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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The effectiveness of treatment methods used in correctional settings has been a long debated issue in our society. Using recidivism as a measure of evaluation, critics of the rehabilitative effort have maintained these endeavors have no effect on recidivism and have adopted the notion that “nothing works” (Martinson, 1974; Whitehead & Lab, 1989; Walker, 1989). In contrast, defenders of treatment continue to advocate for direct intervention (Allen, 1981; Cullen & Gendreau, 1989; Van Voorhis, Braswell & Lester 1997). Some policy makers advocate the building of more prisons and the imposing of longer sentences (Difulio, 1991). Others have become increasingly concerned with the issues that surround alternatives to traditional sanctioning (De Luca, Miller & Weidemann, 1991; Mathias & Mathews, 1991; Holmes, 1992).

Studies suggest that incarceration without rehabilitative services will not reduce recidivism (Palmer, 1975, 1983; Cohn, 1991; Conrad, 1991). Those programs with positive results support advocacy for the appropriateness of service as it relates to a particular offender (Palmer, 1975, 1983; Austin, J. & Irwin, J. 1990; Bonata, J. 1995).

The delivery characteristics of successful programs include service to high-risk cases, behavioral programs, clearly defined services targeting specific needs, and methods which involve the use of social-learning principles of interpersonal influence, skill enhancement, and cognitive change (Jesness, 1988; Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonata, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990; Valliant, Ennis, & Raven-Brooks, 1995).
Various methods of seeking appropriate services have been investigated. Harris (1988) examined a classification system based on interpersonal maturity level. Reitsma-Street and Leschied’s (1988) conceptual-level matching system offers guidelines regarding treatment principles for more self-reflective individuals. Treatment which addresses the cognitive issues of offenders has emerged (Spitzer & Spavecik, 1965; Walsh, 1990; Smith & Faubert, 1990; Ryan, 1994).

Counseling in the prison environment has most often centered on group-process programs focused on social themes such as drug, alcohol, and gambling addictions (Van Wormer, 1988; Rosenthal & Lorenz, 1992; Wexler & Lipton, 1993), behavior modification issues dealing with anger control (Valliant, Ennis, & Raven-Brooks, 1995), and counseling from religious organizations. These programs are predetermined and directive in their approaches and seek to educate offenders. The expectation for program success has traditionally been based on the effectiveness of the program characteristics and the individuals providing the delivery of service. It can be inferred from research issues describing client expectancies and preferences (Tinsley & Benton, 1978; Holloway & Wolleat, 1980; Yuen & Tinsley, 1981; Hardin & Yanico, 1983) that offenders, like non-offenders, approach rehabilitative programs, whether group or individual, with expectations of what they want to accomplish, what they will need to do to complete the program, and expectations of how the program will be conducted. Little attention has been given to expectations of the offender for what will occur during the treatment process.

Counseling expectations of clients outside of the correctional setting have been researched extensively (Bordin, 1955; Goldstein, 1962; Krause, Fitzsimmons, & Wolf,
1969; Tinsley & Harris, 1976; Hardin & Yanico, 1983; Subich, 1983; Subich & Coursol, 1985; Craig & Hennesy, 1989). Previous research indicates that the expectations clients have may be important in determining the effectiveness of counseling (Bordin, 1955; Goldstein, 1962; Frank, 1968; Efron & Veenendaal, 1993; Tokar, Hardin, Adams, & Brandel, 1996). Treatment which is concerned with emotional growth continually examines the level of change in client expectations (Tinsley, Bowman, & Ray, 1988; Satterfield, Buelow, Lyddon, & Johnson, 1995).

A study by Craig and Hennesy (1989) found "that patterns of expectations are directly related to variance in the personality structure of the client population" (p.401). Using the Conceptual Systems Theory (CST) (Harvey, Hunt & Schröder, 1961), Craig and Hennesy (1989) were able to identify patterns of expectations which discriminate between stages of conceptual systems development.

To assess personality structure, Craig and Hennesy (1989) found that Conceptual Systems Theory (CST) (Harvey, Hunt & Schröder, 1961) offered a schema through which an individual organizes information acquired through interaction with the environment. Four sequential stages for conceptual development are outlined. Each stage is structurally different from the others and represents distinct components.

Stage 1 is characterized as unilateral dependence. Thinking at this stage is concrete with dependence on external authority and controls. Beliefs are rigid and distinguished by an inability to accept varying points of view.

Stage 2 is characterized by negative dependence. A strong resistance to external authority and controls dominates while thinking is still concrete.
Stage 3 is characterized by conditional dependence. Desire to maintain close personal relationships by pleasing others motivates thinking in this stage. Decisions reflect an abstract, situation-based reasoning.

Stage 4 is characterized by informational interdependence. This stage "involves the development of informational standards through experiencing the consequences of one's own actions" (Harvey, Hunt & Schroder, 1961, p.194). Individuals at this stage are autonomous and take an analytical approach to problem-solving.

CST, with four stages of differentiation, constitutes a theory-driven model with which to examine the conceptual functioning of the adult inmate population. A central assumption of the CST is that conflict resolution is at the root of conceptual development (Stoppard & Miller, 1985). The theory is focused on the conceptual and behavioral strategies used in coping with conflict and ambiguity in social environments (Miller, 1978). CST delineates behavior as being an equal function of person and environmental characteristics (Stoppard & Miller, 1985) with an emphasis on how conceptual functioning interacts with interpersonal stimuli (Miller, 1978).

Prison inmates form a group of individuals who have resolved their conflicts by engaging in illegal activities. This group copes with the ambiguities in their environments by resorting to socially unacceptable behavioral strategies. Resolving conflicts in an adverse way that is characteristic of a concrete stage of functioning may result from the introduction of complex or novel situations before the individual has developed a level of abstraction compatible to the event (Harvey, Hunt & Schroder, 1961). Consequently, society restricts these individuals to a highly structured environment. This highly
structured environment is compatible with the need for organization attributed to the concrete stage of functioning.

Conceptual functioning has been the basis for substantial research in offender rehabilitation (Hunt & Hardt, 1965; Reitsma-Street, 1980; Leschied, Jaffe & Stone, 1985; Reitsma-Street & Leschied, 1988). Although CST forms the basis for this research, the focus has been on conceptual level rather than conceptual stage. The basic difference between conceptual stage and conceptual level lies in how the two models measure conceptual functioning. CST involves four stages of functioning in which Stages 1 and 2 represent concrete functioning and Stages 3 and 4 entail abstract functioning. Conceptual level alludes to stages or levels which are characteristically concrete and less exemplified by abstract reasoning.

In his conceptual-level model (CLM) Hunt (1970) examined personality organization as a continuous dimension from concrete to abstract functioning, with a range which is defined as Sub Stage I, Stage I, and Stage II. The lowest level, Sub Stage I, is characterized by immaturity, poor organization, and egocentricity. Stage I is exemplified by categorical thinking, and reliance on external standards with fixed rules. The high level, Stage II, is characterized by the ability to generate new concepts, conditional thinking and a greater reliance on internal standards (Hunt, 1970). These stages differ from CST in that they include a Sub Stage I to account for immaturity and in that conditional thinking characterizes Stage II, not necessarily negativistic thinking. This model was devised to be used with 12- to 18-year-old subjects (Hunt, 1970). The CLM offender research based in CST has been limited to the juvenile population.
Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine if patterns of expectations about counseling can be differentiated, within the inmate population, as a function of conceptual system. This study, in part, is an extension of the work of Craig and Hennessy (1989) and Richardson (1992). Their work is built on in this study in that it investigates male inmates. To study those individuals whose problem-solving behavior results in commitment to a highly structured prison setting, the most highly structured and restrictive setting in the prison will be examined. This population will be found in the Administrative Segregation (Ad. Seg.) unit of the prison. The focus of this research is to collect data that will examine the motivating factors of the inmates who demonstrate difficulty in functioning within the structure of the prison setting, the consequences of which are to be removed to an even more highly structured environment.

Furthermore, this study builds on the work of Reitsma-Street (1980, 1988) in that it examines the conceptual system, rather than the conceptual level model, with the adult population in the corrections setting. This study involves examining counseling needs of the male Ad. Seg. client and addresses the appropriateness of rehabilitation in the penal institution.

Background of the Problem

The reasons that inmates have for resorting to illegal means of problem-solving and continuing to recidivate are varied. (Field, 1989; Needels, 1996). Ultimately, the decision about how to resolve a particular problem lies with the individual. The manner in which the resolution takes place, whether by social or antisocial means, depends, at least in part, on the cognitive functioning of the person endeavoring to solve a problem.
The counseling process, as one means of offering services, is important in that it attempts to remediate the cognitive distortions that result in antisocial means of problem solving. Counseling as an effective means of delivering this service to the inmate population has been the subject of extensive research (Martinson, 1974; Johnson & Toch, 1988; Andrews et al., 1990; Van Voorhis, Braswell & Lester, 1997).

Rehabilitation in the prison system is divided into three categories: education, social-support-systems, and psychological services (Andrews, Bonata & Hoge, 1990). This investigation is concerned with the psychological effectiveness of counseling offered in prison settings. Researchers have yet to agree on a clear determination as to what effective counseling encompasses. This is in part attributable to the tendency to deliver service by categorizing the inmate population as to type of crime or generalizing, such as drug rehabilitation, rather than as to individual needs of clients. A meta-analysis of correctional treatment (Andrews et al., 1990) supported the reverse that the use of modes and styles of treatment matched with inmate needs and learning styles will succeed in reducing recidivism. Conceptual-level matching models have been used in the treatment of juvenile cases (Reitsma-Street, 1980; Leschied, Jaffe, & Stone, 1985; Reitsma-Street & Leschied, 1988). These models are derived from the Conceptual Level Model (Hunt 1970) and have been designed for adolescents. A more comprehensive system for determining specific functioning level can be derived from the stage model of the CST and has been employed in research with adults (Ware & Harvey, 1967; Goldberg, 1974; Greaves, 1972; Knudson & Carски, 1978; Lutwak & Hennessy, 1982; Craig & Hennessy, 1989). CST is considered appropriate for use in discerning the functioning
stage of the adult inmate and supports the need for treatment to match client style of learning.

CST is concerned with an individuals' social interaction within the environment. Concepts provide “a system of ordering by means of which the environment is broken down and organized” (Harvey, Hunt & Schroder, 1961, p.11). Threats to the individuals' conceptual order “may result in a major reorientation and reorganization of ties to the world, or more drastically, even to breakdown or destruction of the self” (Harvey, Hunt & Schroder, 1961, p. 11). Harvey (1958) states that more concrete individuals are very resistant to changing their concepts at lower levels of stress. Higher levels of stress challenge the conceptual schemata leading to a loss of ability to discriminate stimuli.

A prison setting is a restrictive environment with high structure. Rules regarding living quarters, meals, movement, and recreation are strictly defined. If these rules are broken, the inmate is then sent into Administrative Segregation (Ad Seg), which is an even more restrictive environment. The Ad. Seg. environment provides minimal conflicting stimuli. CST, in conjunction with expectations about counseling, addresses the individual’s motivation toward behavior that will further restrict his environment.

Theoretical Rationale

Andrews et.al. (1990) maintained that “effective correctional treatment is dependent upon what is delivered to whom in particular settings” (p. 372). In order to better understand how to motivate the process of cognitive change during counseling, it is as important to know how a person thinks as it is to know what a person thinks. These elements are inherent in the CST. Combining the CST with the expectations inmates
have about counseling will provide information for matching therapeutic interventions to a specific group.

The inmates in the Ad. Seg. environment were chosen as a focus of this investigation for the purpose of examining the conceptual level of those inmates who reside in an already highly structured environment but who continue to resolve their conflicts in a manner that lead to an even more restrictive setting. Investigation of this setting will extend the research of Craig and Hennessy (1989) and of Greaves (1971). These studies reported high participant groupings in Stage 1 and Stage 3 and a low percentage of participants in Stage 2 and Stage 4. Greaves (1971) stated that all settings will contain Stage 1 and Stage 3 functioning levels. The inmates that populate the Ad. Seg. unit have demonstrated an opposition to external control and authority that is descriptive of Stage 2 functioning. Reistma-Street (1988) reported both high and low level functioning adolescent offenders demonstrated infraction of rules. Study of this adult setting will represent an extension of offender research.

