those who had served 36 months or less in the experimental group. Their scores were also higher than the mean posttest scores of either group in the control group.

Those in the experimental group who had served 37 months or more responded positively to the Treatment whereas those who had served 36

=4.028

5

*

Page

groups

TABLE 27

"TOTAL QUANTITY"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Significance
Error	24	1334.0	55.6		
Error + Interaction	25				
Interaction	1			15.1	
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment					
Group Treatment				4.024	
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served					
Number of Months Served	1			6.024	
MEAN SCORES					
Group Treatment					
Experimental					
Control					

st
 mates
 the
 e
 term
 mber
 7
 to
 ell
 r
 ce
 6

months or less showed no apparent response.

H III 2 (TOTAL CONCEPTS: Interaction between Number of Months to be Served and Treatment): The null hypothesis was accepted. See Table 54 in Appendix III.

Findings Related to Assumption Tested

In addition to the hypotheses, an assumption of the study was also tested. The assumption tested was that the dependent variable can be standardized to rule out the possibility of confounding with the variable, sex, since the dependent variable was also tested in female groups.

No difference attributable to sex was found to exist in the particular group was found to exist (Appendix I, Table 100) except on the concept, WHITE PACE. The difference between the experimental and control groups was excluded by testing the control and experimental groups led by each of the three leader groups. In the experimental and control groups led by the three leader groups, two pervasively significant variables, WHITE PACE and LEADER GROUP, were found. One of the three leader groups was found to be significant. One of the three leader groups was not significant. The results of the tests were computed at the 5% level of significance. A test on only one out of the twelve concepts, WHITE PACE, was significant.

Groups of female... (text is very faint and partially obscured)

showed a difference in attitude toward WHITE PACE when the influence of Group Leaders, experimental and control, by base and Number of Months to be Served, was tested.

The following Analysis of Covariance table shows a statistically significant difference in attitude toward WHITE PACE attributable to Group Leaders.

TABLE 20
WHITE PACE
EFFECT OF LEADERS, PACE, MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Significance
Error	2	1.05	.525	2.032	.105
Error + Pace	2	2.792	1.396	2.792	.092
Pace	1	2.72	2.72	2.72	.11
Error + Months	2	.88	.44	.88	.41
Months	1	.88	.88	.88	.35
Error + Leaders	2	7.91*	3.955	7.91*	.002
Leaders	1	7.91*	7.91*	7.91*	.002

Table 20, page 17, shows that there was a significant difference between those who had 16 or more months to serve and those who had 15 months or less to serve among the Black members of those groups. It also shows that there was a significant difference between leader groups. Although there was a significant difference between those who had 16 or more months to serve and those who had 15 months or less to serve, there was no significant difference between those who had 16 or more months to serve and those who had 15 months or less to serve among the White members of those groups.

TABLE 30

"WHITE RACE"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

EFFECT OF LEADERS BY RACE AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Leader	Black (Experimental & Control)		White (Experimental & Control)	
	15 months or less to serve	16 months or more to serve	15 months or less to serve	16 months or more to serve
I	24.72	29.32	26.99	31.59
II	30.72	35.32	32.19	37.59
III	22.40	27.01	28.67	29.27
IV	26.72	31.32	28.83	33.59

is enough difference between the two groups of the various leader groups to be significant. The mean posttest scores of the three leader groups are compared to those of the control groups in the analysis of variance on page 116.

Discussion of findings

The following section discusses the implications of the findings presented in the previous section. It is noted that when the hypotheses and assumptions of the analysis of variance are

The most important finding of this study is that the scores of the four groups participating in the study were significantly less positive and more negative than those of the control group that of the control group at the end of the study. The experimental groups' posttest scores, which are significantly lower than those of the control treatment on these posttest scores, are significantly lower than those from

the control groups' posttest scores, adjusted for pretest, regardless of Age, Offense, Race, Time Served, Time to be Served, Recidivism, Achievement, or Group Leaders. This offers evidence that the group book discussion program was an element in changing their attitudes.

The difference between the experimental and control groups on DOPPEL ADDICTION and STEALING was significant beyond the .005 level for the three background personal characteristics variables analyzed for interaction between that variable and Group Treatment (Tables 52 through 66 in Appendix III). The Bibliotherapy Effects also accounted for the .005 level of significance as there was no interaction of any one variable itself, such as Race, accounted for no difference.

A review of the tape recordings of the group book discussions suggests that the higher degree of rejection of DOPPEL ADDICTION and STEALING may have derived more from seeing the alternative life style free from those behaviors than from fear of the consequences of DOPPEL ADDICTION and STEALING. Very little negative discussion was recorded on DRUG ADDICTION or STEALING as a particular behavior.

A corollary finding shows that attitudes toward behaviors changed while attitudes toward persons did not, with the exception of the only two referring to attitudes toward behavior. The only significant difference on the posttests. This phenomenon could be due to the fact that the inmates became aware that change could be effected by their own actions. It is interesting to note that the taped discussions revealed that the inmates were responding and making applications to their own behaviors from I'm

O. K., You're O. K. in which Harris stressed that lives could be changed through transactions or particular behaviors. They analyzed situations in their own lives and those of the characters in the books and discussed ways these situations could have been met.

McClaskey (1970) and Alexander (1968) found that behaviors changed while attitudes did not. The findings of this study seem to indicate that attitudes which relate to readiness to act, as opposed to attitudes relating to persons, may be influenced to a greater degree by bibliotherapy, at least in a short-term discussion program.

Several statistically significant findings were produced when interactions between personal characteristic variables and Bibliotherapy Treatment were analyzed by the Analysis of Covariance. It was found that in the experimental groups the Black inmates, inmates who had 16 or more months to serve, and inmates who had served 31 months or more had higher posttest scores than their counterparts in the experimental groups while the reverse was true in the control groups. These interactions along with possible interpretation will be discussed in the succeeding paragraphs.

An additional statistically significant finding from the Semantic Differential test shows that the Black inmates in the experimental groups moved more in the positive direction on 7 of the 9 concepts related to persons, WOMEN, MOTHERS, MYSELF (.10) and on SOCIAL CONCEPTS than did the White inmates. Interaction on the Socialization Scale also showed this to be true. The significant differences found in the interaction between

Race and Bibliotherapy Treatment were based on the fact that Black experimental group inmates had more positive attitudes than the White experimental group inmates at the end of the program, while the White inmates in the control groups had the more positive attitudes. Since, however, one objective of the bibliotherapy was to encourage discriminating and realistic judgment, and since it is possible that the White inmates had held unanalyzed positive attitudes toward themselves and others, while the Black inmates had held negative opinions at the beginning of the program, such results might be expected. If the White inmates rated themselves and others slightly lower at the end of the discussion program, then a less favorable attitude might represent a more discriminating one, and therefore, a more desirable one. It is possible that the attitudes of the Black inmates were unrealistically less favorable in the beginning and that a move in the positive direction meant a more discriminating attitude for them. The taped discussions revealed that applications from the readings were being applied to participants' own personalities and people they knew. Particularly frank discussions about parents and themselves were held. For instance, parallels were drawn between the readings, their lives, and those of their parents. The contingency for a move in the discriminating direction might be a move in a less positive direction had been anticipated as a possibility. (See page 71.)

The significant differences due to interaction between Number of Months to be Served and Bibliotherapy Treatment resulted in the findings that those who had 16 or more months to serve changed to a more positive

attitude toward FATHERS and TOTAL CONCEPTS (the mean score on all concepts) than those who had 15 months or less to serve in the experimental groups while the reverse was true in the control groups. Support for this finding was found in the second test, the Socialization Scale of the PVA. Criminology studies indicate that as inmates near their release date, they withdraw more and more from the inmate "code", and begin to assume the values and expectations of the outside world.¹⁴³ The findings of this research, however, are the reverse of this expectation. Those in the control groups who had 16 or more months to serve responded as research indicates they would. The same group in the experimental groups did not, possibly indicating that those with negative attitudes, as measured by the pretest, responded positively to bibliotherapy treatment, while those with more positive views either remained unchanged or did not register quite so positive views. It is possible that those who had more time to serve may have viewed themselves more negatively than the facts would justify at the beginning of the program and developed more discriminating attitudes as a result of bibliotherapy. Those who had less time to serve may have held attitudes too positive to be compatible with the facts, and moved in the reverse direction on the posttest. Explanations such as these are highly tentative and need further investigation.

Those who had served 37 months or more developed more positive attitudes toward WOMEN, TOTAL CONCEPTS (the mean score on all concepts) and on the Socialization Scale (.10 level) than those who had served 36 months or less in the experimental groups while the reverse was true in the control groups. Those who had served three years or less could be

expected to have had more positive attitudes at the beginning of the program because they were closer to the influences of the outside world than those who had served over three years. However, the interaction between the Number of Months Served and Bibliotherapy Treatment was due to the finding that those in the experimental groups who had more cause to be negative, i. e., those with 16 or more months to serve, held more positive attitudes than those who had 15 months or less to serve at the end of the program, but the same groups in the control groups actually held the expected attitude. The same interpretation which was made for Race and Number of Months to be Served seems applicable to Months Served.

A number of personal characteristic variables were shown to have little or no influence on attitude change on the Semantic Differential test and the Socialization Scale of the PVA. These variables were Sex, Offense, Achievement, Recidivism, and Age. The range in scores on the tests when analyzed by the above variables was attributable to difference between individuals rather than difference between experimental and control groups. This phenomenon could be a consequence of the random sampling having distributed widely differing individuals equally between the experimental and control groups. McClaskey's study helps confirm that there is no difference in effect of bibliotherapy between the sexes. It remains for other studies to test whether this finding is congruent with the facts for this and other variables.

For the three variables which were analyzed for interactions the control groups hold attitudes that they might be expected to hold, while

the experimental groups do not. The attitudes of the control groups represent those that the experimental groups might have held had there been no bibliotherapy treatment because the sample was randomly selected and assigned.

No significant attitude difference between the control and experimental groups was measured by the Socialization Scale of the PVA for the twelve-week period. It is possible that the scale consisting of 32 items, 6 of which were history items not subject to change, was not comprehensive enough to measure attitude change. The entire Socialization Scale of the CPI or the CPI itself might have revealed differences in attitude. Because the tolerance for test-taking among inmates is not high, the use of the CPI test was not feasible.

The interactions which were significant for the Socialization Scale of the PVA were comparable to the interactions which were observable for those on the Semantic Differential tests. Black inmates and those who had 16 or more months to serve (both significant at the .05 level) and those who had served 37 months or more (significant at the .10 level) in the experimental groups also had higher posttest scores on the Socialization Scale than their experimental group members while the reverse was true for the control groups. Therefore, the same interpretations which were suggested for these findings on the Semantic Differential test apply to the findings of the Socialization Scale of the PVA.

On eight of the ten statistically significant interactions analyzed, the noticeably higher posttest scores in the experimental groups were

usually equal to, or higher than, all scores in the control groups. This was reversed, however, for two interactions, MEN and PAROLE OFFICER, where the control group members who had served 36 months or less (on MEN) and the White inmates (on PAROLE OFFICER) had higher posttest scores than either their control group members or any in the experimental groups.

