

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ANGER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
FOR INMATES OF STONY MOUNTAIN INSTITUTION

by

DAVID M. CLOUSTON

A Practicum Report Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Social Work

School of Social Work
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

August, 1991

David M. Clouston (c)
1991



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-76596-8

Canada

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ANGER MANAGMENT PROGRAM
FOR INMATES OF STONY MOUNTAIN INSTITUTION

BY

DAVID M. CLOUSTON

A practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

© 1991

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this practicum, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this practicum
and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICRO-
FILMS to publish an abstract of this practicum.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither
the practicum nor extensive extracts from it may be printed
or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

ABSTRACT

Stony Mountain Institution is a Federal Penitentiary housing up to five hundred men serving sentences of two or more years, including a large proportion who are violent offenders. Treatment programs offered to these men within the Institution include a range of services and activities, however do not include a program designed to assist offenders to deal with problems in controlling anger. The objective of this practicum was to develop an anger management program which would be appropriate for this setting and which could be presented by interested staff within the institution in the future.

An anger management program was developed and offered to a group of inmates by the author with the assistance of institutional staff. The program included an evaluation component which found that little change could be measured in the participants as a result of their participation in the program. Possible reasons for these results are discussed as well as the implications of these results for further program development within correctional institutions. Suggestions related to some of the problems inherent in offering and evaluating programs of this nature in institutional settings are made in the conclusion.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the support and assistance of many people who had a part to play in the completion of this practicum.

I would like to express my gratitude to my Advisor, Grant Reid for his practical advice and support throughout the program. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dennis Bracken and Steve Brickey for their valuable comments and suggestions during the completion of the practicum.

I am grateful for the support of the Warden, Mr. A. Majkut, and the Case Management staff at Stony Mountain Institution for their assistance throughout the program as well as during the completion of the practicum, as their friendship and willingness to assist me helped to inspire me to continue at times when there simply didn't seem to be enough hours in the day. I would also like to thank my supervisor, Mr. Ed Carleton, and the District Director, Mr. Gord Holloway, who supported me in the completion of the practicum.

I would like to express my heart-felt appreciation to my wife, Margaret Penning, who encouraged me throughout this program and has always had faith in me, even at those times

when I ran out of faith in myself. I would also like to acknowledge my two sons, Sean Clouston and Ryan Clouston, who have assisted me in completing this program by simply being a pleasure to live with.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	v
I. Introduction	1
II. Literature Review	4
Anger Management Theory	5
Research on Anger Management Programs	13
Classical Conditioning Therapies	13
Social Skills/Assertiveness training	14
Operant Conditioning Therapies	15
Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions	17
Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment	23
Summary	36
III. Description of Intervention	39
Research	39
Development of the Program	42
Format of the Program	43
Presentation of the Program	46
Selection of the Participants	47
Characteristics of the Group	48
Co-Trainers	51
Problem Areas	52
Attendance	53
Log-books	53
Imaginal Scenes	55
Relaxation Exercises	55
Group Dynamics	56
Facilities	56
Audio-Visual	57
Evaluation	59
Pre- and Post-tests	59
Self-reporting	66
Post-Program Interviews	68
IV. Evaluation of Theory	71
V. Conclusion	76
Bibliography	79
Appendix A	85

I. INTRODUCTION

Stony Mountain Institution is a Federal Penitentiary housing up to five hundred men from the Manitoba area. These men are serving sentences ranging from two years to life imprisonment for convictions on a variety of criminal offenses. A large proportion are serving sentences for violent crimes (35.8% of the population as of December 31, 1988, according to Correctional Services of Canada figures). Robbery, often considered to be a violent crime as well, accounted for an additional 24.5% of the population at the same time. Finally, many of those people serving sentences for non-violent crimes also have a self-disclosed history of violent behaviour towards others.

In order to meet the needs of men who are serving sentences within Federal Institutions, a variety of services have been developed by the Correctional Services of Canada. These include educational programs, institutional employment, vocational training, recreational programs, cultural development programs for special needs groups, religious programming, and drug and alcohol information programs as well as other programs developed within particular institutions.

Inmates are assessed on intake by Case Management Officers and referrals are made to the appropriate programs and services depending on the individual needs of the inmates, their willingness to participate in the suggested programs, and the availability of the services identified as being needed.