Hypotheses

The primary hypothesis of this study concerns the relationship between patterns of expectations about counseling as they are related to the cognitive functioning of the inmate population. Furthermore, the variance of conceptual functioning of the inmate population will be examined in terms of environment.

It is hypothesized that:

1. Conceptual stage of the inmate will be identified within the patterns of expectations about counseling.
1.a. Inmates with Stage 1 functioning (concrete) as a group will have
significantly higher mean scores on Expectations About Counseling (EAC) sub scales of
understanding, directiveness, and the therapist as an authority figure than inmates
functioning in Stages 2, 3, or 4.

1.b. Inmates with Stage 2 functioning as a group (negative toward authority)
will have significantly higher mean scores on EAC sub scales of counselor
self-disclosure, and relate as a peer rather than an authority figure than inmates
functioning in Stages 1, 3, or 4.

1.c. Inmates with Stage 3 functioning as a group (peer dependent) will have
significantly higher mean scores on EAC sub scales of counselor as provider of
encouragement, support, and reassurance than inmates functioning in Stages 1, 2, or 4.

1.d. Inmates with Stage 4 functioning as a group (abstract, interdependent) will
have significantly higher mean scores on EAC sub scales of autonomy in counseling, and
opportunity to consider multiple alternatives than inmates functioning in Stages 1, 2, or 3

2. Conceptual stage of development will be reflected in the length of time spent
in Ad. Seg.

2.a. Stage 1 inmates, as a group, will spend a moderate amount of time in Ad
Seg.

2.b. Stage 2 inmates, as a group, will spend the most amount of time in Ad Seg.

2.c. Stage 3 inmates, as a group, will spend less time in Ad Seg. than inmates
in Stage 1 or Stage 2 and more time than inmates in Stage 4.

2.d. Stage 4 inmates, as a group, will spend the least amount of time in Ad Seg.
Definition of Terms

1. **Administrative Segregation**: The most restrictive area of a prison. Inmates are confined to a single cell and housed in this unit for an infraction of the prison rules. Length of stay is commensurate with the severity of the infraction.

2. **Client**: An inmate who seeks counseling from designated personnel in a prison setting.

3. **Conceptual System**: A schema that provides the basis by which the individual relates to the environmental events one experiences (Harvey, Hunt & Schroder, 1961). Conceptual system will be assessed by using the This I Believe Test (Harvey, 1974).

4. **Expectations About Counseling**: The expectations that clients have for what will occur during counseling. The client’s expectations will be assessed by using the Expectations about Counseling (Form B) Questionnaire (Washington & Tinsley, 1982).

5. **Inmate**: An adult male who is incarcerated at a prison for performing an antisocial and illegal act or acts which limit the freedoms and/or civil rights of an individual or individuals.

6. **Prison**: A state run institution which houses inmates.

7. **Stage 1**: Concrete and dependent. Rigid thinking.

8. **Stage 2**: False independence. Rebellious thinking.

9. **Stage 3**: Abstract in thinking with dependence.

10. **Stage 4**: Autonomous thinking. Looks for multiple alternatives.
CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

This chapter will give an overview of relevant studies from previous research on the development of rehabilitation in the prison system, the prison environment, counseling expectations, and the Conceptual Systems Theory. This review of the literature will be divided into the following segments.

An historical overview of rehabilitation in the prison setting will be presented including a description of current trends. The concept of administrative segregation for inmates who have committed infractions or broken laws while in prison is examined. The relationship of rehabilitation to the Conceptual Systems Theory is analyzed in terms of previous research in correctional settings. Both the use of conceptual level and conceptual stage in the counseling process is addressed. Finally, research involving the expectations for counseling that both clients and non clients have is explored.

Rehabilitation in the Prison Setting

Historical Overview

The term rehabilitation, in reference to criminal behavior, has taken on a variety of meanings. Origins of the concept of confining people for petty crimes can be traced to Amsterdam’s Rasp Huis in 1596. Its purpose was to provide a regime of labor, discipline, and routine to bring about personal reform (Durham III, 1994). This concept of rehabilitation spread to England and Scotland where places of confinement were commonly called bridewells (Johnson, 1996). In contrast, during the early colonial period, Puritans used punishment, such as stockades, to deter petty criminals. This gave
rise to the post-revolutionary American prisons which were little more than "impersonal institutions marked by brutality and neglect" (Johnson, 1996, p. 29).

It was not until 1790 that the first American penitentiary was established with the intent of providing adequate disciplined living conditions which combined punishment and personal reform (Johnson, 1996). Prison rules of this era included total silence, walking in lockstep to meals and work, and to following commands unwaveringly (Durham III, 1994). It was not until the mid 1800's Ireland that Walter Crofton developed a system of stages through which an inmate could work his way through towards a less restrictive environment. Part of this system was the notion of the indeterminate sentence. Prisoners were held until they demonstrated that they were cured or rehabilitated. This system placed emphasis on individuality and an incentive to reform. In 1870, the concept of parole was established in America (Durham III, 1994).

By the mid-twentieth century, rehabilitation in the form of education, individual and group counseling, anger management, and vocational training emerged to address the specific needs of the offender. By the early 1970's crime had increased, and recidivism rates were high. To address these issues studies were conducted to measure the effectiveness of the rehabilitative programs (Durham III, 1994).

The most controversial study known as the Martinson Report (Martinson, 1974) was a meta-analysis of 231 studies in which Martinson concluded that with few exceptions the rehabilitative effort has had little or no effect on recidivism. The notion "nothing works" became accepted policy. In actuality this report represents a plea for closer investigation, for more effective counseling by skilled clinicians, and better educational programs, as well as research on deterrence theories. One of the difficulties
Martinson found in analyzing the data was a pattern of poor research strategies. Studies examined showed extraneous factors intruding upon measurements, recidivism measures which did not measure the same thing and had different follow-up periods. "It is just possible that some of our treatment programs are working to some extent, but that our research is so bad that it is incapable of telling" (p.49). In 1979 Martinson clarified his original conclusion stating that there are some types of treatment programs that do have an effect on recidivism but others are harmful. Effective programs are described as those that use specific treatments tailored to the appropriate client in suitable settings.

Current Trends

The concern of research today has turned from "nothing works" to under what conditions rehabilitation works (Petersilia, 1991; Antonowicz & Ross, 1994; Greenwood, 1995; Lipton, 1995). The conditions were reflected in percentages Seventy five percent of the programs that were successful were based in cognitive behavioral theory, 70% were multifaceted to meet the need of inmates as individuals rather than offering a single method, 80% were those programs which matched client conceptual level to style of intervention. An interesting concept was proposed by De Luca, Miller and Weidemann (1991) which suggests that sentencing be revised to reflect two stages of correctional supervision. The first stage would provide incapacitation and punishment and the second stage would provide intense supervision and remedial programs. This represents a merging of the concept of sentencing someone to therapy but with the set time limit of the sentence.
Much of the research has agreed that in order to measure the success of a program or develop new programs reliable research designs must be employed (Andrews et al. 1990; Antonowicz & Ross, 1994; Glaser, 1965; Martinson, 1974; Petersilia, 1991). Petersilia (1991) points out that corrections research is either passive or active. Passive, the observation of a program, is most common but also the most difficult to measure. Using passive designs “it is impossible to be sure that the treatment preceded the outcome or that the two study groups were equivalent prior to participating in the program” (p. 25). Active designs, however, would represent the manipulation of variables which could be measured.

Public support for rehabilitation remains high in spite of political rhetoric emphasizing punishment or incapacitation. Surveys taken from 1988 to 1991 showed that between 55% and 70% of citizens from various parts of America support rehabilitation (Durham III, 1994). Ninety percent of burglary victims support counseling and therapy rather than just incarceration or punishment (Umbreit, 1989). A survey by Johnson and Huff (1987) found that, of the population polled, 75% of citizens, 70% of legislatures, and 80% of other decision makers were in favor of changing the behavior of first time offenders as opposed to punishment. Support dropped to about 19% for repeat offenders. This survey shows strong support for rehabilitation for first time offenders. These statistics have not differed greatly since the 1967 Harris Poll which indicated that 73% polled believed that rehabilitation should be the main emphasis in the prisons (Durham III, 1994).
Administrative Segregation

At the turn of the century, prison environments were characterized by isolation. Today, isolation is still a part of the surroundings but it has a different purpose. Administrative Segregation (Ad. Seg.) is the term used for the area of the prison used to house those inmates which have broken rules while in prison. A number of studies have been devoted to prisoner misconduct (Brown & Speracek, 1971; Coe, 1961; Finn, 1995; Flanagan, 1983; Goetting & Howsen, 1986; Jensen, 1977; Senese & Kalinich, 1993; Wolf, Freinek & Shaffer, 1966; Wolfgang, 1961). The strongest of these studies is presented by Goetting & Howsen (1986). Using a nationwide sample of 5586 state-prison inmates, and multiple regression analysis, the research showed that rule breaking behavior is most highly correlated to length of time in prison, number of prior convictions, and age. No relationship was found with educational achievement, current offense, or hours spent outside of the cell.

Studies on race and misconduct has had varying results. Some studies report higher incidence with black inmates (Coe, 1961; Flanagan, 1983; Wolfgang, 1961), some indicate higher rates with white inmates (Petersilia & Honig, 1980). No information was available on other races. The results are inconsistent.

Wolfgang (1961) studied a group of inmates who were convicted of murder with a life sentence in terms of prison adjustment. His findings show that the older inmate (age 35 and over) who has previous prison experience was better adjusted than his younger counterpart. A study done by Brown and Speracek (1971) contrasted young offenders (age 18-26) in a medium security 350 inmate prison with a varied age, medium security, 1200 inmate prison. Results indicated that there were no differences in the
number of incidence, rather the difference was in the kind of incidents and consequently the length of time in Ad. Seg. A difficulty with this study lies in the construction. The two groups differ to the extent that a descriptive comparison of the two prisons may the most valuable component rather than a comparison of prison adjustment and age. Flanagan’s (1983) findings based on 758 inmates at 14 facilities, agrees with the previous findings in that age at commitment (under 25) is the strongest correlate of prisoner misconduct.

All of the studies reviewed are based on collection of data obtained from demographic questionnaires and inmate records and have been measured using univariate statistics. Some studies (Coe, 1961; Wolfgang, 1961) used chi-square and t tests to analyze data when multiple regression techniques may have served better to gain the predictive results the researchers intended. No reliable instruments, surveys, semi-projectives or projectives were utilized to obtain any additional data.

Conceptual Systems Theory

Conceptual Systems Theory (CST) was developed by Harvey, Hunt and Schroder (1961). Essentially the theory describes cognitive structure and its behavioral implications (Greaves, 1971). Several psychological theories derived from Piaget’s ideas on cognitive development, Erickson’s views on polarized conflicts at different life stages, and Lewin’s theory of behavior as a process of the interaction between personality and environment, form the foundation of CST. Basically, the CST claims that an individual, given an optimum environment, will pass through four levels of cognitive development ranging from concrete to abstract and dependency to interdependency. This implies that
the more concrete, dependent stages must be mastered before moving into the more abstract interdependent stages.

The conceptual level model (Hunt, 1970, 1971) emerged as a variation of CST. A considerable amount of research has been done using the conceptual level model (Holloway & Wampold, 1986; Hunt & Sullivan, 1974; Leschied, Jaffe, & Stone, 1985; Reitsma-Street, 1988; Stein & Stone, 1978; Strupp & Bergin, 1969). A similar model based in CST was devised by Schroder (1971). Both models measure two levels of cognitive functioning, high conceptual level and low conceptual level, as opposed to the 4 stages of cognition in CST. Schroder's (1971) perspective concentrates on information processing ability measured by two components: a) differentiation or the number of attributes of information used in the thinking process and b) integration or the number of concepts used by the individual. Hunt (1971) emphasizes integrative complexity and interpersonal maturity in terms of abstractness to differentiate between conceptual levels. Both models are measured by the Paragraph Completion Test or the Paragraph Completion Method. The two measures are virtually interchangeable (Miller, 1978).