An assumption of the study, in addition to the hypotheses, was also tested. The assumption was tested that group book discussion can be standardized to rule out the particular group leadership team as a variable. Each of the three leader groups when compared singly to the fourth leader group was not significantly different from it. When, however, all the groups were compared at the same time, a significant difference appeared on only one out of the twelve concepts, WHITE RACE. No difference between leader groups was found on the Socialization Scale.

The White inmates and those who had 16 or more months to serve rated the WHITE RACE higher than did their Black group members or those who had 15 months or less to serve, no matter which leader group they were in. The group whose participants made the lowest mean posttest scores on the concept, WHITE RACE (Table 30, page 118), had two White leaders. A possible explanation is that the participants reacted negatively to not having one Black leader since the other groups did. This is a highly tentative explanation because these participants exhibited no other differences on the remainder of the tests or when compared singly to the group used as a base.

These interpretations, based on the monitoring of the tapes of the

discussions, the findings of the study, and consultation with group leaders lead to the following conclusions.

Conclusions

The findings of this study led to several conclusions concerning group book discussion as bibliotherapy for those in correctional institutions who desire to participate and who have the ability to read and comprehend:

1. Bibliotherapy may be a helpful adjuvant to the correctional program for improving attitudes related to behavioral concepts for all categories of inmates.

Attitudes toward the behaviors, DOPE ADDICTION and STEALING, indicated a much higher rejection of these concepts by those in the experimental groups as compared with the control groups. This finding was significant beyond the .01 level for all the background variables analyzed.

2. Bibliotherapy may be a helpful adjuvant to the correctional program in improving attitudes toward persons for inmates possessing certain background characteristics.

This conclusion is based on the fact that when bibliotherapy was analyzed by certain background characteristics, attitude improvement by those possessing certain characteristics within the experimental groups was indicated by higher posttest scores.

3. Bibliotherapy may be effectively carried out by librarians, when working with small inmate groups, who meet the criteria for group

book discussion leaders listed on pages 67 and 68.

This seems to be true across certain differences in leader characteristics by analysis of the data testing the effect of differences among leaders.

These conclusions, in addition to questions that arose as the design of this study was planned and carried out, have led to implications for the field of librarianship and for further research in bibliotherapy.

Implications for Librarianship

The findings of this study, while not "proving" beyond a doubt that group book discussion can create anti-criminal attitudes, do contain evidence that group book discussion can be an agent in such an influence and that bibliotherapy, then, may be said to exist as a positive treatment form. This device, which shows promise of strengthening anti-criminal attitudes, is worth further use from the standpoint of a structured rehabilitation program. These group book discussions must, of course, be limited to those who wish to participate and have the capacity to read.

The finding that socially acceptable attitudes may be fostered by group book discussion also has usefulness for librarianship. As prison reform in some states leads to half-way houses and community-based placement for inmates, the nature of institutional librarianship may change. Traveling institutional librarians or community librarians might conduct group book discussions in several half-way houses and prepare inmates for discussions at the public library, thus building a bridge to the outside

world. Group book discussions in public libraries could reinforce positive life values if an inmate could continue group book discussion after his release from a correctional institution.

Another implication for the field of librarianship is that if positive social attitudes can be encouraged by bibliotherapy, then the occurrence of negative social attitudes toward socially censured behavior might be moderated by its use. Public and school librarians may wish to institute book discussion groups for their value of fostering positive personal and social attitudes as well as for their educational worth.

The many requests for a continuation of group book discussions at both institutions in which this study was conducted is indication that the reading and discussions were enjoyed. It is possible that enjoyment is one of the elements necessary for positive change to occur.

This study demonstrated that librarians can conduct discussion groups which are both enjoyable and beneficial. This justifies adding group book discussion to the normal repertoire of library service.

Implications for Further Research

A number of implications for further research became evident as this research progressed. There is a need for the following studies on bibliotherapy:

1. Exploration of the reasons why bibliotherapy studies have found distinct changes in behavior and behavior attitude, but no change in attitudes in personal relationships.

2. Testing the difference in attitudes and behavior due to group composition. It might be possible to determine whether there is a need for interaction between groups possessing a certain individual background factor, as Recidivism, for change to occur by placing only recidivists in one group, only non-recidivists in another, and a mixture of the two in a third and holding as many other factors as possible constant. Comparable control groups randomly chosen would be needed.

3. Determining the effect of book discussion alone, as against in combination with other therapies.

4. Examining effect on attitudes and behavior of group acceptance of each individual group member by comparing results of Sociograms, or other measuring devices, with posttest attitude scores and behavior analyses.

5. Testing the effect of pretesting on participants by using Pretest/Posttest Design with Posttest-Only Design (and other popular designs, if possible) with the Semantic Differential. Effect of other tests when these designs are used is needed.

6. Ascertaining the results of using a Semantic Differential test composed of only behavioral concepts, as opposed to concepts of persons, things, and issues, measured by evaluative measurement terms to ascertain if attitudes toward all types of behavioral concepts change, whether just those behaviors which have special significance to the problems of a specific group change, or whether there is no change at all.

7. Discovering the personal characteristics of persons whose

attitudes are most significantly changed by bibliotherapy.

8. Examining the effect on participant attitudes of differing types of discussion.

9. Determining the effect on participant attitudes made by leaders of differing personal characteristics.

10. Measuring the long term effect of bibliotherapy studied by means of follow-up studies of Recidivism of those who have participated in group book discussion possibly correlated with length of time the people have participated.

11. Testing the maintenance of attitude gains for those who are serving long sentences.

12. Devising a series of studies to isolate the factors which are necessary for successful bibliotherapy programs.

13. Conducting bibliotherapy programs of differing lengths of time (2 months, 3 months, etc.) to test their effect in order to determine the optimum length of such a program.

14. Exploring the effect of bibliotherapy programs of differing frequencies, i. e., every day, three times a week, weekly, etc., in one, two, or three hour sessions, in order to determine the optimum exposure time for such a program.

15. Determining the difference in effect on participants of single versus dual bibliotherapy leadership, as well as minimum and maximum group size.

16. Replicating this study with inmates in the North Central United

States to discover if the results are reproducible.

17. Initiating scientifically controlled studies of inmates in other parts of the country to determine if inmates differ in response to bibliotherapy according to area.

18. The testing of Katz's Theory of Attitude Change (described on pages 15 and 16 of this study) by a bibliotherapist working with a psychiatrist.

19. Selecting a relevant model from the body of mass media research and applying it to bibliotherapy. Mass media research has concentrated on determining the effect of various media exposure on attitudes related to one specific issue, whereas this study used the Semantic Differential to measure general concepts.

20. Investigating the influence of book ownership with the privilege of marking in the books on the attitudes of inmates.

21. Investigating the difference made in inmate attitudes and behavior by reading alone, by reading and discussion, and by opinion discussion alone.

22. Exploring the correlation between amount and kind of reading history (reading records) and change in inmate attitudes and behavior when bibliotherapy is conducted.

23. Determining if Sutherland's Theory of Differential Association holds true for bibliotherapy groups by randomly assigning those with more socially acceptable tendencies to experimental, and control groups and then comparing the groups.

of inmates who are constantly subject to parole, transfer to other institutions or to special projects, etc. In this study inmates were asked not to volunteer for the program if their parole board was to meet prior to the end of the project. Some of those in the sample were paroled or transferred before the completion of the program although that had not been their expectation.

The number of participants proposed for each group had to be reduced from an expected sixteen to eight, because (1) security in a maximum security institution dictated it, and (2) it was felt that enough participation to sustain interest would not be possible in a larger group. This limitation proved beneficial because of the increased interaction between participants that was possible.

The support of the institutional librarians was essential to this project. This research benefited greatly from the active involvement of a professional staff member in each institution to coordinate the program with institution life, recruit participants, act as liaison between institution and research staff, and straighten out problems that arose between group meetings.

The climate of change with its accompanying uncertainties led to an explosive emotional tension during the time of this project. This crisis atmosphere was especially prevalent the week prior to testing at the Wisconsin Home for Women where a governor's commission was conducting studies and where the Parole Board was to meet to consider the paroles of some of the women in the experimental and control groups the day following

of inmates, who are constantly subject to parole, transfer to other institutions or to special projects, etc. In this study inmates were asked not to volunteer for the program if their parole board was to meet prior to the end of the project. Some of those in the sample were paroled or transferred before the completion of the program although that had not been their expectation.

The number of participants proposed for each group had to be reduced from an expected sixteen to eight, because (1) security in a maximum security institution dictated it, and (2) it was felt that enough participation to sustain interest would not be possible in a larger group. This limitation proved beneficial because of the increased interaction between participants that was possible.

The support of the institutional librarians was essential to this project. This research benefited greatly from the active involvement of a professional staff member in each institution to coordinate the program with institution life, recruit participants, act as liaison between institution and research staff, and straighten out problems that arose between group meetings.

The climate of change with its accompanying uncertainties led to an explosive emotional tension during the time of this project. This crisis atmosphere was especially prevalent the week prior to testing at the Wisconsin Home for Women where a governor's commission was conducting studies and where the Parole Board was to meet to consider the paroles of some of the women in the experimental and control groups the day following

the testing. Testing is best done when less stress is present, although the kinds of effects of the tension on testing could not be precisely identified.

The degree of inmate suspicion and curiosity present in correctional institutions was not anticipated by the principal investigator. There was a limited explanation of the project within which the book discussion took place. It was found that even minor points might well have been explored with the participants and that they should have been told as much as possible within the limits of guarding the results of the study.

In spite of such problems as these, it is the opinion of the investigator that the benefits to be reaped by such research are great enough to warrant the attempt.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Alexander, Rosa Horn, and Buggie, Stephen E. "Bibliotherapy with Chronic Schizophrenics: The Therapeutic Function of the Psychiatric Librarian in a State Mental Hospital," Journal of Rehabilitation, XXXIII (November-December, 1967), 26-27, 42.
2. Alston, Edwin F. "Bibliotherapy and Psychotherapy," Library Trends, XI (October, 1962), 159-176.
3. Appel, K. E. "Psychiatric Therapy; Explanatory or Noetic Therapy, Interpretive Therapy and Bibliotherapy," in Personality and the Behavior Disorders. Edited by J. M. V. Hunt. Vol. II. New York: Ronald Press, 1944. Pp. 1128-1133.
4. Arbuthnot, May Hill. Children and Books. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1947.
5. Aring, Charles D. "Reading Is Good Medicine," Archives of Internal Medicine, CXXII (December, 1968), 537-538.
6. Bailey, M. "Candle of Understanding," Education, LXXVI (May, 1956), 515-521.
7. Ball, Ralph G. "Prescription: Books," ALA Bulletin, XLVIII (March, 1954), 145-147.
8. Barton, Virginia L. "Bibliotherapy at Green Hill School," Journal of Correctional Education, XIX (October, 1967), 23-25.
9. Beatty, W. K. "A Historical Review of Bibliotherapy," Library Trends, XI (October, 1962), 106-117.
10. _____, ed. "Proceedings of the A. L. A. Bibliotherapy Workshop, St. Louis, June 25-27, 1964," A. H. I. L. Quarterly, IV (Summer, 1964).
11. Below, Erna. Behavior of Ten to Twelve Year Olds as Influenced by Bibliotherapy. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee, 1956.
12. Berninghausen, D. K., and Faunce, R. W. "Exploratory Study of Juvenile Delinquency and the Reading of Sensational Books," Journal of Experimental Education, XXXIII (Winter, 1964), 161-168.