There are two full-time psychologists and a part-time psychiatrist working within the institution to provide for the mental health needs of the inmates, as well as to complete psychological and psychiatric assessments to assist National Parole Board or Correctional Services of Canada officials in making decisions. Although the psychologists and psychiatrist are able to provide adequate counselling and/or therapy for selected inmates, the major proportion of their work currently entails the provision of psychological and psychiatric assessments for decision-making purposes. There is consequently a large demand for regular individual counselling as well as other services that cannot be met with the number of available staff.

One area of service that the psychology department has not been able to provide in the past has been the development of group programming for inmates who have difficulty controlling their tempers. In 1986, several Case Management Officers employed at Stony Mountain Institution initiated the development of a program to assist these offenders, providing small groups of inmates with the opportunity to participate

in an Anger Management Program on several occasions in 1986 and 1987. It was discontinued due to a number of factors including the transfer and promotion of staff members involved and a general reduction in the level of staffing in the Case Management Department.

The program was based on a cognitive-behavioral model of human behaviour, and participants were provided with information and/or training in four areas - theories of aggression, communication skills, assertiveness training, and stress management. According to an internal evaluation completed on the program, it was popular with the participants and had some benefits in terms of bringing about a shift in attitudes, although no attempt was made to determine the long-term effectiveness of this program.

At the time the original program was developed, the staff involved did not develop a handbook or presentation guide to enable others to prepare themselves to present the program. As a result, much of the information they gathered was lost, and it was impossible for the program to be offered without the area being researched and a new program and handbook being developed to guide those wishing to facilitate the program.

The objective of this practicum was to develop such a program and handbook, utilize it in presenting the program to a group of participants, and then evaluating the usefulness of the program. The results of the evaluation would then be used to modify the program.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of the literature in the area of correctional treatment programming reveals significant interest in programs designed to help people with problems effectively controlling their tempers (Currie, 1987). However, as will be discussed later in this section, there continues to be some controversy over the effectiveness of correctional treatment programming, and this controversy of course would not exclude the type of program which is being discussed in this report, as the program is designed for a correctional setting.

In order to give a good overview of the area of anger management programming, general theory on which programs of this nature are based will be outlined, and then research on the development and relative effectiveness of these types of programs will be examined. A discussion of the effectiveness of correctional treatment programming will then be offered as this issue is rather important when discussing the issue of whether programs should be offered in a correctional setting at all.

ANGER MANAGEMENT THEORY

Anger is generally described as and understood to be an emotional state, or feeling, and as such, is included in classical theory on emotion (Averill, 1982). In this report, the discussion of anger must also include the behaviour that sometimes accompanies or is precipitated by anger, particularly aggressive or violent behaviour. It is important to separate the feeling state from the behaviour, as it is clear that while anger is associated with aggression and violence, anger does not always lead to violence, and it is not necessary for a person to be angry to be violent. As Averill (1982, p.30) notes, "(a)nger ... is the name of an emotional syndrome; aggression - a response intended to inflict pain or discomfort upon another - is one way in which anger is sometimes expressed."

While it is important to note the difference between anger and aggression, there are equally important reasons to indicate a relationship between the emotion commonly known as anger and the aggressive behaviour which often is preceded by or occurs simultaneously with anger. For example, Novaco (1985, p.10) notes that:

"While neither necessary nor sufficient for aggression to occur, anger does lead to aggression. Extensive research has indeed shown that anger arousal increases the probability of aggression (Rule and Nesdale, 1976). A considerable proportion of acts of aggravated assault and homicide involves an angry perpetrator. Instances of criminal assault have been shown to consist not of discrete events but of an escalating sequence of antagonistic moves (Toch, 1969). Domestic disputes, whether between

spouses or directed toward children, typically is (sic) prompted by unmanaged anger. As another example, rape can be motivated by anger toward females. There is little doubt that interpersonal violence ranging from altercations on freeways to assassinations of government leaders is in large measure driven by the forces of anger."

Aggression was viewed by early theorists such as Freud and Lorenz as an instinctive behaviour that was basically inevitable within humans. Freud viewed the functioning of an individual as being included within the concepts of the id, ego, and the superego. The id was seen as the biological source of all drive energy derived from the life and death instincts. The id operates under the pleasure principle - that is, it seeks pleasure and avoids pain, and is impulsive, demanding, selfish, and irrational. In contrast to this repository of primitive desires and impulses is the superego, which is the moral branch of the individual and which holds ideals towards which the individual strives, and the punishments which must be experienced for transgressions of moral standards.