Hunt's (1971, 1975, 1977) research seeks to match the conceptual level of the person with the degree of structure in the person's environment. The matching model has been used in educational research (Hunt 1977; Mc Lachlan, & Hunt, 1973) and in correctional rehabilitation (Leschied, Jaffe & Stone, 1985; Reitsma-Street, 1980; Reitsma-Street, 1988; Reitsma-Street & Leschied, 1988). One of the limitations of the conceptual level matching model lies in that it has been primarily used with adolescents particularly in the correctional settings. Although use of the CLMM with juveniles has been reported as successful, its use with adults has had mixed reviews. By dividing
participants into two conceptual levels based on the sample median will cause the results to fluctuate from sample to sample. The comparability of the results then becomes questionable because the median for each sample may vary. Consequently, those participants which appeared to group into the high conceptual level in one study, may well be classified as low conceptual level in another study (Craig & Hennessy, 1989).

An attempt to apply the conceptual systems model with juvenile delinquents (Hunt & Hardt, 1965) resulted in the formulation of a Sub-Stage 1 category in addition to only Stage 1 and Stage 2 functioning levels. Hunt (1970) reports that cross sectional investigations of the 12-18 year old participants showed that Stage 3 functioning did not occur more frequently in older than in younger participants and Stage 4 was virtually non-existent. This finding led to a redefinition of stages eliminating the motivationally based Stages 3 and 4 of the original CST.

Another study by Jackman, Moellenberg & Brabson (1990) attempted to apply the conceptual systems model to an educational setting. Although the TIB was administered results suggested that CLMM may have been equally useful. These results may be attributable to the scoring system used which did not follow the guidelines originally set for the TIB. Rather, a scoring system was used which was developed by Moellenberg (1978) and is similar to that of the PCT, in which digits are assigned to indicate an individual’s approximate position on the continuum of concrete to abstract. This type of approximation allows for split stages and does not use the more global method developed by Harvey (1966).
CST offers a wider range of stages from concrete to abstract than does the CLMM and is the more versatile model in use with an adult population. CST emphasizes structure, motivation characteristics, and uses content oriented measures (Hunt, 1970).

**Conceptual Level Research in Correctional Settings**

The CLMM has been used in correctional settings with a focus on rehabilitation programs (Brill, 1978; Hunt & Hardt, 1965; Leschied, Jaffe & Stone, 1985; Reitsma-Street, 1980, 1988; Reitsma-Street & Leschied, 1988). Person-environment matching proposes that the matching process provides an opportunity for the individual to feel safe, act more appropriately, and learn more successfully (Hunt 1977-1978). Environment is defined as inclusive of facility, activities, communication, atmosphere, and relationships. A most important feature is the structure which varies from high to low (Reitsma-Street & Leschied, 1988).

Much of the research on conceptual level (CL) has dealt with students in educational settings. A comparison of CL stages between regular educational settings and correctional settings, for the 16-18 year olds, found that a much higher percentage of low CL stages are found in the correctional setting (Reitsma-Street & Leschied, 1988). Use of the CLMM in this setting allows for a scoring system spanning up to three stages which are more sensitive to differences reflected between the lower stages (.5-2.5). Using the median score as basis for division of high CL and low CL matching proves to be more effective when applied to living conditions than for scoring of experimental research.
A study by Brill (1978), demonstrated the benefits of matched environments by comparing a control group of mismatched and four groups of matched subjects. The matched subjects had a median of three days out of the program for reasons varying from running away to detention as compared to a median of 67 for the mismatched group. Behavioral and personality measures demonstrated similar patterns.

A similar study by Leschied, Jaffe, and Stone (1985) examined the relationship between six process variables (independence, responsibility, conformity, social control, staff discipline, time out of program) and environmental match or mismatch with CL. A significant MANCOVA resulted for the behavioral process variables (p < .01) supporting the relationship and structure of matching.

No studies have been done which investigate the use of CLMM in the adult prison environment. The success of the CLMM was, in part, due to the age of the participants and the consequential lack of individuals in Stage 4 and the few participants who demonstrated Stage 3 functioning.

**Conceptual Stages**

Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder (1961) assert that individuals, given an optimum environment, will pass through a series of stages from dependent to interdependent. Each stage has a set of characteristics which define a cognitive type.

Stage 1 individuals represent the most concrete level of thinking. This group is characterized by a need for external control. There is a "lack of differentiation between a rule and its purpose or between authority and one's own experience" (p.94). Answers to questions are in the form of absolutes (Werner, 1957). Behavior is characterized by a
sense of immediacy, sensitivity to limits, and to what is right and wrong. Problem solving is marked by rigidity with an all or nothing solution. In the therapeutic process, the client seeks direct solutions (Rogers, 1957).

A study done by Ware & Harvey, (1967) showed that concrete individuals quickly form an impression of another person and manifest a need for cognitive consistency. Stage 1 and Stage 4 subjects were compared on the extent to which generalizations could be made about a person based on positive and negative input. Although there were only eighteen participants in each group, clear results could be achieved due in part to the extremeness of the stages.

Harvey (1986) in an examination of attitudes toward the death penalty, found that Stage 1 individuals endorsed the death penalty for a variety of crimes p < .001 significantly more often than any of the other stages. This seems to support the characteristic of the concrete individual to form quick impressions and demonstrate low empathy.

Stage 2 functioning represents a negative relationship to external control and the beginning of internal control. Problem solving at this level represents the ability to question established answers. Although the Stage 2 characteristics may seem disagreeable due to the oppositional qualities and the lack of predictability or dependability of behavior, it is an essential stage of development. This stage is still concrete. The counseling process may be met with resistance if the individual views the counselor as an authority figure. Individuals at this stage will "learn to view the source as unreliable, to look upon control with suspicion and to externalize blame" (Harvey,
Hunt & Schroder, 1961, p.178). Interpersonal relationships are difficult at this stage because they represent dependency and control.

To study concrete versus abstract functioning, researchers would either use two extreme Stages as 1 and 4 (Ware & Harvey, 1967) or group Stage 1 and Stage 2 as concrete and group Stage 3 and Stage 4 and abstract (Harvey, Reich & Wycer, 1968). An equal number of subjects were always selected from larger studies to insure equality of group size. The total number in each group was approximately twenty which represented a small but homogeneous sample.

Stage 3 is characterized by a transition from oppositional behaviors to an acceptance of the intentions and wishes of the other person’s point of view. Mutual relationships are now possible. The environment becomes a tool through which the individual can develop empathy and obtain satisfaction from pleasing others. Evaluation of the self is dependent on the approval of others. This stage seeks to define social aspects of the personality.

Harvey, Hunt and Schroder (1961) exemplified Stage 3 teachers as able to create unstructured environment as well as show sensitivity to individual student. The concern this Stage 3 pedagogue shows for students may stem from the need to gain their approval (Miller, 1978)

Stage 4 individuals are able to integrate environmental and social factors. This stage is characterized by internal controls, greater self awareness, and a resistance to stress. Problem solving is based in the ability of the individual to refer to multiple alternative solutions. Abstract functioning enables the person to “hold a strong point of view without distorting incoming information” (Harvey, Hunt, & Schroder, 1961, p.109).
Abstract functioning enables the individual to tolerate ambiguity and demonstrate
greater flexibility when forming opinions about events or people due to a wealth of
judgment categories (Ware & Harvey, 1967). Stage 3 and particularly Stage 4 persons
are impressed by expertise rather than power or status (Greaves, 1971; Harvey & Ware,
1967).

**Conceptual Stages and the Counseling Process**

Lutwak and Hennessy (1982) examined the relationship between conceptual
stages of counselors in training and the ability of the counselor to demonstrate empathy.
In determining the level of mastery that can be expected from counselor training, the
researchers found a significant relationship between skill mastery and cognitive
characteristics.

A common problem in research using the four conceptual stages is that cell
distribution is uneven. To resolve difficulties arising from this, the researchers (Lutwak
& Hennessy, 1982) grouped Stage 1 and Stage 2 as well as group Stage 3 and Stage 4 to
form concrete versus abstract groupings rather than looking for characteristics of each
separate group. For the purposes of this study, grouping works well in that concrete and
extrapersonal functioning, whether Stage 1 or Stage 2 will yield the same low level of
empathy. Stages 3 and 4, both representing abstract and interpersonal functioning, will
yield higher levels of empathy. After performing a one-way ANOVA of cell distribution
and a subsequent t test for concrete versus abstract, both tests were found to have
significance at the $p < .001$ level.
A similar study was done by Goldberg (1974) in which the four conceptual stages were related to counselor verbal style. In this study stages were not grouped into concrete and abstract. Each stage was hypothesized to have specific counselor traits. Results of the study support the theory for a relationship between conceptual stages and verbal behavior ($p < .01$). Particularly evident were the low scores for Stages 1 and 2 on affect, understanding, concern specific, and exploratory categories. Stage 4 mean scores were approximately double that of Stage 3 with the highest score in the exploratory dimension. This study demonstrated distinct ability differences particularly between the abstract dimensions of Stage 3 and Stage 4.

Client preferences for a particular style of therapy was examined by Knudson and Carskadon (1978). Strong evidence supported a relationship between conceptual stages and preference for behavioral or client centered approaches to therapy. After administration of the TIB test and the Therapy Preference Questionnaire to 140 college students (73 males, 67 females), a nonrandom distribution of therapy preferences across subjects conceptual systems resulted at the .001 level. Results were strongest for Stages 3 and 4 where 95.2% and 91.7% respectively preferred client centered therapy.

Craig and Hennessy (1989) examined conceptual stage functioning in conjunction with expectations about counseling. This study sought to discriminate between the four conceptual stages and a large number of singular expectations found in the Expectations About Counseling Brief form (Washington & Tinsley, 1982) questionnaire. Most prior research tested singular dimensions of expectations. A MANOVA followed by discriminant function analysis supported the distinction between Stage 1 clients and Stage 3 and 4 clients as well as the difference of Stage 3 clients from Stages 2 and 4.
Function 1 was concerned with counselor directiveness (Stage 1), empathy, and attractiveness (Stages 3 and 4). Function 2 was concerned with counselor genuineness, self-disclosure (Stages 2 and 4) and nurturance (Stage 3). Craig and Hennessy (1989) found a reliable method of identifying expectations clients have for the counseling process through the identification of related personality variables. Some of the limitations of this study were the small number of overall participants, sixty, and the small number of participants in Stage 2 and in Stage 4.

Expectations About Counseling

Bordin (1955), emphasized the importance of considering the expectations clients have about counseling and its effects on the counseling processes. Matching client expectation has been found to be more effective, in some cases, than solution focused therapies (Efron & Veenendaal, 1993). Tokar et. al. (1996) found when the expectations for personal commitment from the therapist was positively correlated with work alliance, the need for expertise was negative. Considerable attention has been given to the expectations that clients have for the counseling process (Craig & Hennessy, 1989; Hardin, Subich & Holvey, 1988; Hardin & Yanico, 1983; Overall & Aronson, 1963; Severinsson, 1966; Subich, 1983, Tinsley & Benton, 1978).

Comparisons of the counseling expectations of clients and non-clients (Hardin & Subich, 1985; Subich & Coursol, 1985) have had varied results. Hardin and Subich (1985), found there to be no significant difference (a probability level of only .12) between groups. However, the findings of Subich and Coursol (1985) indicated that clients expect to take more responsibility for the counseling process and to have a less
empathic, accepting and nurturant counselor than did non clients. This stands in contrast to Bordin’s (1955) work which suggests that the client seeking counseling to resolve a conflict is concerned with friendliness nurturance and empathic responses of the counselor. However Subich and Coursoi’s (1985) client does resemble the information seeking client discussed in Bordin’s (1955) work in that the information-seeking client tended to reject the nurturing, objective and understanding counselor as detrimental to the information seeking process. Although this contrast seems to defend the need to include problem type in considering the importance of expectations in counseling, Hardin and Yanico (1983), found there to be no significant differences in problem type.