13. Bishop, W. J. "Hospital Library and Bibliotherapy: A Bibliography," Library Association Record, I (June, 1931), 198, 200.
14. _____. "Hospital Library and Bibliotherapy: A Bibliography," Library Association Record, I (July, 1931), 231-232.
15. _____. "Hospital Library and Bibliotherapy: A Bibliography," Library Association Record, I (August, 1931), 274-275.
16. Briggs, J. F. "Adverse Effects from Bibliotherapy," Hospital Progress, XLV (July, 1964), 123-135.
17. Bryan, Alice I. "Can There Be a Science of Bibliotherapy?" Library Journal, LXIV (October 15, 1939), 773-776.
18. Burmeister, Alyce. An Experimental Application of Group Bibliotherapy to Improve Intragroup Relations in a Sixth Grade Class. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee, 1952.
19. Burton, D. "Books to Meet Students' Personal Needs," English Journal, XXXVI (November, 1947), 469-473.
20. Campbell, D. "Factors Relative to the Validity of Experiments in Social Settings," Psychology Bulletin, LIV (July-August, 1957), 297-312.
21. Carey, M. E. "Libraries and Their Management in State Hospitals," Modern Hospital, V (December, 1915), 407-410.
22. Carner, Charles. "Reaching Troubled Minds through Reading," Today's Health, XLIV (December, 1966), 32-33, 75-77.
23. Carter, Richard F.; Ruggles, W. Lee; and Chaffee, Steven H. "The Semantic Differential in Opinion Measurement," The Public Opinion Quarterly, XXXII (Winter, 1968-1969), 666-674.
24. Child, I. L.; Potter, E. H.; and Levine, E. M. Children's Textbooks and Personality Development: An Exploration in the Social Psychology of Education. Psychological Monograph, Vol. LX, No. 3. Evanston, Illinois: American Psychological Association (Northwestern University), 1946.
25. Cole, D. M. "Bad Boys and Their Books," Wilson Library Bulletin, XVI (March, 1942), 532-536, 543.
26. Coville, Walter J. "Bibliotherapy: Some Practical Considerations," Hospital Progress, XLI (April, 1960), 138, 141-142.

27. _____. "Bibliotherapy: Some Practical Considerations," Hospital Progress, XLI (May, 1960), 20-24.
28. Craig, Laila P. "Boys And Books Get Together," The Child, XVI (March, 1952), 98-109.
29. Delaney, S. P. "Bibliotherapy in a Hospital," Opportunity, XVI (February, 1938), 53-56.
30. _____. "Time's Telling," Wilson Library Bulletin, XXIX (February, 1955), 461-463.
31. DuBois, Isabel. "Books as a Solace for the Sick," Hygeia, X (January, 1932), 55-58.
32. Fader, Daniel N., and McNeil, Elton B. Hooked on Books: Program and Proof. New York: Berkeley Medallion Books, 1968.
33. Favazza, A. R. "Bibliotherapy: a Critique of the Literature," Bulletin of the Medical Library Association, LIV (April, 1966), 138-141.
34. Feliner, Carl H. "Paperback Psychiatry," The Journal of Medical Education, XLIV (July, 1969), 585-588.
35. Floch, Maurice. "Bibliotherapy and the Library," The Bookmark, XVIII (December, 1958), 57-59.
36. _____. "Correctional Treatment and the Library," Wilson Library Bulletin, XXVI (February, 1952), 454.
37. Foreman, E. T. "Carefully Chosen Books Have Therapeutic Value," Modern Hospital, XLI (November, 1933), 69-70.
38. Glasser, Daniel. Reality Therapy; a New Approach to Psychiatry. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.
39. Glueck, S., and Glueck, Eleanor. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950.
40. Goldstein, A. P.; Heller, K.; and Sechrist, L. B. Psychotherapy and the Psychology of Behavior Change. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.
41. Gottschalk, Louis A. "Bibliotherapy as a Adjuvant in Psychotherapy," American Journal of Psychiatry, CIV (April, 1948), 632-637.

42. Gough, Harrison G. "Conceptual Analysis of Psychological Test Scores and Other Diagnostic Variables," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, LXX (August, 1965), 294-302.
43. _____. "A Cross-Cultural Analysis of the CPI Femininity Scale," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXX (February, 1966), 136-141.
44. _____. "Cross-Cultural Validation of a Measure of Asocial Behavior," Psychological Reports, XVII (October, 1965), 379-387.
45. _____. "Personality Assessment in the Study of Population," in Psychological Aspects of Population Control. Edited by J. T. Fawcett. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972.
46. _____. ; Chun, K1; and Chung, U-E. "Validation of the CPI Femininity Scale in Korea," Psychological Reports, XXII (February, 1968), 155-160.
47. _____, and Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. The Adjective Check List Manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1965.
48. Grant, Quentin Rae. "Proceedings of A. L. A. Bibliotherapy Workshop," A. H. I. L. Quarterly, IV (Summer, 1964), 42.
49. Gunston, David. "Books as Medicine," Library Review, CII (Summer, 1954), 368.
50. Hakeem, Michael. "Prediction of Parole Outcomes from Summaries of Case Histories," in Penology; a Realistic Approach. Edited by Clyde B. Vedder and Barbara A. Kay. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1964.
51. Hannigan, Margaret C. "Experience in Group Psychotherapy," ALA Bulletin, XLVIII (March, 1954), 145-150.
52. _____. "The Librarian in Bibliotherapy: Pharmacist or Bibliotherapist?" Library Trends, II (October, 1962), 184-198.
53. _____, and Henderson, W. T. "Narcotic Addicts Take Up Reading," Bookmark, XVII (July, 1963), 281-287.
54. Hartley, Helene W. "Developing Personality Through Books," English Journal, XL (April, 1951), 198-204.
55. Hartman, Esther A. Imaginative Literature as a Projective Technique; A Study in Bibliotherapy. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1951.

56. Havinghurst, R. J. Human Development and Education. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1953.
57. _____, and Neugarten, B. L. Society and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1957.
58. Herminghaus, Earl George. The Effect of Bibliotherapy on the Attitudes and Personal and Social Adjustment of a Group of Elementary School Children. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Washington University, 1954.
59. Hipsie, L. E., and Campbell, R. J. Psychiatric Dictionary. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.
60. Hirsch, Lore. "Book Service to Patients," Wilson Library Bulletin, XXVII (April, 1953), 634-639.
61. _____. "How a Doctor Uses Books," Library Journal, LXXV (December 1, 1950), 2046-2049.
62. Hirsch, M. C. "Bibliotherapy: Some Aspects and Values and Need for Research," American Library Association Hospital Book Guide, XVII (June, 1956), 111-115.
63. Insko, Chester A. Theories of Attitude Change. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1967.
64. Jackson, Evalene P. "Bibliotherapy and Reading Guidance: A Tentative Approach to Theory," Library Trends, XI (October, 1962), 127-135.
65. _____. "Effects of Reading upon Attitudes Toward the Negro Race," Library Quarterly, XIV (January, 1944), 47-54.
66. Johnson, Nina B. "Group Therapy in a Hospital Library," Medical Bulletin of the Veterans Administration, XX (October, 1943), 207-209.
67. Jones, E. Kathleen. "Growth of Hospital Libraries," Modern Hospital, XVIII (May, 1922), 452-454.
68. Jones, Perrie, "Mental Patients Can Read," Modern Hospital, LXL (September, 1937), 72-75.
69. Jones, Vernon. What Would You Have Done? Boston: Ginn and Company, 1931.
70. Kamman, G. R. "The Role of Bibliotherapy in the Care of the Patient," Bulletin of the American College of Surgeons, XXIV (June, 1939), 183-184.

71. Katz, Daniel. "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV (Summer, 1960), 163-204.
72. Kearns, M. M. "Observations of Bibliotherapy in a VA Hospital Library," Kentucky Library Association Bulletin, XXV (April, 1961), 22-24.
73. Keneally, K. G. "Therapeutic Values of Books," in Youth, Communication and Libraries: Papers Presented before the Library Institute at the University of Chicago, August 11-16, 1947. Edited by Frances Henne and others. Chicago: American Library Association, 1949. Pp. 69-70.
74. Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
75. Kiell, Norman. The Adolescent through Fiction: A Psychological Approach. New York: International Universities Press, 1959.
76. Klapper, Joseph T. "Social Effect of Mass Communication," in The Science of Human Communication. Edited by Wilbur Lang Schramm. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1963.
77. Koffka, K. Principles of Gestalt Psychology. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1935.
78. Kohler, W. Gestalt Psychology. New York: Liveright Publishing Co., 1947.
79. Lauber, Margaret. MMPI Findings in the Rehabilitation of Delinquent Girls. Unpublished Master's Thesis, State University of Iowa, 1951.
80. Lazarsfeld, Sophie. "The Use of Fiction in Psychotherapy," American Journal of Psychotherapy, III (January, 1949), 26-33.
81. Lee, Robert. The Library-Sponsored Discussion Group. Chicago: American Library Association, 1957.
82. Leedy, J. J., ed. Poetry Therapy: The Use of Poetry in Emotional Disorders. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1969.
83. Lewin, Kurt. A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1935.
84. Livengood, Dorothy Kroft. The Effect of Bibliotherapy upon Peer Relations and Democratic Practices in a Sixth Grade Classroom. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, The University of Florida, 1961.

85. Lorang, Sister Mary Corde. The Effect of Reading on Moral Conduct and Emotional Experience. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University Press, 1946.
86. Lutchins, A. S. Group Therapy: A Guide. New York: Random House, 1964.
87. McClaskey, Harris Clark. Bibliotherapy with Emotionally Disturbed Patients: An Experimental Study. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1970.
88. McElroy, Elizabeth Warner. "Subject Variety in Adult Reading: I. - Factors Related to Variety in Reading," Library Quarterly, XXXVIII (April, 1968), 154-168.
89. _____. "Subject Variety in Adult Reading: II. Subject Variety in Adult Reading: Characteristics of Readers of Ten Categories of Books," Library Quarterly, XXXVIII (July, 1968), 261-269.
90. Macrum, A. M. "Supplying the Reading Needs of the Tuberculosis Patient," Modern Hospital, XXXVII (September, 1931), 52-56.
91. Mandel, N. G. Paper presented at the Upper Midwest Hospital Association Conference, Minneapolis, Minn., May 10, 1968.
92. Martin, Clyde. "But How Do Books Help Children," Library Journal, XXXL (October 15, 1955), 83-85.
93. Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1954.
94. Mattera, Gloria. Bibliotherapy in a Sixth Grade. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1961.
95. Meckel, H. C. An Exploratory Study of Responses of Adolescent Pupils to Situations in a Novel. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1946.
96. Menninger, Karl A. "Reading as Therapy," ALA Bulletin, LV (April, 1961), 316-319.
97. Menninger, William C. "Bibliotherapy," Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, I (November, 1937), 263-274.
98. Monroe, Margaret E., ed. Reading Guidance and Bibliotherapy in Public, Hospital and Institution Libraries, a Selection of Papers Presented at a Series of Adult Services Institutes, 1965-1968. Madison: Library School of the University of Wisconsin, 1971.