The ego seeks reality rather than pleasure or perfection and attempts to express and satisfy the demands of the id for immediate gratification and the superego for perfection. In order to satisfy the desires of the id in the social world, the ego blocks, diverts, and slowly releases the energy supplied by the id, delaying gratification until the appropriate time and place. The ego is seen as the mediator between the two powerful internal forces and reality and is

sometimes unable to successfully control the impulses of the id. Within this model, Freud viewed impulsive, aggressive or violent people as having poorly developed egos which could not control the id (Pervin, 1970). In a complicated fashion, aggression was also related to Freud's 'death instinct', and he asserted that energy from the death instinct had to be constantly converted to outward aggression in order to prevent self destruction. Freud suggested that expended destructive energy reduced tension and that catharsis could occur during which destructive energy could be discharged in a harmless way (Zillmann, 1979).

Lorenz viewed the aggressive instinct as a result of aggressive energy which is produced by the organism and which must be discharged regularly. Lorenz viewed people as having numerous instincts that might lead to aggressive behaviour, such as the instinct to protect their own territory, the instinct to nurture and protect children, the mating instinct, and many others. These were viewed as instincts that could lead to appropriate expressions of aggressive energy. Lorenz also felt that if it was not regularly discharged, this aggressive energy would build up and that aggressive behaviour could occur even in the absence of appropriate conditions in the environment. He indicated that this energy could be discharged in many pro-social ways such as sports, hard work, and other physically active types of behaviour. Lorenz conceived of this aggressive energy in terms of a hydraulic

model within which expended energy would cause pressure to be built up and eventually cause an explosion of energy (and possibly explosively violent behaviour).

In a further expansion of this theory, Lorenz indicated that if aggressive energy was not dissipated the organism could search for an outlet (Zillmann, 1979). While searching for an outlet, the organism could potentially act in an aggressive fashion when faced with inappropriate stimuli or even in the absence of stimuli in response to a tremendous internal build up of aggressive energy.

Frustration and Aggression were linked together first by Dollard, Doob, Miller and Sears in 1939 and a good deal of theoretical work was completed in the intervening years relating aggression to a drive. The frustration-aggression hypothesis maintains that:

a) Frustration can lead to behaviour that may or may not be hostile or aggressive; however

b) Any hostile or aggressive behaviour that takes place is always caused by frustration (Zillman, 1979).

Frustration (the thwarting of a basic need) then, was viewed as a drive that is a necessary pre-requisite to hostility and aggression. This hypothesis was debated over the years and later theorists (particularly behaviorally oriented authors) tended to reduce frustration to the status of an intervening variable rather than as a drive as it is unobservable in behavioral terms (Zillmann, 1979). Despite

the popularity of the concept, numerous attempts to isolate and substantiate a frustration drive failed to do so (in fact the research suggests that it is not a drive), and the concept of physiological arousal appears to have replaced the concept of drive as a factor related to aggression (Zillmann, 1979).

Later theories on aggressive behaviour have tended to be based on social learning theory approaches, in which aggression is viewed as being a totally learned response to the environment, with modelling, rehearsal, and other learning techniques becoming more important in explaining violent behaviour.

For example, Bandura's (1973) social theory of aggression is comprised of the following elements:

1. Hostility and aggression are seen to be under the control of contingencies of external reinforcement and punishment. They are also seen to be under the control of external discriminative cues and conditional stimuli;

2. Hostility and aggression are similarly controlled by contingencies of vicarious reinforcement and punishment. Vicarious discriminative cues and conditional stimuli function similarly to external stimulus control;

3. Hostility and aggression may be under the control of self-reinforcement and self-punishment; and

4. Hostility and aggression are under cognitive control.

Cognitive control potentially dominates over both stimulus and

reinforcement and/or punishment control. It results in rational, behaviour-guiding strategies that are relatively independent of direct or vicarious experiences with contingencies of reinforcement and punishment (Zillman, 1979).

According to Bandura, hostility and aggression are totally learned behaviours that can be changed through exposure to modelling.