Researchers concerned with expectations of the counseling process have investigated the notion that expectations may be influenced by age (Kunkel & Williams, 1991; Lagana, 1995). An examination of older adults (Lagana, 1995) showed that previous experience in counseling and marital status were two variables which were significant predictors of expectation. Gender, residence, income and religiosity were not found to be significant predictors. Limits of the study can be found in that the sample was specific to fifty-seven Caucasian, retired professors. Although information which is relevant to this group may be found, it is not certain that the results can be generalized to the larger population of retired persons. Another limit may be in the small sample size.

A more encompassing study was done by Kunkel and Williams (1991) which compared college students age twenty-two and under, to elderly persons age sixty-five and over. Two distinct procedures were used in data collection, completion of the EAC-B Questionnaire and semi structured group interviews. The analysis of interview responses revealed differences in expectation between young and elderly whereas
responses to questionnaires revealed no differences. Interviews revealed that elderly persons were most likely to seek counseling services. Multivariate analysis found that age and sex did not interact significantly but follow up univariate tests showed that gender was significantly related across age groups with the most distinct differences being the expectation that males had for counselor directiveness and that women view their role as responsible, motivated and interactive. This is similar to findings in previous research (Hardin & Yanico, 1983; Kunkel, Gongora-Coronado, & Castillo-Vales, 1989).

Several studies have investigated the gender variable in relation to counseling expectations (Bernstein, Hofman & Wade, 1987; Hardin & Yanico, 1983; Sipps & Janeczek, 1986; Subich, 1983). These studies reveal conflicting results. Subich (1983), as well as Hardin and Yanico (1983), reported that specification of counselor gender had no main effect while Bernstein, Hofman and Wade (1987) reported that overall a male counselor was preferred rather than a female counselor. Subich (1983), and Hardin and Yanico (1983) reported that males expect to be more self-disclosing than females. Contrary to prior studies, Sipps and Janeczek (1986) reported femininity accounted for most of the variance while subject sex accounted for little variance.

Considerable attention has been given to research in cultural background and expectations about counseling (Balibil & Dolan, 1992; Kenney, 1994; Kunkel, et. al. 1989; Watkins & Terrell, 1988). A study by Watkins and Terrell (1988) examined the cultural effects of client-counselor racial match and mismatch and concluded that black clients preferred black counselors and significance was found related to mistrust level of mismatched clients a side effect of which is early termination of counseling. Limitations
of this study may be found in the environment in that it represented a predominantly black population college setting. Preference for a particular match may not have been limited to the counseling setting but to a general setting as well. Another limitation may be found in the socioeconomic level of the students. All subjects were low to low middle socioeconomic level. A study by Overall and Aronson (1963) showed that clients of low socioeconomic background were more likely to terminate early based on the match of expectation of counseling and the perception of the initial interview.

Premature termination of counseling was examined by Hardin, Subich and Holvey, (1988). Using equal numbers of male and female subjects and equivalent problem type, no differences in precounseling expectations of early terminators versus appropriate terminators was found. In contrast, Richardson (1992) demonstrated that a basis for predictions can be found when expectations about counseling are measured in conjunction with cognitive aspects of personality measured in stages inherent in the Conceptual Systems Theory. Using a cross tabulation and Chi-square statistics Richardson (1992) showed that clients in Stages 2 and 4 can be expected to terminate early significantly more often than clients in Stages 1 and 3.

Studies of the expectations that clients have for counseling are varied and demonstrate conflicting results. The study by Craig and Hennessy (1989) using conceptual stages provides a theory driven exploration of expectations based on personality structure of the client as opposed to the counselor characteristics or the counseling process. The clarity of predictability in Richardson’s (1992) study supports this premise.
Summary

"It was thought that the wayward were often unregulated in their habits, and that exposure to a well ordered environment in which proper habits could be developed would help to address such personal shortcomings" (Durham III, 1994, p. 140). After 400 years, researchers are still seeking effective means of rehabilitation in the prison system.

Rehabilitation, through the centuries has been characterized by a fluctuation between various forms of punishment and rehabilitation (Durham III, 1994; Johnson, 1996) but high recidivism rates continue to demonstrate that the methods or the measurement of methods have failed to show one system leading over the other. Repeatedly, one technique, that of matching client to program has shown some measure of success. In meta-analyses by Antonowisc and Ross (1994) and Andrews et.al. (1990) regarding successful treatment methods showed that matching conceptual level of the client to the style of intervention was 80 % successful. Based on Hunt’s (1974) work, correctional investigators (Leschied, Jaffe & Stone, 1985; Reitsma-Street 1980, 1988) used Conceptual level to create matching environments for juvenile delinquents providing them with the optimum environment for conceptual growth. The preservation of order demonstrates the assumption that people in each cognitive type will act similarly to other people in the same cognitive type and seek out situations which match their level of conceptual development (Greaves, 1971).

Reitsma-Street (1980, 1988) work showed a representation of at least two stages of conceptual development within the corrections setting. The lack of higher stages of abstract functioning in juvenile delinquents in contrast to non juvenile delinquents supports the contention of Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder (1961) which state that "hostile
reactions represent the extreme manifestations of closed second stage relatedness, which
denotes the arrestation of development at this stage.” (p.98).

According to Greaves (1972) there will always be a representation of Stage 1 and
Stage 3 in any group. Due to the internal controls and the ability to integrate
environmental and social factors, Stage 4 person are “virtually never to be found
imprisoned (except as a political prisoner)” (Greaves, 1971, p. 55). CST has not yet been
tested within an adult incarcerated population and it remains to be seen if these
statements can be supported and if so under what conditions.

Although expectations about counseling have been studied on college campuses
and in counseling centers no research on the expectations of men in prison has been
done. Relating the CST to expectations for counseling has been researched with stable
results demonstrating patterns of expectations that discriminate between stages of
conceptual development (Craig & Hennessy, 1989; Richardsen, 1992). A study which
examines these specific variables within the prison population will build on previous
work using CST and provides information useful to understanding concepts which
underlie the rehabilitative process.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

This chapter contains a description of the methodology and procedures that were utilized to investigate the relationship of male inmates' conceptual functioning as it related to their expectations about counseling.

Included in this chapter are descriptions of the participants, procedure and process for data collection, scoring information on the selected instruments, reliability, validity, and a discussion on the statistical procedure that was used to analyze the data.

Participants

Administrative Segregation (Ad. Seg.) is a separate housing unit within Northern State Prison, which can hold up to 324 inmates. Ninety percent of the men who are housed here were removed from the general population for committing an infraction of prison rules. Ten percent were placed here for other reasons such as protective custody or those who were in transit to or from another institution.

Data for this study was generated from approximately 300 male inmates at Northern State Prison in Newark, New Jersey. The inmates in this study were specifically limited to those who were assigned to the Administrative Segregation unit after committing a crime while in prison or for an infraction of prison rules.

Those inmates not included are those who have been assigned to Ad. Seg. because of:
1. Psychiatric disabilities such as schizophrenia and were waiting for psychiatric hospital placement. The paragraph completion requirement of the TIB may have been skewed by incoherent thought process and resulted in an unscoreable test.

2. Nonreaders. These tests would have had to be read to the inmate and answers recorded by the researcher. These responses may have been skewed by the interaction between the inmate and the researcher.

3. Protective custody. These inmates have not committed an infraction.

4. Inmates in transit. The length of stay was minimal.

5. Non-English proficient inmates.

The ages, type of crimes, and length of time served on the current sentence of those inmates who chose to participate were obtained from individual responses to a demographic questionnaire (See Appendix).

All eligible Ad. Seg. inmates were given an equal opportunity to participate. Selection was based on willingness to participate.

Procedure

The inmates were asked individually, by the researcher, if they were interested in participating in a research project. Information was then given about the project (See Appendix). It was explained that assessments obtained would be anonymous, confidential, and was available only to the researcher. Upon completion, participants were given a letter for their file indicating their participation in the research project. In accordance with prison policy, inmates were informed that participation in the project was not indicative of any resulting special treatment. In the event that any discomfort
arose for the participant as a result of completing these questionnaires, directions were given as to how to request an interview from the psychology department at Northern State Prison to talk about the emotional distress.

A packet was given to each participating inmate by the researcher. The top sheet was the consent form followed by a questionnaire of demographic data including questions as to length of stay in Ad. Seg., nature of the infraction, length of original prison sentence, and type of crime committed. Harvey's (1974) This I Believe Test, which was designed to assess conceptual stage was completed next followed by the Expectations About Counseling Questionnaire-Brief form (Washington & Tinsley, 1982), which measured 17 aspects of expectations. Standardized instructions for completing the EAC-B were utilized.

The packets were left with the participating inmates for completion and picked up at the end of the day. Upon collection, the assessment forms were secured in an enclosed envelope and were available only to the researcher for analysis. An officer of the Ad. Seg. unit accompanied the researcher at all times.

Instruments

This I Believe Test (TIB)

To determine the conceptual functioning of the inmate, Harvey’s (1974) TIB, a semi-projective paragraph completion test was administered. The TIB consisted of a series of sentences to which respondents wrote brief statements about nine stimuli. Each sentence started with the statement, “This I believe about” followed by the stimulus word
or phrase; the American way of life, religion, people, marriage, ultimate truth, deceit, friendship, deference to authority, and power to control the important things in life.

The TIB was developed to measure conceptual functioning according to four stages which represent a progression from the most concrete to the most abstract and from dependent to interdependent. These stages were measured by scoring the content of the paragraph completed after each stimulus word or phrase. The purpose of the stimulus words were to elicit beliefs. Subjects were classified into one of the four stages based on their responses. Scoring was predicated on the content of the response. Responses which were concrete and dependent were assigned Stage 1. Negative dependence characterized Stage 2. Abstract thinking was exemplified by presentation of alternatives for conflict resolution and internal control and was assigned to Stage 3. A final stage score was assigned to each protocol resulting from a global estimate of the predominant stage after reading all responses. This type of scoring required rater familiarity with the theoretical descriptions of the four stages. Harvey (1966) classified 1700 college students and found 30% Stage 1, 15% Stage 2, 20% Stage 3, 7% Stage 4, and 23% demonstrate a mixture of two or more stages without any predominance in a primary stage.

The writer served as the primary rater of the TIB protocols. In learning to score the TIB, the writer evaluated 136 protocols previously scored by an experienced rater. Proficiency in rating was established by comparison of scores. Agreement was reached on 132 of the 136 protocols. Another rater, Ph. D level, was trained in the same manner as the writer and served as the second rater in scoring the protocols for this study.

Conceptual systems have been the focus of a number of studies. Investigations in personality (Craig & Hennessy, 1989), therapeutic communication (Goldberg, 1974),
recall (Greaves, 1972), achievement (Jackman, Mollenberg & Brabson, 1990),
psychotherapy preferences (Knudson & Carskadon, 1978), counseling skills (Lutwak &
Hennessy, 1982), personal attributes (Ware & Harvey, 1967), job satisfaction (Harvey,
Juhasz, Griffin, & Gore, 1998), shame and guilt (Harvey, Frank, Gore, & Batres, 1998),
attitudes (Harvey, Reich, & Wyer, 1968; Wright, & Harvey, 1965; Harvey, 1986)
demonstrate the range of exploration. This diversity of studies lend support to the validity
of this test in a variety of experimental settings.

Coll and Lega (1981) explored the relationship between gender and conceptual
functioning using the TIB. No significant differences were found between male and female
subjects indicating that the cognitive functioning of females is equivalent to that of males
across the four stages.