99. Moody, Mildred T. "The Reader Who Needs Remotivation," ALA Bulletin, LVIII (October, 1964), 175-176.
100. _____, and Limper, Hilda K. Bibliotherapy: Methods and Materials. Chicago: American Library Association, 1971.
101. Moore, Thomas V. The Nature and Treatment of Mental Disorders. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1951.
102. _____, and Breland, W. E. "Bibliotherapy: Useful Adjunct to Modern Psychotherapy," Journal of the Mississippi Medical Association, III (May, 1962), 227-230.
103. Morrison, C. V. "Prison Library Book Prescriptions," Proceedings of the American Prison Association, 1940, 462-467. ○
104. Mullahy, Patrick. "The Theories of Harry Stack Sullivan," in Oedipus: Myth and Complex. Edited by Patrick Mullahy. New York: Hermitage House, Inc., 1952.
105. Oppenheim, Abe. "Diversion and Direction (Prison Library Service)," Wilson Library Bulletin, XXX (November, 1955), 245-248, 255.
106. Osgood, Charles E.; Suci, George J.; and Tannenbaum, Percy H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
107. Panken, J. "Psychotherapeutic Value of Books in the Treatment and Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency," American Journal of Psychotherapy, I (January, 1947), 71-86.
108. Pomeroy, Elizabeth. "Bibliotherapy--A Study and Results of Hospital Library Service," Medical Bulletin of the Veterans Administration, XIII (April, 1937), 360-364.
109. "Pornography--Crime Link Denied by Psychiatrists," Library Journal, XCII (March 15, 1967), 1103-1104.
110. Porterfield, A. L. Mirror, Mirror: On Seeing Yourself in Books. Fort Worth, Texas: Leo Potishman Foundation, 1957.
111. Powell, John Walker. Education for Maturity; an Empirical Essay on Adult Group Study. New York: Hermitage House, 1949.
112. _____, and others. "Group Reading and Group Therapy," Psychiatry, XV (February, 1952), 213-226.
113. Quint, M. D. "The Mental Hospital Library," Mental Hygiene, XXVIII (April, 1944), 263-272.

114. Redl, Fritz. "What We Can Do for Them Right Now," in "The Furious Children and the Library--Part Three," Top of the News, XVII (October, 1960), 51-63.
115. Robinson, J. P., and Shaver, P. R. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, 1969.
116. Rodier, Ruth E. "Prescribed Reading in a Veterans Administration Hospital," Medical Bulletin of the Veterans Administration, XVIII (July, 1941), 80-82.
117. Rogers, Carl R. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961. Pp. 39-57.
118. Rosenbaum, M., and Gerger, M. Group Psychotherapy and Group Function. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1963.
119. Rosenblatt, L. M. "The Enriching Values of Reading," in Reading in an Age of Mass Communication. Edited by W. S. Grøn. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, Inc., 1949. Pp. 19-38.
120. Russell, D. H., and Shrodes, C. "Contributions of Research in Bibliotherapy to the Language Arts Program I," School Review, LVIII (September, 1950), 335-342.
121. _____. "Contributions of Research in Bibliotherapy to the Language Arts Program II," School Review, LVIII (October, 1950), 411-420.
122. Ryan, Mary Jane. "Bibliotherapy and Psychiatry: Changing Concepts, 1937-1957," Special Libraries, XLVIII (May-June, 1957), 197-199.
123. Schauffler, R. H. The Poetry Cure. New York: Dodd, 1927.
124. Schneck, Jerome M. "Bibliotherapy and Hospital Library Activities for Neuropsychiatric Patients; a Review of the Literature with Comments on Trends," Psychiatry, VIII (May, 1945), 207-228.
125. _____. "Studies in Bibliotherapy in a Neuropsychiatric Hospital," Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation, XXIII (December, 1944), 316-323.
126. Shaffer, G. W., and Lazarus, R. S. Fundamental Concepts in Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952.
127. Shrodes, Carolyn. Bibliotherapy: A Theoretical and Clinical Experimental Study. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1949.

128. Slocum, G. P. "Books for Probationers: A Court-Library Project," National Probation and Parole Association Journal, I (July, 1955), 20-24.
129. Steel, Robert G. D., and Torrie, James H. Principles and Procedures of Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
130. Stone, A. A., and Stone, S. S., eds. The Abnormal Personality through Literature. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
131. Stoner, J. A. P. A. A Comparison of Individual and Group Decisions including Risk. Unpublished Master's Thesis, School of Industrial Management, M. I. T., 1961.
132. Test Scoring and Norm Establishment for the Personal Values Abstract. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1970.
133. Tews, Ruth M. "Introduction," Library Trends, XI (October, 1962), 97-105.
134. _____. "Patients' Library," in Applied Medical Library Practice. Edited by T. E. Keys and others. Springfield, Illinois, Charles C. Thomas, 1958.
135. _____. "Progress in Bibliotherapy," in Advances in Librarianship. Edited by Melvin J. Voight. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
136. Therese Marie, Sister. "Bibliotherapy in the Elementary Classroom," Catholic School Journal, LV (Fall, 1955), 35-37.
137. Tsimpoukis, Constantinos John. Bibliocounseling: Theory and Research Implications for and Applications in Counseling and Guidance. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1968.
138. Turner, Mary L. Bibliotherapy and Its Place among the Sciences. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Missouri, 1967.
139. Twyeffort, L. H. "Therapy for Reading Ills." The Cyclopedia of Medicine, Surgery, and Specialties. 1959. Vol. XII. Pp. 1-10.
140. United States. President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. The Report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.
141. Weimerskirch, Phillip J. "Benjamin Rush and John Minson Galt, II; Pioneers of Bibliotherapy in America," Medical Library Association Bulletin, LIII (October, 1965), 510, 515.

142. Weingarten, S. "Boundaries of Reading in Satisfying Needs," Education, LXXIV (April, 1956), 480-489.
143. Wheeler, Stanton. "A Study of Prisonization," in Sociology of Punishment and Corrections. Edited by Norman Johnston, Leonard Savitz, and Marvin E. Wolfgang. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
144. Whipple, C. M., Jr. The Effect of Short Term Classroom Bibliotherapy on the Personality and Academic Achievement of Reformatory Inmate Students. Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968.
145. Whitaker, C. A.; and Malone, T. P. The Roots of Psychotherapy. New York: The Blakiston Company, 1963.
146. Wilson, J. W. "Treatment of Attitudinal Pathosis by Bibliotherapy," Journal of Clinical Psychology, VII (October, 1951), 345-351.
147. Wisconsin. Department of Health and Social Services. Division of Corrections. Bureau of Planning, Development, and Research. Offenders Admitted to Adult Correctional Institutions Calendar 1970. Madison, Wisconsin: Division of Corrections, November, 1971.
148. Offenders Released from Adult Correctional Institutions Calendar 1970. Madison, Wisconsin: Division of Corrections, November, 1971.
149. Offenders Resident in Wisconsin Adult Correctional Institutions on June 30, 1971. Madison, Wisconsin: Division of Corrections, October, 1971.
150. Wisconsin. University, Madison. Library School. Reader Interest Survey. Developed by the Research Project, Library Materials to the Adult New Reader, July, 1968-September, 1971. Unpublished research instrument.
151. Zaccaria, Joseph S., and Moses, Harold A. Facilitating Human Development through Reading. Champaign, Illinois: Stipes Publishing Company, 1968.

APPENDIX I: TESTING INSTRUMENTS

A. SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

The directions given for the Semantic Differential and the test follow. The placement of each concept was randomly assigned so that no two people answered the test in the same order.

DIRECTIONS

Each page has a term such as WOMEN at the top. Check the space between each pair of two describing words, such as "Sincere" and "Insincere", that best fits the meaning of the term WOMEN. Continue marking each page until you finish.

DOPE ADDICTION

Smart	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Dumb
Dependable	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Undependable
Not Responsible	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Responsible
Cruel	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Kind
Cowardly	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Brave
Unselfish	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Selfish
Love	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Hate
Bad	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Good
Hurtful	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Helpful

STEALING

Dependable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Undependable
 Cowardly : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Brave
 Cruel : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Kind
 Responsible : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Not Responsible
 Bad : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Good
 Dumb : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Smart
 Confident : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Fearful
 Helpful : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Hurtful
 Unselfish : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Selfish

WOMEN

Insincere : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Sincere
 Reasonable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Unreasonable
 Fearful : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Confident
 Dumb : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Smart
 Good : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Bad
 Brave : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Cowardly
 Dependable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Undependable
 Selfish : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Unselfish
 Not Responsible : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Responsible

MYSELF

Smart : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Dumb
 Undependable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Dependable
 Fearful : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Confident
 Brave : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Cowardly
 Sincere : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Insincere
 Hurtful : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Helpful
 Bad : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Good
 Unselfish : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Selfish
 Responsible : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Not responsible

WHITE RACE

Unselfish : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Selfish
 Responsible : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Not responsible
 Unreasonable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Reasonable
 Helpful : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Hurtful
 Bad : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Good
 Kind : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Cruel
 Dumb : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Smart
 Sincere : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Insincere
 Hate : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Love

MOTHERS

Dependable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Undependable
 Unreasonable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Reasonable
 Bad : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Good
 Brave : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Cowardly
 Insincere : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Sincere
 Smart : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Dumb
 Kind : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Cruel
 Fearful : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Confident
 Unselfish : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Selfish

MEN

Unreasonable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Reasonable
 Brave : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Cowardly
 Sincere : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Insincere
 Cruel : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Kind
 Selfish : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Unselfish
 Undependable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Dependable
 Good : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Bad
 Smart : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Dumb
 Hurtful : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Helpful

GOD

Kind	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Cruel
Bad	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Good
Unreasonable	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Reasonable
Unselfish	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Selfish
Love	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Hate
Sincere	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Insincere
Undependable	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Dependable
Smart	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Dumb
Hurtful	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Helpful

FATHERS

Insincere	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Sincere
Unselfish	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Selfish
Brave	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Cowardly
Dumb	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Smart
Good	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Bad
Kind	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Cruel
Undependable	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Dependable
Reasonable	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Unreasonable
Hurtful	: ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ :	Helpful

PAROLE OFFICER

Hate : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Love
 Responsible : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Not responsible
 Reasonable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Unreasonable
 Helpful : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Hurtful
 Cowardly : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Brave
 Insincere : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Sincere
 Cruel : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Kind
 Confident : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Fearful
 Unselfish : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Selfish

BLACK PACE

Selfish : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Unselfish
 Helpful : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Hurtful
 Cruel : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Kind
 Insincere : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Sincere
 Responsible : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Not responsible
 Unreasonable : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Reasonable
 Love : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Hate
 Good : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Bad
 Dumb : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Smart

B. PERSONAL VALUES ABSTRACT

Harrison Gough, the author of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), chose certain scales from that instrument to construct the Personal Values Abstract (PVA). ✓

The PVA includes the entire 38 items from the Femininity Scale of the CPI, which has been validated in American studies and work in several foreign countries.^{43, 46}

Thirty-two items were selected for the PVA from the 54 items of the Socialization Scale of the CPI. These 32 items were those with the most significant differentiations in the original validation. The CPI Socialization Scale has been validated in more than ten cross-cultural applications.^{42, 44} "The underlying dimension of measurement is addressed to the internalization of norms and the degree to which behavior is spontaneously guided by normative sanctions."⁴⁵

The third scale of the PVA, Modernity, was developed by an item-cluster analysis from the first cluster of scales of the CPI to assess the 32 items having the highest correlations on norm-changing and norm-improving.