Zillmann (1979) builds on Bandura's theory by developing a theory describing two types of aggressive behaviour: annoyance motivated aggression and incentive motivated aggression. He notes that annoyance motivated aggression can result when the individual is at either a very low or very high level of excitement, because cognitive guidance systems (the internal dialogue which individuals engage in during normal activity) are most effective at moderate levels of excitation. In general terms, the cognitive guidance systems are effective in assessing long-term effects of certain behaviours, but in very annoying situations the individual becomes excited, and the cognitive guidance systems break down, allowing behaviour to become very impulsive and intent only on removing annoyance. Learned reactions of great habitual strength are those likely to be exhibited in this state. After the organism returns to moderate levels, the cognitive guidance system becomes effective again and can evaluate behaviour. In cases where the individual is at a very low level of excitement (such as soon after awakening),

behaviour can be considered to be impulsive as well, but normally people in this state lack energy to act in a violent fashion, and soon move to either moderate or very high levels of excitation depending on the perceived threat in the environment.

Zillman (1979) also posits an incentive motivated aggressive behaviour; that is, violence which is motivated by incentives of some sort. People exhibiting this type of behaviour may act violently if they feel they have a reasonable chance of getting away with it without paying serious social or physical costs in the event that they are identified.

He notes that three factors are important to consider in analyzing violent behaviour - a person's disposition, the level of excitation that the person is exhibiting, and the actual situation being experienced.

Zillmann (1979) also discusses violent habits, indicating that people who exhibit both annoyance and incentive motivated aggressive behaviour may develop hostile and aggressive habits depending on whether the violent behaviour is reinforced.

Other theorists have made efforts to explain violent behaviour as well. For example, Toch (1969) discusses what he terms 'the violent man'. He develops a typology of violent behaviours which includes two major categories - violent behaviour meant to bolster or preserve the self-image (expressive), or violent behaviour to control or exploit

others (instrumental).

Megargee (1966) differentiates violent offenders in a similar fashion, classifying them as either the 'over-controlled aggressive person' or the 'under-controlled aggressive person'. The over-controlled person is said to be prone to explosive behaviour and the under-controlled person is habitually violent due to a lack of self-control.

In sum, there is considerable theoretical development in the area of violent behaviour, with much of the theory being developed following important research findings in the area. Similarly, there have been many therapeutic techniques developed to help people who experience anger management problems. Over the past twenty five years, these therapeutic approaches have tended to be based on cognitive-behavioral theoretical bases, starting with Ellis (1962) and his rational emotive therapy (which he later expanded to include anger control), Goldfried and Davidson's (1976) cognitive restructuring therapy and Meichenbaum's (1977) stress inoculation therapy. All of these therapeutic approaches functioned by instructing the client to identify and alter his or her own internal dialogue (or self-talk) to be more rational and positive in nature, thus more effectively mediating behaviours which follow (Goldstein et al, 1983).

In the following section, literature and research on the various types of anger management programs are examined.

RESEARCH ON ANGER MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

Novaco (1985) traces the development of treatment for Anger and Aggression to Witmer (1908) who reported treating an 11 year old boy for 'outbursts of uncontrollable and unreasoning rage' and Redl and Wineman (1951;1952) who developed a residential program for aggressive children. He notes that therapeutic interventions that have been evaluated in the research literature are almost exclusively behavioral or cognitive-behavioral in nature and tend to fall into the following categories: Classical Conditioning Therapies; Social Skills/Assertiveness Training; Operant Conditioning Therapies; and Cognitive - Behavioral Interventions.

Classical Conditioning Therapies

Classical Conditioning is based on Pavlov's early research showing that dogs can be trained to salivate at the sound of a bell in the absence of food by repeatedly ringing the bell before food is presented to the dog. In a similar fashion, it is reasoned that people can be trained to respond differently to a stimulus which normally elicits an undesirable response such as fear or anger. Therapists use systematic desensitization techniques which allow the client to become accustomed to certain situations they have difficulty dealing with over and over again until they are able to learn alternate techniques of dealing with them. A number of investigators have used systematic desensitization

and assertiveness training to treat Anger and Aggression and these approaches can both be traced to classical conditioning.