The TIB has drawn criticism in the area of test scoring (Cox, 1970), and a concern
commented that the TIB is “too heavily dependent on content indicators for one to be
convinced that the test measures structural properties” (p.46). In response, Miller (1978)
noted that the TIB seeks to make a systems classification based on both structural and
functional characteristic rather than on structural inferences alone.

Although the instructions for the TIB specify a time limit of two minutes for each
response to increase ego involvement, Greaves’ (1971) study supported sufficiency of the
material itself to stimulate ego involvement adequate for extended time limits. In a
sample of 359 subjects, 158 were given the two minute time limit, and 201 subjects were
permitted to complete the test at their leisure. Results indicated that timed subjects
scores were distributed as 53% Stage 1, 3% Stage 2, 9% Stage 3, 1% Stage 4, 29% mixed
Stages, and 5% unscorable (because of insufficient responses). Results of those subjects who completed the TIB at their leisure indicated a similar distribution: 59% Stage 1, 3% Stage 2, 8% Stage 3, 2% Stage 4, 27% mixed Stages, and 1% unscorable (because of insufficient responses). These differences are small and do not approach significance, thus demonstrating stability under different administrative techniques (Greaves, 1971).

Reliability of the TIB has been reported by Greaves (1971) as having an interrater reliability of .91, and test-retest coefficients of .94 after nine weeks. Greaves (1971) also reported a Kendall coefficient of concordance for independent assessment of .986 based on 82 test protocols. Craig and Hennessy (1989) found interrater agreement on 96% of 220 protocols rated.

A study by Greaves (1971) tested the validity of stimulus items to accurately reflect the participants actual cognitive stages. Participants were exposed to the TIB through testing and critiquing of responses. Four weeks later, after attending eight 50-minute lectures on CST, participants were again asked to complete the TIB. Results indicted that there were no differences on test scores with the exception of a Stage 1 and Stage 4 mix which occurred in some cases, indicating that a Stage 1 subject may have committed Stage 4 answers to memory but upon embellishment of the answers Stage 1 functioning emerged as dominant. Item strength was reported by Greaves (1971) to have an overall correlation of .81.

**Expectations About Counseling Questionnaire, Brief Form**

The EAC-B (Washington & Tinsley, 1982), the brief form of the Expectations About Counseling (EAC) (Tinsley, Workman & Kass, 1980), was used to assess the
precounseling expectations of inmates. Considerable research has been done using either the original EAC or the EAC-B. These investigations have focused on age (Kunkel & Williams, 1991; Lagana, 1995), client stage of change (Satterfield, Buelow, Lyddon & Johnson, 1995), effects of expectations (Tinsley, Bowman, & Barich, 1993), gender (Johnson, 1990), culture (Kunkel et. al., 1989; Yuen & Tinsley, 1981), group differences (Tinsley, Holt, Hinsin & Tinsley, 1991), personality (Craig & Hennesy, 1989), counselor gender (Hardin & Yanco, 1983; Subich, 1983), premature termination (Hardin, Subich & Holvey, 1988; Richardson, 1992), and counseling preferences (Tinsley & Benton, 1978; Tinsley & Harris, 1976).

Although the EAC and EAC-B have received some criticism regarding development using a non-client sample (Galassi, Crace, Martin, James & Wallace, 1992), Johnson’s (1990) research supported use of the EAC-B. After examination of 420 subjects, Johnson’s (1990) findings indicated that there is no difference between clients and non-clients and that there was no difference between applicants with and without prior counseling experience. The participants for this study will be comprised of non-clients who may or may not have requested or received counseling prior to research participation.

Tinsley (1992) outlined the theoretical works which influenced the development of the EAC as derived from (a) Goldstein’s (1962) prognostic and participant-role expectations, (b) Apfelbaum’s (1958) expectations regarding the nurturant, the critic, and the model type of therapist, (c) Loor’s (1965) understanding, accepting authoritarian independence encouraging, and critical/hostile expectancies’ and (d) Begley and Lieberman (1970) active, directive and warm versus passive, detached and objective
counselor expectations. The resulting scales measured five areas of expectations regarding (a) client attitudes and behaviors, (b) counselor attitudes and behaviors, (c) counselor characteristics, (d) characteristics of the counseling process, and (e) quality of the counseling outcome.

In a factor analysis of the EAC by Tinsley, Workman and Kass, (1980), 20 possible expectancies were identified and 203 items were written to measure their constructs. Contributions to this compilation came from theoretical works of Carkhuff (1969), Rogers (1957), Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler, and Traux (1967), and Tinsley and Harris (1976). For the purpose of analysis, internal consistency of the scales were maintained between .70 and .85. In the initial item analysis two scales were dropped (respect and analytic) because of high correlation with other scales. A third scale, realism, was deleted because of the possible variation of scoring. The resulting internal consistencies of the remaining 17 scales ranged from .77 to .89 with a median reliability of .82. A split group factor analysis indicated that four factors accounted for 75% of the variance and were the most replicable. The orthogonal rotation of four factors were labeled personal commitment, facilitative conditions, counselor expertise, and nurturance. The first three factors found by Tinsley, et. al. (1980) have since been confirmed in the works of Hayes and Tinsley (1989), Kunkel, et. al. (1989), as well as Tinsley, Holt, Hinson and Tinsley (1991).

The EAC-B form was developed by Tinsley (1982) and yielded scores that correlated .83 with scores from the EAC. The 54 items with 17 scales measure expectations in four areas (a) client attitudes and behaviors, (b) counselor attitudes and behaviors, (c) counselor characteristics, and (d) counselor process and outcome. The
internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .69 to .82 with a median reliability of .77 (Tinsley, et. al., 1980). Test-retest reliabilities for a two-month interval ranged from .47 to .87 with a median of .71 (Tinsley, et. al., 1980). The factorial reliability has been examined by Tinsley, Holt, Hinson and Tinsley (1991). The results were consistent with Hayes and Tinsley (1989). These results supported the factorial validity of the EAC-B.

Permission to use the Expectations About Counseling Questionnaire, Form B (Washington and Tinsley, 1982) was obtained from the author.

The 54 individual responses of the EAC-B are based on a seven-point Likert scale. Response options included (1) not true, (2) slightly true, (3) somewhat true, (4) fairly true, (5) quite true, (6) very true, (7) definitely true. Sub scale scores were calculated by summing the responses to the items assigned to each of the 17 scales and dividing by the number of items on that scale. Higher numeric value for a scale indicated a higher degree of expectation with regard to that scale’s salient construct. After calculating the scale scores, scores on the factors were obtained by adding the scale scores specified and dividing by that number of scale scores. A Cronbach Alpha for the responses of inmates in the current study was calculated for the four factors. The alpha levels were Personal Commitment, .87; Facilitative Conditions, .76; Nurturance, .82; and Counselor Expertise, .74.

Statistical Procedure

This study addressed the question of the relationship between conceptual stage and expectations about counseling. It represented an extension of the work of Craig and Hennessy (1989), Richardson (1992), and that of Reitsma-Street (1980, 1988).
In order to test Hypothesis 1, which defines the relationships between conceptual stage and expectations about counseling a MANOVA was used. This process consistent with the work of Craig and Hennessy (1989). According to Huberty (1975) a MANOVA is appropriate primarily when the dependent variables are being investigated as a system. A MANOVA is used when a group of dependent variables are examined in relationship to multiple independent variables. Performing a discriminant analysis was not necessary to identify the underlying patterns of expectation that distinguish the four stages of conceptual development. Significant F values were found in both multivariate and univariate analysis. A Box’s M test was not significant. A multiple comparisons test for Least Significant Differences (LSD) provided sufficient information on group differences. This process is consistent with the purpose of this study (Betz, 1987; Borgen & Selin, 1978; Craig & Hennessy, 1989; Huberty, 1975; Richardson, 1992).

To insure significant differences between the four conceptual groups with regard to expectations, alpha was set at .05. This means that differences obtained by chance alone were no more than 5 times out of 100. Through the use of multivariate analysis, the probability of making a Type I error was held at alpha.

In order to test Hypothesis 2, which states that there exists a relationship between conceptual stage and the length of time an inmate spends in Ad. Seg., a MANOVA was used. Using MANOVA, group differences emerged as to the overall length of time in Ad. Seg. and the inmate conceptual stage. Variables were length of sentence, measured in days, and number of times in Ad. Seg. for the current prison sentence. Comparing these variables revealed group differences between those men who commit repeated
minor infractions, and conceptual stage, from those who commit serious infractions, and conceptual stage, during their current prison term.

Further exploratory analyses was pursued using demographic data. A multiple comparisons (LSD) test revealed a significant relationship between stages and the type of crime or infraction for which an inmate was sent to Ad. Seg.
CHAPTER IV

Analysis of the Data

Assessed in this chapter is the relationship between conceptual stage and the expectations about counseling of inmates who are housed in a prison Administrative Segregation (Ad. Seg.) unit. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilized for the data analyses. The statistical analyses of the results are presented in the following manner: (a) descriptive information about participants and variables, (b) analyses directly related to hypotheses, and (c) supplementary data.

Descriptive Information About Participants and Variables

Participants

The data for this study were generated by 151 prison inmates in Ad. Seg. which is a solitary confinement unit in Norther State prison. All of the participants were male. Their ages ranged from 19 to 50 with a mean age of 31 (SD 6.87). One hundred forty-one participants completed all of the required information for the study. Five participants did not complete the EAC-B Questionnaire (Washington & Tinsley, 1982). Five participants did not complete the This I Believe (Harvey, 1974) survey. Since the TIB is a semi-projective instrument, the remaining protocols were rated independently by the writer and one other trained rater. This process reduced the risk of scoring bias and promotes appropriate assignment of stage. Interrater agreement was .98. Sixteen participants exhibited a mixture of two or more stages and could not be categorized. Two participants were eliminated because of inter-rater disagreement on stage functioning. This is consistent with prior studies (Greaves, 1971; Harvey, 1965; Knudson
& Carskadon, 1978). Data for this study were produced from the remaining 125 participants which represents approximately 45 percent of the total population of the Ad. Seg. unit at the time of this research.

The participants for this study had been housed in the Ad. Seg. unit serving Ad. Seg. sentences ranging from 90 days to 1460 days with bimodal times of 180 days and 325 days (Figure 1). Inmates were held in Ad. Seg. for an infraction of the prison rules or for otherwise posing a risk to security.

Conceptual Stage

Evaluation of the inmate’s responses to the This I Believe Test (Harvey, 1974) resulted in 49 of the 125 inmates being classified into Stage 1, 62 into Stage 2, 14 into Stage 3, and none into Stage 4. These findings are not consistent with previous research (Craig & Hennesy, 1989; Richardson, 1992) which examined conceptual development as it influences expectations about counseling. In contrast to the prison setting, prior studies (Craig & Hennesy, 1989; Richardson, 1992) were conducted in college counseling centers with a student population as the primary participants.

Expectations About Counseling

Scale scores on the EAC-B were calculated by summing the responses to the items assigned to each of the seventeen sub scales and dividing by the number assigned to that scale.

The means and standard deviation for the 17 sub scales of the EAC-B (Washington & Tinsley, 1982) are presented in Table 1. The responses participants
Figure 1. Bimodal distribution of Ad. Seg sentences, measured in days.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTIVATION</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPENNESS</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTIVE</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPATHY</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENUINENESS</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF DISCLOSE</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERTISE</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLERANCE</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSTWORTHY</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCRETE</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REALISM</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFRONT</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURTURE</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRACTIVE</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMEDIACY</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITMENT</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Minimum score =1, Maximum score=7. The higher the score is, the higher the expectation. N = 125
recorded for expectations about the counseling process ranged from 1, not true, through 7, definitely true. A higher numeric value for an individual scale indicates a higher expectation with regard to that scale. Sub scales with means of 5.8 or more reflect a relatively strong expectation, while sub scale means of 4.3 or less indicate a relatively weak expectation on the part of the inmate (Tinsley, Tokar & Helwig, 1994). This table represents the means of the overall expectations of inmates in Ad. Seg. as a group.