In order to identify the exact psychological meaning attached to each variable, the three scales were scored on samples of male and female college students for whom adjectival descriptions by peers were available. Each subject had been rated by three acquaintances using the Gough Adjective Check List (Gough and Heilbrun, 1965).⁴⁷ "The tallies for each adjective in the 300-item list is taken as the score of the student on

that attribute."⁴⁵

For the Socialization Scale the most positive correlates for females were responsible, reliable, kind, self-controlled, conservative, patient, peaceable, trusting, cooperative, and obliging.⁴⁵ The key negative correlates were disorderly, reckless, rebellious, sarcastic, careless, coarse, headstrong, unconventional, impulsive, and cynical. The strongest positive correlates for men were reliable, reasonable, steady, honest, sincere, wholesome, organized, responsible, stable, and modest; and the most negative correlates were undependable, rebellious, irresponsible, hard-hearted, careless, reckless, thankless, impulsive, distrustful, and argumentative.⁴⁵

The following table was used to interpret the data on the Personal Values Abstract.

NORMS

NORMATIVE DATA FROM SAMPLES OF 529 MALES AND 431 FEMALES

	<u>Correlations*</u>			<u>Males</u>		<u>Females</u>	
	<u>My</u>	<u>Sn</u>	<u>Fy</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
My	----	.01	-.06	19.07	4.15	18.62	4.30
Sn	-.04	----	.06	23.99	3.60	25.78	3.40
Fy	-.22	.10	----	14.11	3.19	21.11	3.21

SCALES

The modernity scale is intended to assess the kind of self-confidence, spontaneity, and personal verve that one finds in individuals interested in new experience and variation in routine. High-scorers are often seen as

*above diagonal, males; below diagonal, females.

self-assured, outgoing, and pleasure-seeking, whereas low-scorers are seen as diffident, conventional in outlook, and lacking in social grace and poise.

The Socialization scale reflects the degree to which one has internalized societal values concerning self-discipline, the management of impulse, and the acceptance of order. High-scorers tend to be seen as responsible, organized, and self-controlled, whereas low-scorers are described as rebellious, undependable, and headstrong.

The Femininity scale attempts to identify patterns of interest and preference indicative of nurturance and the conservation of human relationships on the one hand versus enterprise and potency on the other. High-scoring women are often described as feminine, gentle, and sympathetic, low-scoring as restless, self-assertive, and dissatisfied. High-scoring men tend to be seen as dependent, irresolute, and sensitive, low-scoring as masculine, forceful, and self-reliant.*

The Personal Values Abstract follows on pages 155-156.**

*Harrison G. Gough, "Personality Assessment in the Study of Population," in Psychological Aspects of Population Control, ed. by J. T. Fawcett (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972).

**Reproduced by special permission from: Harrison G. Gough, Personal Values Abstract (Palo Alto, Cal.: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1956, 1970).

INSTRUCTIONS: Ninety-seven statements are given on these pages. Please read each one and decide whether you would agree or disagree with the statement made. If you agree with the statement, or think that it is true about you, blacken in the box under "T" (for "true") If you disagree with the statement, or think that it is not true about you, blacken in the box under "F" (for "false") Please respond to every item, even if you must guess on some

- | T | F | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. I am quite a fast reader. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. I like adventure stories better than romantic stories |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. I often think about how I look and what impression I am making upon others |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. It is always a good thing to be frank |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. I want to be an important person in the community. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. My home life was always happy. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. A person needs to "show off" a little now and then. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. A windstorm terrifies me |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. I get nervous when I have to ask someone for a job. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. When in a group of people, I usually do what the others want rather than make suggestions. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. I am very slow in making up my mind |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. I never worry about my looks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Women should not be allowed to drink in cocktail bars. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. I think I would like the work of a building contractor. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. I find it easy to "drop" or "break with" a friend. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. I seem to be about as capable and smart as most others around me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. I get very tense and anxious when I think other people are disapproving of me |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. I often feel that I made a wrong choice in my occupation. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. I'm pretty sure I know how we can settle the international problems we face today |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 20. I am embarrassed by dirty stories |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 21. I must admit that I enjoy playing practical jokes on people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 22. When I was going to school, I played hooky quite often. |

- | T | F | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 23. I would disapprove of anyone's drinking to the point of intoxication at a party |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 24. I became quite irritated when I see someone spit on the sidewalk |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 25. I would do almost anything on a dare |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 26. It is very hard for me to tell anyone about myself |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 27. I get excited very easily. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 28. With things going as they are, it's pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to something. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 29. I would like the job of a foreign correspondent for a newspaper. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 30. I prefer a shower to a bathtub. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 31. I have had more than my share of things to worry about. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 32. People today have forgotten how to feel properly ashamed of themselves. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 33. The thought of being in an automobile accident is very frightening to me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 34. My parents have often disapproved of my friends. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 35. I like to be the center of attention. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 36. The average person is not able to appreciate art and music very well. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 37. I have never been in trouble with the law. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 38. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 39. Sometimes I have the same dream over and over. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 40. In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 41. I believe we are made better by the trials and hardships of life. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 42. At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 43. My parents have generally let me make my own decisions |

Abstracted from the California Psychological Inventory, by Harrison G. Gough, Ph.D. © Copyright 1956, 1970 by Consulting Psychologists Press, 577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94306, U.S.A. Not to be reproduced in whole or in part except by written permission of the copyright holder

- | T | F | | T | F | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 44. I was a slow learner in school | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 73. I very much like hunting. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 45. I think I would like the work of a dress designer. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 74. I used to steal sometimes when I was a youngster |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 46. Most of the time I feel happy. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 75. In a group, I usually take the responsibility for getting people introduced. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 47. I like poetry. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 76. I think I would like the work of a garage mechanic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 48. I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 77. My home as a child was less peaceful and quiet than those of most other people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 49. I seem to do things that I regret more often than other people do. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 78. Our thinking would be a lot better off if we would just forget about words like "probably," "approximately," and "perhaps." |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 50. I am likely not to speak to people until they speak to me. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 79. If I get too much change in a store, I always give it back. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 51. I think I would like to drive a racing car | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 80. Even the idea of giving a talk in public makes me afraid. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 52. I know who is responsible for most of my troubles. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 81. I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 53. I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 82. I think I would like the work of a librarian. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 54. I like to be with a crowd who play jokes on one another. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 83. As a youngster in school I used to give the teachers lots of trouble |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 55. Life usually hands me a pretty raw deal | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 84. I think I am usually a leader in my group. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 56. I read at least ten books a year | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 85. Sometimes I feel that I am about to go to pieces. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 57. I think I would like the work of a clerk in a large department store. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 86. If the pay was right, I would like to travel with a circus or carnival. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 58. I have often gone against my parents' wishes. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 87. I have a natural talent for influencing people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 59. I usually expect to succeed in things I do | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 88. I would like to be a nurse. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 60. I am somewhat afraid of the dark. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 89. I never cared much for school. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 61. People often talk about me behind my back. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 90. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 62. I like to read about history. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 91. I like mechanics magazines. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 63. I think I could do better than most of the present politicians if I were in office. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 92. The members of my family were always very close to each other. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 64. I have never done any heavy drinking. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 93. People seem naturally to turn to me when decisions have to be made. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 65. I would rather be a steady and dependable worker than a brilliant but unstable one. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 94. I must admit I feel sort of scared when I move to a strange place. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 66. I am inclined to take things hard. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 95. My parents never really understood me |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 67. I would never play cards (poker) with a stranger. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 96. I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 68. A person does not need to worry about other people if only he looks after himself | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 97. If I were a reporter, I would like very much to report news of the theater. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 69. I would like to be a soldier. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 70. I don't think I'm quite as happy as others seem to be. | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 71. Sometimes I rather enjoy going against the rules and doing things I'm not supposed to | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 72. A person is better off if he doesn't trust anyone. | | | |

**APPENDIX II: DISCUSSION LEADERS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES
FOR DISCUSSION LEADERS**

A. GROUP BOOK DISCUSSION LEADERS

1. The book discussion leaders at the Wisconsin Home for Women were:

a. WHW Team One:

Mrs. Mae Hayden, the institution librarian who has served 8½ years in that capacity.

Miss Monteria Hightower, a specialist degree candidate at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, experienced in library work with minority groups in the inner city.

b. WHW Team Two:

Dr. Dennis Ribbens, experienced public and university librarian who has worked with inmates previously.

Mrs. Lois Hinseth, a registered nurse with a degree in public health nursing, and experienced as a professional librarian in a psychiatric hospital.

2. The book discussion leaders at the Wisconsin Correctional Institution were:

a. WCI Team One:

Mrs. Jeanne Dornfeldt, the institution librarian who has served in that capacity for eleven years.

Mr. Prentiss Gillespie, a Library School master's candidate who

has worked with inmates previously.

b. WCI Team Two:

Mr. Allen Zoroya, a public librarian, who is completing an additional degree in philosophy.

Miss Veronica Murray, a Library School master's candidate preparing to become a correctional institution librarian.

B. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR DISCUSSION LEADERS

1. Objectives:

- a. To afford vicarious experience in dealing with problems and difficult situations thereby affording a larger reservoir of solutions from which to choose.
- b. To lessen the sense of frustration and isolation when it becomes evident that others have the same or similar problems.
- c. To learn the mechanics of working within an "idea" group effectively.
- d. To enhance self-concept by membership in a group that deals with ideas.
- e. To form a bridge to the outside world by participation in a library-related activity available to those outside institution walls.
- f. To afford a release from stress.
- g. To increase self-understanding so that the inmate may become more independent and self-directive.

- h. To enhance self-esteem as the ability to formulate ideas and articulate them to the group grows.
- i. To learn to discriminate between fact and opinion.
- j. To learn to assess the motives and values of others and their own by examination of those revealed in literature.
- k. To increase ability for concern for others as insight develops as to the dynamics of human relationships.
- l. To ". . . encounter, consider, and try out new ways of perceiving old data, as he begins to borrow the eyes of the group; and these new ways of perceiving permit new patterns of response to which the group also gives exercise and practice."¹¹¹

2. Process:

The leaders will:

- a. Keep the discussion operating at an objective, fact-documented level.
- b. Hold identification with the leader at a minimum through focusing members of the group continuously on the book and the author's ideas.
- c. Will ask a question to stimulate discussion, but will not inject their own views.
- d. Will allow no one to monopolize the discussion or violate the rules of common courtesy.
- e. Will gently encourage everyone to make a contribution.
- f. Will encourage critical, evaluative, and increasingly more discriminating comments.

APPENDIX III: ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE TABLES

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE, MAIN EFFECTS

TABLE 31

"SOCIALIZATION"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	48	521.97	10.97	
Error + Sex	49	532.31		
Sex	1	10.34	10.34	.95
Error + Offense	49	533.94		
Offense	1	11.97	11.97	1.10
Error + Race	49	528.49		
Race	1	6.52	6.52	.59
Error + Achievement	49	521.97		
Achievement	1	00.00	00.00	0.00
Error + Recidivism	49	522.07		
Recidivism	1	.10	.10	0.00
Error + Months to be Served	49	522.19		
Months to be Served	1	.22	.22	.02
Error + Months Served	49	535.18		
Months Served	1	13.21	13.21	1.21
Error + Age	49	538.19		
Age	1	16.22	16.22	1.49
Error + Group	49	524.66		
Group	1	2.69	2.69	.24

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

TABLE 32

"SOCIALIZATION"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	13.85
Female	14.78
Offense	
Against Persons	13.85
Against Property	14.93
Race	
Black	13.85
White	14.72
Achievement	
Above Mean	13.85
Below Mean	13.87
Recidivism	
Yes	13.85
No	13.75
Months to be Served	
15 or less	13.85
16 or more	14.02
Months Served	
36 or less	13.85
37 or more	12.37
Age	
25 or less	13.85
26 or more	15.05
Group	
Experimental	13.85
Control	13.41

TABLE 33

"WHITE RACE"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	28.27
Female	24.59
Offense	
Against Persons	28.27
Against Property	30.73
Race	
Black	28.27
White	34.06
Achievement	
Above Mean	28.27
Below Mean	29.47
Recidivism	
Yes	28.27
No	30.47
Months to be Served	
15 or less	28.27
16 or more	28.98
Months Served	
36 or less	28.27
37 or more	34.87
Age	
25 or less	28.27
26 or more	27.93
Group	
Experimental	28.27
Control	29.35

TABLE 34

"WHITE RACE"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	1, 48, .05	4.034
Error	48	3060.38	63.75			
Error + Sex	49	3217.84				
Sex	1	157.46	157.46			2.45
Error + Offense	49	3121.71				
Offense	1	61.33	61.33			.96
Error + Race	49	3335.47				
Race	1	275.09	275.09			4.31*
Error + Achievement	49	3072.26				
Achievement	1	11.88	11.88			.18
Error + Recidivism	49	3117.67				
Recidivism	1	57.29	57.29			.89
Error + Months to be Served	49	3064.21				
Months to be Served	1	3.83	3.83			.06
Error + Months Served	49	3336.61				
Months Served	1	276.23	276.23			4.33*
Error + Age	49	3061.61				
Age	1	1.23	1.23			.01
Error + Group	49	3075.68				
Group (Experimental vs. Control)	1	15.30	15.30			.24

TABLE 35

"WOMEN"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	48	3140.37	65.42	1, 48, .05 =4.034
Error + Sex	49	3142.13		
Sex	1	1.76	1.76	.02
Error + Offense	49	3262.36		
Offense	1	121.99	121.99	1.86
Error + Race	49	3150.88		
Race	1	10.51	10.51	.16
Error + Achievement	49	3214.87		
Achievement	1	74.50	74.50	1.13
Error + Recidivism	49	3302.09		
Recidivism	1	161.72	161.72	2.47
Error + Months to be Served	49	3274.98		
Months to be Served	1	134.61	134.61	2.05
Error + Months Served	49	3531.18		
Months Served	1	390.81	390.81	5.97*
Error + Age	49	3281.10		
Age	1	140.73	140.73	2.15
Error + Group	49	3146.11		
Group	1	5.74	5.74	.08

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

TABLE 36

"WOMEN"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	33.18
Female	33.57
Offense	
Against Persons	33.18
Against Property	36.67
Race	
Black	33.18
White	34.30
Achievement	
Above Mean	33.18
Below Mean	36.21
Recidivism	
Yes	33.18
No	36.83
Months to be Served	
15 or less	33.18
16 or more	28.98
Months Served	
36 or less	33.13
37 or more	41.00
Age	
25 or less	33.18
26 or more	36.72
Group	
Experimental	33.18
Control	32.53

TABLE 37

"MEN"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	25.61
Female	23.33
Offense	
Against Persons	25.61
Against Property	24.19
Race	
Black	25.61
White	31.89
Achievement	
Above Mean	25.61
Below Mean	30.80
Recidivism	
Yes	25.61
No	27.87
Months to be Served	
15 or less	25.61
16 or more	30.01
Months Served	
36 or less	25.61
37 or more	29.08
Age	
25 or less	25.61
26 or more	27.04
Group	
Experimental	33.18
Control	28.30

TABLE 38

'MEN'

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 48, .05} = 4.034
Error	48	2293.95	47.79	
Error + Sex	49	2353.71		
Sex	1	59.76	59.76	1.25
Error + Offense	49	2314.37		
Offense	1	20.42	20.42	.42
Error + Race	49	2569.96		
Race	1	276.01	276.01	5.77*
Error + Achievement	49	2486.67		
Achievement	1	192.72	192.72	4.03
Error + Recidivism	49	2356.57		
Recidivism	1	62.62	62.62	1.31
Error + Months to be Served	49	2443.48		
Months to be Served	1	149.53	149.53	3.12
Error + Months Served	49	2371.46		
Months Served	1	77.51	77.51	1.62
Error + Age	49	2317.08		
Age	1	23.13	23.13	.48
Error + Group	49	2392.43		
Group	1	98.48	98.48	2.06

TABLE 39

"MOTHERS"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	48	5883.47	122.57	1, 48, .05 = 4.034
Error + Sex	49	5885.06		
Sex	1	1.59	1.59	.01
Error + Offense	49	6047.33		
Offense	1	163.86	163.86	1.33
Error + Race	49	6065.55		
Race	1	182.08	182.08	1.48
Error + Achievement	49	5892.64		
Achievement	1	9.17	9.17	.07
Error + Recidivism	49	5894.65		
Recidivism	1	11.18	11.18	.09
Error + Months to be Served	49	5921.67		
Months to be Served	1	38.20	38.20	.31
Error + Months Served	49	5910.04		
Months Served	1	26.57	26.57	.21
Error + Age	49	5957.70		
Age	1	74.23	74.23	.60
Error + Group	49	5968.80		
Group	1	85.33	85.33	.69

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

TABLE 40
"MOTHERS"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	53.58
Female	53.20
Offense	
Against Persons	53.58
Against Property	57.61
Race	
Black	53.58
White	49.02
Achievement	
Above Mean	53.58
Below Mean	52.52
Recidivism	
Yes	53.58
No	52.63
Months to be Served	
15 or less	53.58
16 or more	51.36
Months Served	
36 or less	53.58
37 or more	55.64
Age	
25 or less	53.58
26 or more	56.15
Group	
Experimental	53.58
Control	51.08

TABLE 41
"FATHERS"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	37.72
Female	35.00
Offense	
Against Persons	37.72
Against Property	41.36
Race	
Black	37.72
White	36.55
Achievement	
Above Mean	37.72
Below Mean	38.50
Recidivism	
Yes	37.72
No	39.83
Months to be Served	
15 or less	37.72
16 or more	39.64
Months Served	
36 or less	37.72
37 or more	39.95
Age	
25 or less	37.72
26 or more	43.60
Group	
Experimental	37.72
Control	36.66

TABLE 42

"FATHERS"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 48, .05} = 4.034
Error	48	4917.85	102.45	
Error + Sex	49	5005.51		
Sex	1	87.66	87.66	.85
Error + Offense	49	5053.01		
Offense	1	135.16	135.16	1.31
Error + Race	49	4929.15		
Race	1	11.30	11.30	.11
Error + Achievement	49	4922.60		
Achievement	1	4.75	4.75	.04
Error + Recidivism	49	4969.02		
Recidivism	1	51.17	51.17	.49
Error + Months to be Served	49	4945.88		
Months to be Served	1	28.03	28.03	.27
Error + Months Served	49	4948.96		
Months Served	1	31.11	31.11	.30
Error + Age	49	5297.17		
Age	1	379.32	379.32	3.70
Error + Group	49	4933.17		
Group	1	15.32	15.32	.14

TABLE 43

"BLACK RACE"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 48, .05} = 4.034
Error	48	3553.30	74.02	
Error + Sex	49	3610.44		
Sex	1	57.14	57.14	.77
Error + Offense	49	3643.36		
Offense	1	90.06	90.06	1.21
Error + Race	49	4223.56		
Race	1	670.26	670.26	9.05*
Error + Achievement	49	3638.97		
Achievement	1	85.67	85.67	1.15
Error + Recidivism	49	3589.68		
Recidivism	1	36.38	36.38	.49
Error + Months to be Served	49	3554.68		
Months to be Served	1	1.38	1.38	.01
Error + Months Served	49	3850.55		
Months Served	1	297.25	297.25	4.01
Error + Age	49	3830.87		
Age	1	277.57	277.57	3.74
Error + Group	49	3592.51		
Group (Experimental vs. Control)	1	39.21	39.21	.52

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

TABLE 44

"BLACK RACE"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	43.30
Female	45.49
Offense	
Against Persons	43.30
Against Property	40.48
Race	
Black	43.30
White	34.54
Achievement	
Above Mean	43.30
Below Mean	40.03
Recidivism	
Yes	43.30
No	45.04
Months to be Served	
15 or less	43.30
16 or more	42.88
Months Served	
36 or less	43.30
37 or more	50.20
Age	
25 or less	43.30
26 or more	48.26
Group	
Experimental	43.30
Control	45.01

TABLE 45

"PAROLE OFFICER"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	26.60
Female	29.55
Offense	
Against Persons	26.60
Against Property	27.93
Race	
Black	26.60
White	32.76
Achievement	
Above Mean	26.60
Below Mean	27.93
Recidivism	
Yes	26.60
No	26.94
Months to be Served	
15 or less	26.60
16 or more	24.45
Months Served	
36 or less	26.60
37 or more	31.22
Age	
25 or less	26.60
26 or more	27.89
Group	
Experimental	26.60
Control	28.25