The mean on the Genuineness sub scale, 6.3, suggests that inmates in Ad. Seg., as a group, expected the counselor to be sincere, honest, and respectful. The mean on the Responsibility sub scale, 6.0, implies that inmates in Ad. Seg., as a group, expect to talk about concerns, ask for clarification when needed, take responsibility for the decision-making process, and work on concerns outside the counseling session. The mean on the Empathy sub scale, 3.5, indicates that inmates in Ad. Seg., as a group, did not expect the counselor to understand their present concerns without adequate explanation of the related feelings. The mean on the Self-Disclosure sub scale, 4.2, suggests that inmates in Ad. Seg., as a group, did not expect the counselor to speak freely about personal attitudes and experiences and relate these phenomena to the inmates concerns.

The results of sub scale means obtained from Ad. Seg. inmates are consistent with those of Richardson’s (1992) study using data generated from participants who were seeking help at a college counseling center. This would indicate that expectations for the counseling process, on the seventeen sub scales of the EAC-B, appear to be similar for clients and non clients, and thus transcend environmental differences.
Factor scores, obtained by Tinsley, Workman, and Kass (1980) were calculated by adding the scale scores and dividing by that number of scale scores. These four factors are Personal Commitment, Facilitative Conditions, Counselor Expertise, and Nurturance. The Cronbach alpha calculations for each of the four factors were Personal Commitment, .87; Facilitative Conditions, .76; Counselor Expertise, .74; and Nurturance, .82.

Analysis Directly Related to the Hypotheses

The primary hypothesis for this study concerned the group differences between conceptual stage and patterns of expectations about the counseling process. It was hypothesized that Ad. Seg. inmates functioning in Stage 1, as a group, would expect the counselor to be directive, understanding, and act as an authority figure. Stage 2 Ad. Seg. inmates, as a group, would expect the counselor to relate as a peer rather than an authority figure. Ad. Seg. inmates with Stage 3 functioning, as a group, would expect the counselor to provide encouragement, support and reassurance. No Ad. Seg. inmates were found to function in Stage 4.

Hypothesis 2 stated that conceptual stage of development would be reflected in the length of time inmates spent in Ad. Seg. Specifically, Stage 2 inmates, as a group, would spend the most amount of time in Ad. Seg. followed by Stage 1 inmates, as a group. Stage 3 inmates, as a group, would spend less time in Ad. Seg. than inmates functioning in Stage 1 or Stage 2. Stage 4 inmates would spend the least amount of time in Ad. Seg. Listed below are the two hypotheses and the analyses used to address each hypothesis.
A Box's M test for equality of covariance matrices was not significant. This tests the null hypothesis that covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups. The results suggested that there may exist differences between groups which might be significant.

Hypothesis One

In order to test the hypothesis that group differences exist between Ad. Seg. inmates conceptual stage and expressed patterns of expectations about counseling, a one-way MANOVA was utilized based on the four factor scores obtained by Tinsley, Workman, and Kass (1980). The MANOVA was calculated in order to determine the effect of conceptual Stage 1, Stage 2, and Stage 3 on EAC-B factors. These factors are Counselor Expertise, Nurturance, Personal Commitment, and Facilitative Conditions. A significant multivariate F was found, indicating that the three groups were significantly different on the multivariate composite, Wilks' Lambda $\lambda(14, 204) = 2.015, p = .01$.

Follow-up univariate F tests were used to show that significant group differences exist on each dependent variable. The univariate F tests of between-subjects effects indicate the association among the four factors of expectations about counseling and Stage membership. Significant F-ratios were found for each of the four factors: Nurturance: $F(2, 122) = 9.3, p < .0001$; Counseling Expertise: $F(2, 122) = 8.3, p < .0001$; Personal Commitment: $F(2, 122) = 4.3, p = .015$; Facilitative Conditions: $F(2, 122) = 3.1, p < .05$. Thus there exists a significant effect of stage on all four factors of expectations about counseling.
A Post Hoc test for Least Significant Differences (LSD) exhibits multiple comparisons of the significant mean differences among the four factors of expectations and three stages of conceptual development (Table 2). An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests. Significant mean differences were found between Stage 1 and Stage 2 functioning on each of the four factors. Nurturance was found to have the largest significant mean difference of .93 (p < .0001) followed by Counselor Expertise, .83 (p < .0001), Personal Commitment, .53 (p = .004) and Facilitative Conditions, .42 (p = .01). A significant mean difference was found between Stage 1 and Stage 3 on the Counselor Expertise factor, .71 (p = .03). No other mean significant differences were found to differentiate Stage 3 functioning from Stage 1.

A discriminant function analysis was not necessary to confirm the MANOVA because the Wilks’ Lambda was significant F(14, 204) = 2.015, p = .01, the Box’s M was not significant, and the three conceptual stage groups demonstrated univariate differences on the four factors of the EAC-B.

As a result of these findings, hypothesis one was supported in that differences among the means for the three stages of conceptual functions can be differentiated within the patterns of expectations about counseling. Significant multivariate differences were found as well as significant univariate mean differences. Further exploratory analyses on the EAC-B sub scales were performed to investigate specific differences in expectations between stage groups. Table 3 shows multiple comparisons (LSD) of those sub scales that have significant mean differences between stages of functioning.

Hypothesis one was divided into four subgroups of hypotheses. According to hypothesis one, section a, inmates with Stage 1 functioning, as a group, will have
### Table 2

**Comparisons of Stage Differences on the Four Factors of the EAC-B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAC-B FACTOR</th>
<th>(S) STAGE</th>
<th>Comparative (C) STAGE</th>
<th>Mean Difference (S-C)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNSELOR EXPERTISE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.83*</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.71*</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL COMMITMENT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.53*</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURTURANCE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.93*</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.93*</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITATIVE CONDITIONS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N=125. *The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. (S) = STAGE, (C) = Comparative STAGE, (S-C) = Mean difference between STAGE and Comparative STAGE.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB SCALE</th>
<th>(S) STAGE</th>
<th>(C) STAGE</th>
<th>Mean Difference(s-c)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.59*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPENNESS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.74*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.74*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTIVE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.76*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPATHY</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.63*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF DISCLOS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB SCALE</th>
<th>(I) STAGE</th>
<th>(J) STAGE</th>
<th>Mean Difference(I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERTISE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.0*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRACTIVE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.2*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.2*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTANCE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-1.1*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Sub scales with mean difference significant at the .05 level. N =125.
significantly higher mean scores on EAC-B sub scales of understanding, directiveness and the therapist as an authority figure than inmates functioning in stages 1, 3 or 4. Inmates functioning in Stage 1 as a group were found to have significantly different mean scores on all four factors of expectations about counseling from either of Stage 2 or Stage 3. The largest mean differences between Stage 1 and Stage 2 functioning were found in Nurturance \((93, p < .0001)\) followed by Counselor Expertise \((83, p < .0001)\). The Nurturance factor is comprised of the sub scales of need for acceptance, self-disclosure, counselor nurturance, and counselor attractiveness. The Counselor Expertise factor includes sub scales regarding counselor directiveness, empathy, and expertise. Inmates functioning in Stage 1 scored significantly different mean scores \((.71, p < .04)\) on the Counselor Expertise factor than Stage 3 however, Stage 1 did not produce significantly different mean scores than Stage 3 inmates on the Nurturance factor. The Stage 1 inmate expects to develop a pleasant and productive counseling experience provided the counselor is willing to be directive and demonstrate expertise.

Inmates with Stage 2 functioning received significantly different mean scores reflecting the separation between Stage 1 and Stage 2 on all four factors of the EAC-B. Inmates functioning in this stage are distrustful of the counseling relationship and are reluctant to share feelings. The separation between Stage 2 and Stage 3 however is not as clear. No significant mean differences between these two groups were found. However, inmates functioning in both Stages 2 and 3 were found to reject the counselor as an authority figure.

Inmates with Stage 3 functioning, as a group, produced significant mean differences from Stage 1 functioning on the Counselor Expertise factor where there
exists a significant mean difference (.71, p < .04) between Stage 1 and Stage 3. Stage 3 expected less counselor empathy, and counselor disclosure.

No Inmates exhibited Stage 4 functioning.

Hypothesis Two

According to hypothesis two, conceptual development stage would be reflected in the length of time spent in Ad. Seg. Responses on the demographic questionnaire provided a measure for length of time. The number of times an inmate was sent to Ad. Seg. while serving his current sentence was included in the analysis. A MANOVA was used to examine the effect stage on length of time spent in Ad. Seg. The results indicate that a significant multivariate F was found, Wilks' Lambda, $F(14,204) = 2.015$, $p = .018$, therefore the groups are significantly different on their multivariate composite. The univariate F tests indicate that significant group differences exist on each variable. Univariate tests of between subjects effects showed significant F values for the three measures of time which were time spent in Ad. Seg. at the time the survey was given, $F(2,108) = 3.234$, $p < .05$, length of the Ad.Seg. sentence, $F(2, 108)$, $p = .005$, and the number of times an inmate had been sent to Ad. Seg. during his current prison sentence, $F(2,108) = 5.221$, $p = .007$. This shows the effect of Stage across the three measures of time spent in Ad. Seg.

A Post Hoc test for LSD, Table 4, shows the multiple comparisons of significant mean differences among the three measures of time and three stages of conceptual development. Alpha was set at .05. Significant mean differences were found between the three Stages of functioning on each of the three factors of time. Stage 2 Ad. Seg. inmates
Table 4

Comparisons of Stage Differences on Three Measures of Time in Ad. Seg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>(S) STAGE</th>
<th>Comparative (C) STAGE</th>
<th>Mean Difference (S-C)</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADS SENT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-174*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>174*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>188*</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-188*</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME ADS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-78*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>78*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO X ADS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.62*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.87*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. N = 125. ADS. SENT = Administrative Segregation (Ad. Seg.) Sentence measured in days, TIME ADS = Time spent in Ad. Seg during present sentence measured in days, NO X ADS = Number of times inmate was sent to Ad. Seg. during this prison term. (S) = STAGE, (C) = Comparative STAGE, (S-C) Mean difference between STAGE and Comparative STAGE
were serving significantly longer Ad. Seg. sentences than inmates functioning in Stage 1 (-174, p = .003) and in Stage 3 (-188, p < .05). The number of times in Ad. Seg., during the current prison sentence, followed this same pattern. Ad. Seg. inmates functioning in Stage 2 were sent to Ad. Seg. more often than inmates functioning in Stage 3 (-.87, p = .017) and more often than Stage 1 (-.62, p = .007) respectively. The mean difference for the amount of time an inmate in the Stage 2 group had spent in Ad. Seg., was shown to have been significantly longer (-86, p = .015) than inmates functioning in Stage 1. Although Stage 2 inmates had spent longer amounts of time in Ad. Seg. at the time of this research, than stage 3 inmates, no statistical significance was found between these two groups. The purpose of the Time Spent in Ad.Seg. demographic data was to insure the variable against confounds which may have occurred due to an unusual amount of turn over of the inmate population in Ad. Seg. The pattern of the data demonstrates that there has been no such unusual turn over.

Hypothesis two was supported. The data demonstrated that inmates functioning in Stage 2, as a group, spent the longest time in Ad. Seg. followed by the groupings of Stage 1 and Stage 3 respectively. No Stage 4 inmates were found in Ad. Seg.

**Exploratory Analysis**

An additional MANOVA of demographic data was used to examine the relationship of stage to the original crime for which the inmate was sentenced, type of institutional infraction committed and age. The Wilks' Lambda results indicate that no significant multivariate F was found therefore the groups are not significantly different on their multivariate composite. However, the univariate F tests for between subjects
effects indicate that significant group differences, $F(2,112) = 3.5$, $p < .05$ exist on the relationship between stage and type of institutional infraction. No significant difference could be found for relating age or type of original crime to any particular stage. A Post Hoc test for LSD indicated that the type of infraction for which inmates were sentenced to Ad. Seg. showed significant mean differences between inmates functioning in Stage 2 and those in both Stage 1 (1.94, $p < .05$) and in Stage 3 (3.06, $p < .05$). Figure 2 shows the frequency and type of prison infractions committed by inmates according to stage membership.
Figure 2. Frequency and type of prison infractions committed by inmates functioning in Stage (n = 49), Stage 2 (n = 58), and Stage 3 (n = 12).
CHAPTER V

Discussion

The findings of this study are presented in relationship to previous studies and within the limitations of this research. Data for this study has been gathered from a specialized population of men who are inmates in the Administrative Segregation (Ad. Seg.) unit of a New Jersey prison. As in much of the previous research (Tinsley and Harris, 1976) participants were not actual clients seeking help and results were generated by analogue data.