TABLE 46
 "PAROLE OFFICER"
 EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	48	3210.13	66.87	1, 48, .05 ^{=4.034}
Error + Sex	49	3307.16		
Sex	1	97.03	97.03	1.45
Error + Offense	49	3228.19		
Offense	1	18.06	18.06	.27
Error + Race	49	3539.01		
Race	1	328.88	328.88	4.91*
Error + Achievement	49	3224.35		
Achievement	1	14.22	14.22	.21
Error + Recidivism	49	3211.28		
Recidivism	1	1.15	1.15	.01
Error + Months to be Served	49	3246.21		
Months to be Served	1	36.08	36.08	.53
Error + Months Served	49	3344.85		
Months Served	1	134.72	134.72	2.01
Error + Age	49	3224.77		
Age	1	14.64	14.64	.21
Error + Group	49	3242.14		
Group	1	32.01	32.01	.47

TABLE 47

"GOD"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 48, .05} = 4.034
Error	48	5169.87	107.70	
Error + Sex	49	5205.89		
Sex	1	36.02	36.02	.33
Error + Offense	49	5425.04		
Offense	1	255.17	255.17	2.36
Error + Race	49	5218.10		
Race	1	48.23	48.23	.44
Error + Achievement	49	5212.89		
Achievement	1	43.02	43.02	.39
Error + Recidivism	49	5177.09		
Recidivism	1	7.22	7.22	.06
Error + Months to be Served	49	5199.37		
Months to be Served	1	29.50	29.50	.27
Error + Months Served	49	5263.62		
Months Served	1	93.75	93.75	.87
Error + Age	49	5238.03		
Age	1	68.16	68.16	.63
Error + Group	49	5173.60		
Group	1	3.73	3.73	.03

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

TABLE 48

"GOD"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	37.07
Female	39.00
Offense	
Against Persons	37.07
Against Property	42.07
Race	
Black	37.07
White	39.42
Achievement	
Above Mean	37.07
Below Mean	39.35
Recidivism	
Yes	37.07
No	37.83
Months to be Served	
15 or less	37.07
16 or more	35.12
Months Served	
36 or less	37.07
37 or more	40.91
Age	
25 or less	37.07
26 or more	39.71
Group	
Experimental	37.07
Control	37.59

TABLE 49

"MYSELF"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	45.49
Female	44.15
Offense	
Against Persons	45.49
Against Property	43.69
Race	
Black	45.49
White	47.48
Achievement	
Above Mean	45.49
Below Mean	48.50
Recidivism	
Yes	45.49
No	48.13
Months to be Served	
15 or less	45.49
16 or more	44.69
Months Served	
36 or less	45.49
37 or more	49.43
Age	
25 or less	45.49
26 or more	45.96
Group	
Experimental	45.49
Control	44.56

TABLE 50

"MYSELF"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	48	3033.27	63.19	$F_{1, 48, .05} = 4.034$
Error + Sex	49	3054.56		
Sex	1	21.29	21.29	.33
Error + Offense	49	3065.23		
Offense	1	31.96	31.96	.50
Error + Race	49	3067.70		
Race	1	34.43	34.43	.54
Error + Achievement	49	3107.27		
Achievement	1	74.00	74.00	1.17
Error + Recidivism	49	3111.57		
Recidivism	1	78.30	78.30	1.23
Error + Months to be Served	49	3038.00		
Months to be Served	1	4.73	4.73	.07
Error + Months Served	49	3131.95		
Months Served	1	98.68	98.68	1.56
Error + Age	49	3035.68		
Age	1	2.41	2.41	.03
Error + Group	49	3044.90		
Group	1	11.63	11.63	.18

TABLE 51

"TOTAL CONCEPTS"

EFFECT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	1, 48, .05 = 4.034
Error	48	104,000	2,166		
Error + Sex	49	104,445			
Sex	1	445	445		.20
Error + Offense	49	106,190			
Offense	1	2,190	2,190		1.01
Error + Race	49	104,540			
Race	1	540	540		.24
Error + Achievement	49	104,420			
Achievement	1	420	420		.19
Error + Recidivism	49	104,310			
Recidivism	1	310	310		.14
Error + Months to be Served	49	104,050			
Months to be Served	1	50	50		.02
Error + Months Served	49	112,990			
Months Served	1	8,990	8,990		4.15*
Error + Age	49	108,210			
Age	1	4,210	4,210		1.94
Error + Group	49	105,560			
Group	1	1,560	1,560		.72

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES (ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR) BY INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

TABLE 52

"TOTAL CONCEPTS"

Factor	Mean
Sex	
Male	225.51
Female	231.81
Offense	
Against Persons	225.51
Against Property	240.16
Race	
Black	225.51
White	233.46
Achievement	
Above Mean	225.51
Below Mean	232.69
Recidivism	
Yes	225.51
No	230.87
Months to be Served	
15 or less	225.51
16 or more	222.80
Months Served	
36 or less	225.51
37 or more	263.06
Age	
25 or less	225.51
26 or more	246.80
Group	
Experimental	225.51
Control	214.75

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE

TABLE 53

"SOCIALIZATION"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	549.48	10.17	
Error + Interaction	55	572.99		
Interaction	1	23.51	23.51	2.31
Error + Interaction + Group				
Treatment	56	577.81		
Group Treatment	1	4.82	4.82	.47
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served				
Number of Months Served	56	603.09		
Number of Months Served	1	30.10	30.10	2.95

TABLE 54

"TOTAL CONCEPTS"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	113,190	2096.20	
Error + Interaction	55	120,910		
Interaction	1	7,720	7720.00	3.68
Error + Interaction + Group				
Treatment	56	122,950		
Group Treatment	1	2,040	2040.00	.97
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served				
Number of Months to be Served	56	121,110		
Number of Months to be Served	1	1,088	1088.00	.51

TABLE 55

"STEALING"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	P
Error	54	4137.94	76.62		
Error + Interaction	55	4171.83			
Interaction	1	33.89	33.89		.44
Error + Interaction + Group					
Treatment	56	4938.99			
Group Treatment	1	967.16	967.16		10.01***
Error + Interaction + Race	56	4171.83			
Race	1	00.00	000.00		0.00

TABLE 56

"STEALING"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	P
Error	54	4128.54	76.45		
Error + Interaction	55	4171.11			
Interaction	1	42.52	42.52		.55
Error + Interaction + Group					
Treatment	56	4946.10			
Group Treatment	1	774.99	774.99		10.13***
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	4171.83			
Number of Months Served	1	.72	.72		0.00

TABLE 57

"STEALING"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Factor	Treatment	
	Experimental	Control
Race		
Black	52.60	43.44
White	50.96	44.92
Number of Months to be Served		
15 or less	48.61	46.79
16 or more	52.55	43.50
Number of Months Served		
36 or less	52.21	44.23
37 or more	54.51	51.31

TABLE 58

"STEALING"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 54, .05} = 4.024$
Error	54	4033.19	74.68	
Error + Interaction	55	4170.31		
Interaction	1	137.12	137.12	1.83
Error + Interaction + Group				
Treatment	56	4946.17		
Group Treatment	1	775.86	775.86	10.38***
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served	56	4171.83		
Number of Months to be Served	1	1.52	1.52	.02

TABLE 59

"DOPE ADDICTION"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 54, .05} = 4.024$
Error	54	4878.78	89.42	
Error + Interaction	55	4836.47		
Interaction	1	7.69	7.69	.08
Error + Interaction + Group				
Treatment	56	5809.99		
Group Treatment	1	973.52	973.52	10.88***
Error + Interaction + Race	56	4858.67		
Race	1	22.20	22.20	.24

TABLE 60

"DOPE ADDICTION"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 54, .05} = 4.024$
Error	54	4796.15	88.81	
Error + Interaction	55	4813.66		
Interaction	1	17.51	17.51	.19
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	5829.53		
Group Treatment	1	1005.87	1005.87	11.32***
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served	56	4858.67		
Number of Months to be Served	1	45.01	45.01	.50

TABLE 61

"DOPE ADDICTION"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 54, .05} = 4.024$
Error	54	4799.76	88.88	
Error + Interaction	55	4820.97		
Interaction	1	21.21	21.21	.23
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	5835.38		
Group Treatment	1	1014.41	1041.41	11.41***
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	4858.67		
Number of Months Served	1	37.70	37.70	.42

TABLE 62

"DOPE ADDICTION"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Factor	Treatment	
	Experimental	Control
Race		
Black	55.12	47.87
White	57.18	46.38
Number of Months to be Served		
15 or less	54.00	48.56
16 or more	57.30	49.34
Number of Months Served		
36 or less	56.34	47.52
37 or more	56.75	51.30

TABLE 63
 "WHITE RACE"
 INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	3536.38	66.08	
Error + Interaction	55	3653.00		
Interaction	1	84.62	84.62	1.28
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	3675.41		
Group Treatment	1	22.41	22.41	.33
Error + Interaction + Race	56	3900.73		
Race	1	247.73	247.43	3.74

TABLE 64
 "WHITE RACE"
 INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	3718.93	68.86	
Error + Interaction	55	3775.18		
Interaction	1	56.25	56.25	.81
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	3779.17		
Group Treatment	1	3.99	3.99	.05
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	3900.73		
Number of Months Served	1	125.55	125.55	1.82



TABLE 65

"WHITE RACE"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Factor	Treatment	
	Experimental	Control
Race		
Black	33.53	31.76
White	35.29	38.46
Number of Months Served		
36 or less	33.91	32.51
37 or more	40.99	34.08

TABLE 6

"WHITE RACE"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	3809.86	70.53	
Error + Interaction	55	3848.03		
Interaction	1	38.17	38.17	.54
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	3854.04		
Group Treatment	1	6.01	6.01	.08
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served	56	3900.73		
Number of Months to be Served	1	52.70	52.70	.74

TABLE 67

"WOMEN"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	3997.30	74.02	
Error + Interaction	55	4033.16		
Interaction	1	35.86	35.86	.48
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	4039.57		
Group Treatment	1	6.41	6.41	.08
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served	56	4090.16		
Number of Months to be Served	1	57.00	57.00	.77

TABLE 68

"MEN"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} ^{=4.024}
Error	54	2864.11	53.03	
Error + Interaction	55	2915.19		
Interaction	1	51.08	51.08	.96
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	3084.82		
Group Treatment	1	169.63	169.63	3.19
Error + Interaction + Race	56	2943.00		
Race	1	27.81	27.81	.52

TABLE 69

"MEN"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} ^{=4.024}
Error	54	2683.69	49.69	
Error + Interaction	55	2829.91		
Interaction	1	146.22	146.22	2.94
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	2974.45		
Group Treatment	1	144.54	144.54	2.90
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served	56	2943.00		
Number of Months to be Served	1	113.09	113.09	2.27

TABLE 70

"MOTHERS"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	1, 54, .05	^{=4.024}
Error	54	6371.86	117.99			
Error + Interaction	55	6382.39				
Interaction	1	10.53	10.53			.08
Error + Interaction + Group						
Treatment	56	6468.29				
Group Treatment	1	85.90	85.90			.72
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served	56	6395.79				
Number of Months to be Served	1	13.40	13.40			.11