The primary hypotheses for this study state that there exists a relationship between Ad. Seg. inmates conceptual stage and expressed patterns of expectations about counseling. This represents, in part, an extension of the work of Craig and Hennesy (1989) and Richardson (1992) whose research is based on clients entering a college counseling center. The concern of the second hypotheses asserted that conceptual development stage would be reflected in the length of time spent in Ad. Seg. Responses on the demographic questionnaire measured length of time. The number of times an inmate was sent to Ad. Seg. while serving his current sentence was included in the analysis.

Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis 1 was supported by the analyses. Ad. Seg. inmates expectations about counseling can be differentiated based on conceptual stages. On the factor most closely related to Stage 1 functioning, Counselor Expertise, significant mean differences were
found to separate the three stages. Only Stage 1 Ad. Seg. inmates expected the counselor to be directive and know how to help them.

Significant differences were found between Stage 1 and Stage 2 on all four factors with the strongest difference in Nurturance followed by the Counselor Expertise factor. This is consistent with the responses on the TIB test of Stage 2 individuals who tend to be the opposite of those in Stage 1 (Harvey, 1966). These differences are indicative of the need for the Stage 1 group to receive direction and to see the counselor as an authority figure in contrast to the resistance of the Stage 2 group and their drive toward autonomy. The opposition found in these factors, between groups, represents the polarity of the two stages.

No significant mean differences were found between Stage 2 and Stage 3 on any of the four factors. Significant mean differences were found between Stage 1 and Stage 3 on the Counselor Expertise factor. This would suggest that there are aspects of expectations for the counseling process that Stage 3 persons share with both Stage 1 and Stage 2 individuals.

Regarding Hypothesis 1, it can be stated that the differences between these groups on the four factors of expectations about counseling reinforce the theory of the existence of stages of conceptual functioning and the need for the counselor to examine the cognitive aspects of the counseling process. This study supported the following differences:

Stage 1 Ad. Seg. inmates, as a group, expected the counselor to be nurturing and know how to help them. Unique to this group was an attitude of trust, openness, and dependency on the counselor to be directive.
Stage 2 Ad. Seg. inmates, as a group, expected the counselor to be non directive and foster autonomy. Although discussion of personal issues was expected, reservations concerning expression of feelings and openness was evident.

Stage 3 Ad. Seg. inmates, as a group, expected the counselor to be non directive and nurturing. The inmate functioning in this stage expects the counseling process to be pleasant.

Richardson's (1992) study found “clients in all four stages expected a prescriptive approach to counseling” (p.113). In contrast, the present study found that only inmates functioning in Stage 1 were open to direction from the counselor. This finding is similar to that of Craig and Hennessy (1989) which found a distinction between Stage 1 and Stages 3 and 4. This represents a differences in functioning between concrete and abstract but not between Stages 1 and 2 both of which are concrete stages but, in fact, quite diverse in expectations for counseling. The discrepancy may be due in part to the small number of participants functioning in Stage 2 in both prior studies (Craig & Hennessy, 1989; and Richardson, 1992). The present study secured adequate numbers of both Stage 1 and Stage 2 participants to represent differentiation between the two groups of concrete functioning. However, the difference between concrete and abstract stage expectations are not as clear.

Richardson's (1992) findings reflect the characteristics of clients coming to a career counseling center. The results found this group to be motivated and expect a positive and genuine response from the counselor without confrontation. Craig & Hennessy (1989) also found that the client in this setting expected an empathizing and sharing counselor. Richardson's (1992) work revealed the possibility of stage regression
The need for directive counseling may have actually reflected the purpose of a career counseling center which is, in part, to disseminate information about career related issues. Perspective clients may have been information seekers regardless of stage functioning. Both studies (Craig & Hennessy, 1989; Richardson, 1992) reported fifty percent of the participants as Stage 1. This is consistent with CST (Harvey, Hunt & Schroder, 1961). The present study found that even though concrete functioning was represented by ninety percent of the participants, inmates are diversified as to their expectations about counseling. The overall indication of these three studies suggests that stage membership may be predicted by the characteristics of the environment from which participants are recruited.

The findings of the present research suggested that a diversity of counseling methods is required to meet the needs of inmates. Men in prison, as in any setting, will be best served by a variety of programs. Traditional, directive, education oriented programs may be helpful for Stage 1 individuals and self-help oriented programs may offers guidance for the autonomy driven Stage 2 or Stage 3 individuals.

Conceptual Systems Theory (Harvey, Hunt & Schroder, 1961) asserts that the process by which individuals organize information found through interaction with the environment can be measured on a continuum, from concrete to abstract functioning, in four stages. The manner in which a person copes with conflict and ambiguity is reflected in the conceptual stages of functioning. Individuals demonstrating Stage 1 and Stage 2 characteristics have the greater reliance on structure whereas Stage 3 and Stage 4 individuals can tolerate higher levels of ambiguity in the environment. Ability to cope with conflicting social stimuli increases with stage progression.
The distribution of Ad. Seg. inmates into one of four conceptual stages was different from prior studies. Previous studies (Greaves, 1971; Harvey, 1966, 1986) showed that Stage 1 represented the largest group followed by Stage 3, Stage 2, and Stage 4. This study revealed Stage 2 to represent approximately 50% of the Ad. Seg. inmate population followed by Stage 1, 40%, and Stage 3, 10%, and no representation of Stage 4. This distribution supports Greaves (1971, 1972) speculation that Stage 1 and Stage 3 would be represented in any setting and virtually no Stage 4 individual would be found in prison. The large proportion of Stage 2 represented in this study supports the premise that individuals in this stage are distrusting of authority and guided “by rebellion against social prescription” (Harvey, 1966, p. 45).

Ninety percent of the men in AD. Seg. are functioning on a concrete level. Stage 1 and Stage 2 individuals, although different in their approach when responding to events in their environment are, as a group, less tolerant of ambiguity (Harvey, 1966), react quickly to cognitive dissonance (Harvey, 1966), have difficulty delineating between means and ends with few alternative methods of solving problems (Harvey, 1966). When faced with ambiguities in the environment, the concrete thinker will rely on established opinions and therefore use conventional solutions to complex or changing problems (Felknor & Harvey, 1963; Harvey, 1966). The individuals participating in this study have solved their problems in a socially unacceptable manner and have been sent to a prison setting. This resulted in a restriction of their environment and in this way, reduced the ambiguities and chaos of their environment. Those inmates who continue to resolve difficulties in a similar manner while in prison, further restrict their chaos by existing in solitary confinement. This premise is demonstrated in the high number of Stage 1 and
Stage 2 individuals found in Ad. Seg. Stage 1 individuals are segregated primarily due to the paucity of methods for problem solving and, Stage 2, due to their drive toward autonomy and rejection of established rules.

It should be noted that certainly not all people functioning in Stage 1 or Stage 2 go to prison. The difference, according to Conceptual Development Theory (Harvey, Hunt, & Schroder, 1961), can be found in the characteristics of the environments and the problems that these environments present. The comparatively small numbers of Ad. Seg. inmates functioning in Stage 3 demonstrates the increased tolerance of ambiguity in the environment. Persons functioning in this stage, although more abstract and flexible in cognitive organization, establish dependencies on others and are described to be extremely peer group dependent (Greaves, 1971, 1972; Harvey, 1966). This dependency suggests that environmental characteristics may serve to shape the cognitive organization for this group (Greaves, 1972).

Hypothesis two states that conceptual stage would be reflected in the amount of time an inmate spent in Ad. Seg. A MANOVA of the demographic data supported this hypothesis. The results showed that the Stage 2 inmate spends significantly more time in Ad. Seg. than the Stage 1 inmate and significantly more time than the Stage 3 inmate on both measures of length of Ad. Seg. sentence and number of times in Ad. Seg. for the current prison sentence. This is consistent with the characteristics of the Stage 2 individual that include rebellion against authority and struggle for autonomy (Harvey, 1966). Stage 1 individuals, although less able to cope with environmental stressors, are more willing to accept and abide by authority-related cues and thereby commit fewer serious infractions with shorter sentences. Stage 3 individuals, although more able to
deal with ambiguities can be influenced by peer group dependency. The type of infraction may be influence by the environment and current peer group affiliations giving variability to the sentence length.

Goetting and Howsen’s (1986) study found that rule breaking behavior is most highly correlated to length of time in prison, number of convictions and age. No relationship was found with educational achievement, current offense or hours spent outside the cell. This study found that those inmates with the most severe and frequent infractions were also those inmates that had committed serious crimes and were serving the longest sentences. Unlike previous research (Goetting & Howsen, 1986; Brown & Spevacek, 1971; Flanagan, 1983) which found age (less than 25) to be the strongest correlate of prisoner misconduct, this study showed that the average age of an inmate in Ad. Seg. was 31. In contrast to much of the research done within the correctional system, which has been drawn from comparisons of various groups of demographic data, the results for the present study were drawn from inmates willing to participate in the study. This may account for some of the discrepancies in the findings.

Analyses of the supplementary data gave further support of the differences in functioning between the conceptual stages. Significant differences were found to separate Stage 2 functioning from Stage 1 and Stage 3 on type of Ad. Seg infraction and consequently, the time spent in Ad. Seg., as well as the number of times an inmate went to Ad. Seg. during his current prison sentence. This evidence may be indicative of the Stage 2 propensity to reject established rules.

No significant mean differences were found between age and stage functioning. Stage membership rather than age may serve as a predictor for prisoner misconduct.
Further investigation showed only Stage 2 inmates were in Ad. Seg. for assaulting an officer and a variety of crimes related to refusing to follow regulations. Stage 1 inmates are characterized by threatening both inmates and officers in addition to posing an institutional security threat. Stage 3 inmates, in contrast to Stages 1 and 2, were drug free but were both threatening to another inmate and assaultive.

Practical Implications

The present study showed that there exists significant differences in the counseling expectations of Ad. Seg. inmates which are dependent on group membership in one of three stages of conceptual development. This research clearly implicates the need to consider the conceptual perspective of a participant. Greaves (1972) points out the importance of considering conceptual stages in his research. "Failure to have identified these subgroups would have resulted in a failure to demonstrate the selective recall phenomenon due to "canceling" effects of the differential subgroup performances" (p. 331). Some prior studies (Lutwak and Hennessey, 1982; grouped conceptual stages into concrete (Stages 1 and 2) and abstract (Stages 3 and 4) categories. Depending on the objective of the study, this grouping may mask effects. When the men in Ad. Seg. were reviewed for overall effect (predominantly Stage 1 and Stage 2), it was found that certain aspects of the counseling process, as genuineness on the part of the counselor and responsibility of the client to achieve counseling goals were given high ratings. Upon closer study, opposition could be found for most aspects of the counseling process between Stage 1 and Stage 2. Responsibility for the counseling process was placed under the directiveness of the counselor by inmates with Stage 1 thinking and a non directive
approach was favored by inmates functioning in Stages 2 and 3. Current rehabilitation programs may, in fact, be weakening their effectiveness by addressing all inmates in the same manner.

Reitsma-Streets’ (1980, 1988) work with juvenile delinquents demonstrated the value of considering the opposition of Stage 1 and Stage 2 conceptual levels when grouping juveniles in living quarters. The more concrete group comparable to Stage 1 lived together in a highly structured setting. The less concrete group comparable to Stage 2 lived in a less highly structured setting with opportunities to exercise autonomy. This living arrangement helped to reduce the number of incidents within the juvenile delinquent population.

High recidivism rates may be due to failure of the penal system in addressing the issue of appropriate rehabilitation techniques that allow for conceptual functioning. Traditional counseling which is educationally oriented and directive is designed to reach large groups of inmates. Psychologically oriented and individualized counseling may only reach a small number of inmates without adequate personnel to deliver these services. However, since a large percentage of inmates can benefit from directive counseling, only those inmates which seek autonomy need be addressed at this level.

Limitations

Generalizability of the results of this study is limited to male inmates living in an Ad. Seg. prison setting. Participants of this study represent a non-client population.
Gender

Some studies account for differences in expectations about counseling to be rooted in gender. According to Kunkel and Williams (1991) men expected counselors to be directive and women viewed their roles as responsible, motivated, and interactive. When considering conceptual stages the findings of this study showed that only Stage 1 men seek directive counseling whereas Stage 2 and 3 rejects this component. Subich (1983) and Hardin and Yanico (1983) reported males to be more self-disclosing than females. This study found that men gave low ratings to self disclosure. Using an entirely male population, it is clear that expectations are influenced by factors other than gender. The Conceptual Stage Theory (Harvey, Hunt and Schroder, 1961) provided a basis for differentiating expectations which may transcend gender (Coll & Lega, 1981).

Non Client Population

Although this study was conducted with non clients, the overall findings were similar to the expectations of actual clients of Subich and Coursol (1985). Like clients these non clients expected to take responsibility for the counseling process and have a less empathic and accepting counselor. These results may have been due to the fact that the majority of inmates fell into Stage 2. These expectations are characteristic of this stage. Richardsons' (1992) study of clients showed similar overall results but the subsequent analyses showed an overall need for directive counseling. This may have been due to the majority of Stage 1 participants.
Instruments

A semi-projective questionnaire was used to measure conceptual development of the inmate and subsequent grouping into stages which constituted the independent variable for this study. Difficulties arise in rating this type of instrument which may include rater subjectivity and stage transition of the participant. Although specific guidelines exist for the assignment of stage, prior beliefs concerning inmate ability, comparison of expression of thought among questionnaires, discerning split stages, and evidence of stage transition complicate the scoring of the TIB. To control for inaccuracies in stage placement an additional rater, Ph. D level, trained in scoring the TIB was enlisted. This led to the elimination of twenty-six participants from this study which is consistent with other studies (Carskadon, 1978; Harvey, 1966; Greaves, 1971).

Reduction of participants may threaten statistical power and require the researcher to secure a large number of participants. Since collection of data from an Ad. Seg. unit must be on an individual basis, the time required may result in events which effect the outcome of the study.

Counterbalancing of measurements to guard against instrument bias was a limitation of the Ad. Seg. environment. Since participants completed the packets over an extended amount of time, no controls were possible as the order in which the inmates completed the surveys.

No time limits are placed on the EAC-B. The TIB has been administered with and without time constraints in a comparison study by Greaves (1971). The results demonstrated the stability of the instrument under differing administrative techniques.
This study showed that age was not a predictor of stage membership. Previous studies have not mentioned the age or ethnic background of participants. This may be due to the focus of CST on conceptual and behavioral strategies used in coping with conflict and ambiguity in social environments (Stoppard & Miller, 1985). Greaves (1971) projected that any setting would contain members of both Stage 1 and Stage 3. The manner and degree of flexibility with which a person copes with conflicting stimuli constitutes the measure, ranging from concrete to abstract, of stage.

Stage Regression

Richardson (1992) suggested, in her research, that the large number of Stage 1 clients in a college campus counseling center may be due to a regression of stage in participants who were experiencing stress situations. Although the Ad. Seg. unit offers a restriction of environmental chaos, inmates living under these conditions may also be exhibiting stress reactions which have influenced stage functioning. The majority of inmates who were found to function within the concrete stages, and those who demonstrate split stages, may group differently under other conditions.

Supplementary Data

No information was obtained concerning racial or ethnic background, prior experience in counseling, counselor preference, or educational level. Generalizability across persons is limited in this study since consideration was not given to possible categories within the population.
Implications for Future Research

This study showed that Stages 1, 2 and 3 are found in an Ad. Seg. prison setting. The question still remains as to why this group of individuals were unable to deal with the chaos in their environments even after prison restrictions were in place. Future research is needed to address the differences in stage functioning of inmates in Ad. Seg., inmates in prison, and non inmates. Comparative studies of other influences on stage development such as self-esteem and parenting may reveal differentiating characteristics.

Coping mechanisms which may have cultural or spiritual influence may differ for individuals who share the same stage functioning. Further investigation using instruments which measure coping practices may reveal the individual’s similarities and differences in each stage.

Studies in other prisons using the TIB and the EAC-B would help to strengthen the validity of the findings of this study or clarify where differences exist. Further studies with women inmates as participants are needed to further explore the possible effects of gender on stage functioning and expectations for the counseling experience.

Post-testing of the participants after receiving counseling programs that address the conceptual stage and expectations of the inmate would measure the effectiveness of variation in services. Ideally, the skills to cope with environmental chaos would have increased and may be reflected in stage progression and ability to remain outside of the Ad. Seg. unit.

Non clients were participants for the current research. The overall data suggests some similarities between clients and non clients found in Richardson’s (1992) study as
to expectations for the counseling process. Some question still remains after reevaluating
the data in relation to stage functioning as to the validity of analyzing general data.
Clarification of this issue may be found by examining the expectations of those inmates
who have requested counseling and are ready to begin a counseling process in contrast to
those inmates who are surveyed as non clients.

Conclusion

This study added to the research on the expectations about counseling of the
Stage 2 client. Prior studies (Craig & Hennessy, 1989; Richardson, 1992) recruited
insufficient numbers of Stage 2 participants to confidently define the counseling needs of
this group. The opposition of expectations within the concrete functioning of Stages 1
and 2 are apparent.

Stage differentiation was evident on the two levels of counseling expectations and
method of problem solving. Stage 1 is characterized by the need for direction and
responds in the form of verbal threats to life situations which are not clearly defined.
Stage 2 maintains a strong need for autonomy and rejects imposition of rules or directives
in an assaultive fashion. Stage 3 expects positive encounters and to exercise internal
control but can be either threatening or assaultive when faced with conflict. These
findings are consistent with Conceptual Systems Theory (Harvey, Hunt, & Schroder,
1961).

Inmates in Ad. Seg. demonstrate the effect of environmental influences on
behavior. This group of inmates have shown a variety of difficulties in adjusting to the
environment and are most in need of rehabilitative help. They are therefore the least
likely to readjust to the outside environment and may be the group most likely to recidivate.

The purpose of programs in prison settings is to help the inmate gain new perspectives on dealing with conflict. Many inmates leave prison unprepared to cope with the challenges of their environment. Investigating the pre-counseling expectations of inmates gives indications as to the type of programs of which the inmate will be accepting. The goal of presenting appropriate programs lies not so much in changing the program but changing the manner of presentation to suit the expectations and conceptual stage of the population.
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Appendix A

Participant Information Letter
To the Participant,

You are invited to participate in a study. The purpose of this study is to learn more about a person's beliefs and how they influence the expectations a person has for the counseling process and their environment.

Participants in this study are invited to fill out three pen and paper questionnaires.
1) Demographic questionnaire regarding time spent in Ad. Seg.
2) This I Believe questionnaire. In this questionnaire there are nine statements which all begin "This I believe about" and are followed by a word or phrase regarding social or personal beliefs. The participant will be asked to add at least two or three sentences to complete the phrase.
3) Expectations About Counseling. This survey contains fifty-four questions regarding expectations a client has about the counseling process. Responses to the questions are measured on a scale of one through seven ranging from 1) not true through 7) definitely true found on the top of each page. The participant will be asked to determine the number on the rating scale which corresponds to the participants expectation then circle this number on an answer sheet.

The total time involved will be approximately one hour.

No names or identifying information about you will be used in this project and any information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential. All survey materials will remain in the possession of the researcher and will be secured in a locked file.

Participation is voluntary. If you decide to participate in this project, you are free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. Those participants who complete the questionnaires will be given a letter acknowledging participation to be placed in their file. Participants names and state identification numbers will be obtained from completed consent forms which will be filed separately from test materials.

In the event that any discomfort arises for the participant as a result of completing these questionnaires, the participant may send a request for an interview to the psychology department at Northern State Prison to alleviate corresponding emotional distress.

This research is conducted by Ms. Rabben in conjunction with Seton Hall University and with permission from Northern State Prison. Questions about this study can be addressed by written contact through central facilities.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human participants research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the participant's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services.
Appendix B

Consent Form
Consent Form

The purpose of this study is to learn more about a person’s beliefs and how they influence the expectations a person has for the counseling process and their environment.

Participants in this study are invited to fill out three pen and paper questionnaires.

1) Demographic questionnaire regarding time spent in Ad. Seg.

2) This I Believe questionnaire. In this questionnaire there are nine statements which all begin “This I believe about” and are followed by a word or phrase regarding social or personal beliefs. The participant will be asked to add at least two or three sentences to complete the phrase.

3) Expectations About Counseling. This survey contains fifty-three questions regarding expectations a client has about the counseling process. Responses to the questions are measured on a scale of one through seven ranging from 1) not true through 7) definitely true found at the top of each page. The participant will be asked to determine the number on the rating scale which corresponds to the participants expectation then circle this number on an answer sheet.

The total time involved will be approximately one hour.

No names or identifying information about you will be used in this project and any information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential. All survey materials will remain in the possession of the researcher and will be secured in a locked file.

Participation is voluntary. If you decide to participate in this project, you are free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. Those participants who complete the questionnaires will be given a letter acknowledging participation to be placed in their file. Participants names and state identification numbers will be obtained from completed consent forms which will be filed separately from test materials.

In the event that any discomfort arises for the participant as a result of completing these questionnaires, the participant may send a request for an interview to the psychology department at Northern State Prison to alleviate corresponding emotional distress.

This research is conducted by Ms. Rabben in conjunction with Seton Hall University and with permission from Northern State Prison.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human participants research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the participant’s privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services.

I have read the material above, and any questions I asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity, realizing that I may withdraw without prejudice at any time.

__________________________  ________________________
Participant                                      Date
Appendix C

Questionnaire
1. What is your current prison sentence? ___________________________________

2. What is the crime for which you are sentenced? ___________________________________

3. What is your current Ad. Seg. sentence? ___________________________________

4. What was the reason you were sent to Ad. Seg.? ___________________________________

5. How long have you been in Ad. Seg.? ___________________________________

6. How many times have you been in Ad. Seg. since you started your current prison sentence? ___________________________________

7. What is your age? ___________________________________
Appendix D

Inmate File Letter
For Inmate File:

_______________________, has participated in the research project entitled: Conceptual Development and Expectations About Counseling within the prison population. The purpose of this study is to learn more about a person's beliefs and how they influence the expectations a person has for the counseling process and their environment.

This study took place at Northern State Prison during April 3 through April 10, 1999.

_______________________
S. Rabben
Seton Hall University Researcher
Appendix E

Legend for Figure 2
LEGEND FOR FIGURE 2.

1. security threat
2. group demonstration
3. weapon possession
4. threatening another
5. arson
6. refusing work order
7. drug related
8. personality conflict
9. incite to riot
10. assault
11. escape
12. sending money out
13. threatening officer
14. threat group
15. lock tampering
16. planning assault
17. refusing double lock
18. another inmates' action
19. refusing search
20. assaulting officer
21. fraud
Appendix F

This I Believe Questionnaire
Information pertaining to the administration of This I Believe can be obtained from:

University of Colorado
Psychology Department
Boulder, Colorado 80311

Att: Dr. O. J. Harvey
Appendix G

Expectations About Counseling
Information pertaining to the administration of Expectations About Counseling can be obtained from:

Howard E. A. Tinsley  
Department of Psychology  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, FL 32611-2250

tinsley@psych.ufl.edu