TABLE 71

"MOTHERS"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	1, 54, .05	^{=4.024}
Error	54	6287.59	116.43			
Error + Interaction	55	6326.04				
Interaction	1	38.45	38.45			.33
Error + Interaction + Group						
Treatment	56	6414.91				
Group Treatment	1	88.87	88.87			.76
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	6395.79				
Number of Months to be Served	1	69.75	69.75			.59

TABLE 72

"FATHERS"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 54, .05} = 4.024$
Error	54	5660.36	104.82	
Error + Interaction	55	5822.72		
Interaction	1	162.36	162.36	1.54
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	5835.38		
Group Treatment	1	12.66	12.66	.12
Error + Interaction + Race	56	5897.74		
Race	1	75.02	75.02	.71

TABLE 73

"FATHERS"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 54, .05} = 4.024$
Error	54	5619.25	104.06	
Error + Interaction	55	5841.95		
Interaction	1	222.70	222.70	2.14
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	5852.06		
Group Treatment	1	10.11	10.11	.09
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	5897.74		
Number of Months Served	1	55.79	55.79	.53

TABLE 74

"BLACK RACE"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	54	4397.39	81.43	1.54, .05 = 4.024
Error + Interaction	55	4397.70		
Interaction	1	.31	.31	.00
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	4421.90		
Group Treatment	1	24.20	24.20	.29
Error + Interaction + Race	56	5564.94		
Race	1	1167.24	1167.24	14.33**

TABLE 75

"BLACK RACE"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Race	
	Black	White
Experimental	45.26	35.72
Control	46.37	37.13

TABLE 76

"BLACK RACE"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	$\alpha = 4.024$
Error	54	4704.28	87.11	1, 54, .05	
Error + Interaction	55	4796.76			
Interaction	1	92.48	92.48		1.06
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	4847.33			
Group Treatment	1	50.57	50.57		.58
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	5564.94			
Number of Months Served	1	748.18	768.18		8.81**

TABLE 77

"BLACK RACE"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Number of Months Served	
	36 Months or less	37 Months or more
Experimental	36.95	51.00
Control	39.97	46.81

TABLE 78

"BLACK RACE"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	5521.08	102.24	
Error + Interaction	55	5521.18		
Interaction	1	.10	.10	0.00
Error + Interaction + Group				
Treatment	56	5597.01		
Group Treatment	1	75.83	75.83	.74
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served	56	5564.94		
Number of Months to be Served	1	43.76	43.76	.42

TABLE 79

"PAROLE OFFICER"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	3684.14	68.22	
Error + Interaction	55	3795.60		
Interaction	1	111.46	111.46	1.63
Error + Interaction + Group				
Treatment	56	3808.88		
Group Treatment	1	13.28	13.28	.19
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served	56	3890.17		
Number of Months to be Served	1	94.57	94.57	1.38

TABLE 80
 "PAROLE OFFICER"
 INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	3877.00	71.99	
Error + Interaction	55	3879.91		
Interaction	1	2.91	2.91	.04
Error + Interaction + Group				
Treatment	56	3890.26		
Group Treatment	1	10.35	10.35	.14
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	3890.17		
Number of Months Served	1	10.26	10.26	.14

TABLE 81
 "GOD"
 INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	5612.23	103.93	
Error + Interaction	55	5686.28		
Interaction	1	74.05	74.05	.71
Error + Interaction + Group				
Treatment	56	5691.36		
Group Treatment	1	5.08	5.08	.04
Error + Interaction + Race	56	5707.73		
Race	1	21.45	21.45	.20

TABLE 82

"GOD"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	5614.21	103.96	
Error + Interaction	55	5670.17		
Interaction	1	55.96	55.96	.53
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	5672.87		
Group Treatment	1	2.70	2.70	.02
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	5707.73		
Number of Months Served	1	37.56	37.56	.36

TABLE 83

"GOD"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 54, .05} = 4.024
Error	54	5629.15	104.24	
Error + Interaction	55	5705.68		
Interaction	1	76.53	76.53	.73
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	5709.34		
Group Treatment	1	3.66	3.66	.03
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served	56	5707.73		
Number of Months to be Served	1	2.05	2.05	.01

TABLE 84

"MYSELF"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 54, .05} = 4.024$
Error	54	3207.31	59.39	
Error + Interaction	55	3369.62		
Interaction	1	162.31	162.31	2.73
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	3372.31		
Group Treatment	1	42.41	42.41	.71
Error + Interaction + Number of Months to be Served	56	3401.41		
Number of Months to be Served	1	31.79	31.79	.53

TABLE 85

"MYSELF"

INTERACTION BETWEEN NUMBER OF MONTHS SERVED AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 54, .05} = 4.024$
Error	54	3282.51	60.78	
Error + Interaction	55	3284.86		
Interaction	1	2.35	2.35	.03
Error + Interaction + Group Treatment	56	3290.38		
Group Treatment	1	5.52	5.52	.09
Error + Interaction + Number of Months Served	56	3401.41		
Number of Months Served	1	116.55	116.55	1.91

TABLE 86

"MYSELF"

INTERACTION BETWEEN RACE AND TREATMENT

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	P
Error	54	3187.61	59.02		
Error + Interaction	55	3399.79			
Interaction	1	212.18	212.18		3.59
Error + Interaction + Group					
Treatment	56	3404.20			
Group Treatment	1	4.41	4.41		.07
Error + Interaction + Race	56	3401.41			
Race	1	1.62	1.62		.02

TABLE 87

"MYSELF"

MEAN POSTTEST SCORES ADJUSTED FOR PRETEST AND ERROR

Group Treatment	Race	
	Black	White
Experimental	51.37	46.88
Control	45.98	49.34

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE

TABLE 88

"SOCIALIZATION"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	52	541.79	10.41	$F_{1, 52, .05} = 4.032$ $F_{3, 52, .05} = 2.792$
Error + Race	53	567.08		
Race	1	25.29	25.29	2.42
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	547.88		
Number of Months to be Served	1	6.09	6.09	.58
Error + Leaders	55	581.77		
Leaders	3	39.98	13.32	1.27

TABLE 89

"STEALING"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	52	4640.63	89.24	$F_{1, 52, .05} = 4.032$ $F_{3, 52, .05} = 2.792$
Error + Race	53	4650.77		
Race	1	10.14	10.14	.11
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	4658.98		
Number of Months to be Served	1	18.35	18.35	.20
Error + Leaders	55	4938.86		
Leaders	3	298.23	99.41	1.11

TABLE 90

"DOPE ADDICTION"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	52	5746.50	110.50	$F_{1, 52, .05} = 4.032$
Error + Race	53	5810.23		$F_{3, 52, .05} = 2.792$
Race	1	63.73	63.73	.57
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	5799.96		
Number of Months to be Served	1	53.46	53.46	.48
Error + Leaders	55	5768.42		
Leaders	3	21.92	7.30	.66

TABLE 91

"TOTAL CONCEPTS"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	52	116,810	2246.40	$F_{1, 52, .05} = 4.032$
Error + Race	53	116,900		$F_{3, 52, .05} = 2.792$
Race	1	90	90.00	.04
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	117,000		
Number of Months to be Served	1	190	190.00	.08
Error + Leaders	55	121,900		
Leaders	3	5,090	1696.00	.75

TABLE 92

"WOMEN"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 52, .05} = 4.032$ $F_{3, 52, .05} = 2.792$
Error	52	3996.75	76.86	
Error + Race	53	4024.14		
Race	1	27.39	27.39	.35
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	4048.66		
Number of Months to be Served	1	51.91	51.91	.67
Error + Leaders	55	4010.71		
Leaders	3	13.96	13.96	.06

TABLE 93

"WHITE RACE"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 52, .05} = 4.032$ $F_{3, 52, .05} = 2.792$
Error	52	3047.64	58.60	
Error + Race	53	3317.99		
Race	1	130.35	130.35	2.22
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	3099.52		
Number of Months to be Served	1	51.88	51.88	.88
Error + Leaders	55	3573.48		
Leaders	3	525.84	175.28	2.9 *

TABLE 94

"MEN"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 52, .05} = 4.032$ $F_{3, 52, .05} = 2.792$
Error	52	2597.86	49.95	
Error + Race	53	2627.11		
Race	1	29.25	29.25	.58
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	2727.25		
Number of Months to be Served	1	129.39	129.39	2.59
Error + Leaders	55	2939.09		
Leaders	3	341.23	113.74	2.27

TABLE 95

"MOTHERS"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	$F_{1, 52, .05} = 4.032$ $F_{3, 52, .05} = 2.792$
Error	52	6191.18	119.06	
Error + Race	53	6191.26		
Race	1	.08	.08	0.00
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	6385.45		
Number of Months to be Served	1	194.27	194.27	1.63
Error + Leaders	55	6282.83		
Leaders	3	91.65	30.55	.25

TABLE 96

"FATHERS"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 52, .05} = 4.032 F _{3, 52, .05} = 2.792
Error	52	5133.43	98.71	
Error + Race	53	5170.78		
Race	1	37.43	37.43	.37
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	5291.05		
Number of Months to be Served	1	157.62	157.62	1.59
Error + Leaders	55	5606.54		
Leaders	3	473.11	157.70	1.59

TABLE 97

"BLACK RACE"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 52, .05} = 4.032 F _{3, 52, .05} = 2.792
Error	52	4393.13	84.48	
Error + Race	53	5532.30		
Race	1	1139.17	1139.17	13.48*
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	4394.71		
Number of Months to be Served	1	1.58	1.58	.01
Error + Leaders	55	4421.90		
Leaders	3	28.77	9.59	.11

TABLE 98
 "PAROLE OFFICER"
 EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 52, .05} = 4.032 F _{3, 52, .05} = 2.792
Error	52	3434.10	66.04	
Error + Race	53	3715.19		
Race	1	281.09	281.09	4.25*
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	3452.85		
Number of Months to be Served	1	18.75	18.75	.28
Error + Leaders	55	3530.17		
Leaders	3	96.07	32.02	.48

TABLE 99
 "GOD"
 EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F _{1, 52, .05} = 4.032 F _{3, 52, .05} = 2.792
Error	52	5634.06	108.34	
Error + Race	53	5651.88		
Race	1	17.82	17.82	.16
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	5634.86		
Number of Months to be Served	1	.80	.80	0.00
Error + Leaders	55	5690.89		
Leaders	3	56.83	18.94	.17

TABLE 100

"MYSELF"

EFFECTS OF LEADERS, RACE, AND NUMBER OF MONTHS TO BE SERVED

Source	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Error	52	3328.49	64.00	$F_{1, 52, .05} = 4.032$
Error + Race	53	3332.99		$F_{3, 52, .05} = 2.792$
Race	1	4.50	4.50	.07
Error + Number of Months to be Served	53	3365.92		
Number of Months to be Served	1	37.43	37.43	.58
Error + Leaders	55	3368.18		
Leaders	3	39.69	13.23	.20

ERIC Clearinghouse
 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
 on Administration