Systematic desensitization involves using relaxation counter-conditioning to assist in anger control. Novaco cites Hearn and Evans (1972,1973), O'Donnell and Worell (1973), and Rimm, DeGroot, Bon, Reiman, and Dillon (1971) as finding that desensitization can reduce anger in studies with student populations, and Evans (1971) and Herrell (1971) as having obtained similar findings with systematic case studies. He qualifies these findings by citing his own research (Novaco, 1975) which found the effects of counter-conditioning to be limited as he only found significant differences for imaginal provocations with no transference to role-play, direct, or real-life provocations.

Assertiveness training involves training the client alternative methods of dealing with provocative situations, and although it also stems from classical conditioning, it will be discussed in the next section along with Social Skills Programs.

Social Skills/ Assertiveness Training

Social Skills training is designed to teach the client how to respond effectively in situations of conflict, thereby minimizing the likelihood of aggressive behaviour.

Training of this type generally consists of the following sequence - Modelling, Focused Instruction, Behaviour Rehearsal

in Role-Play, Feedback on Target Behaviour, and Social Reinforcement.

Results of this approach are described as mixed in non-psychiatric populations (Novaco, 1985) with Kaufman and Wagner (1972) credited with developing the approach. In an experimental project, Rimm, Hill, Brown, and Stuart (1974) found reductions in self-anger reports. However, several other studies including Galassi and Galassi (1978), Lee, Hallberg, and Hassard (1979), and Pentz (1980) are cited as finding a failure to modify behaviour through assertiveness training. Spence and Munzillen (1979, 1981) completed a comprehensive evaluation of Social Skills Training with a population of young offenders living in a short-stay institution for juveniles in England. They found that social skills training was able to improve the performance of their subjects on specific skills, but that these improved skills did not increase adaptive and pro-social behaviour nor reduce recidivism among the subjects.

Favourable results have, however, been found by researchers among various populations of psychiatric patients (ie. Foy, Eisler, Pinkston, 1976; Fredrickson, Jenkins, Foy, and Eisler, 1976; Matson and Stephens, 1978; and Matson and Zeiss, 1978).

Operant Conditioning Therapies

Operant Conditioning is derived from the work of B.F.

Skinner and is based on the concept of learning through reinforcement of behaviour elicited by the organism. Behaviour which is reinforced by the environment is strengthened, and behaviour that is not reinforced by the environment is extinguished and eventually, no longer elicited. Complex social behaviour is reinforced through successive approximation, where behaviour that resembles a small part of a complex behaviour receives reinforcement, with more reinforcement being provided to the organism as it learns the total behaviour. Gerald Patterson and his research colleagues are cited as being leaders in terms of utilizing Operant Conditioning Therapies focusing on shaping new behaviour through positive reinforcement (Novaco, 1985). In their view, aggression is seen as a 'high-amplitude response' that forces a reaction from the environment. Aggression is seen as the outcome of socialization where the reactions of adults and other children provide reinforcement that shapes the behaviour of the client. In Patterson's (Patterson et al., 1967) initial study, it was found that children who were initially rated low for aggression were conditioned by peers to accelerate to high levels of aggression and that this acceleration was a function of the frequency of victimization and the successfulness of the counter-attack.

Successive research on families has found that aggressive children more frequently come from coercive families where they frequently encounter aversive events and contribute to

the acceleration of coercive exchanges by persistently misbehaving despite punishment.

Patterson developed a treatment program which involved teaching parenting skills using behaviour modification techniques. A number of studies are cited in which the effectiveness of these techniques are reported (eg. Patterson, 1974; Patterson et al, 1972; Patterson, Ray, and Shaw, 1968; and Patterson and Reid, 1973).

A more recent study by Budd, Leibowitz, Riner, Mindell, and Goldfarb (1981) reviewed a nine week summer program for behaviour-problem children using parents to reinforce positive behaviour. This program was found to be effective in modifying the behaviours of all but two of the children in the treatment group.

Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions

Cognitive-Behavioral interventions are the type of program most frequently offered and researched in contemporary literature (Novaco, 1985). The origins of this approach can be traced to theorists such as Kelly (1955), Beck, (1963,1967), and Ellis, (1962). Of these, Ellis was the only one to deal directly with anger control as he extended his Rational-Emotive therapy to include this area. Novaco (1975,1976) developed a program taking a coping skills approach to chronic anger problems. This program taught cognitive mediation skills such as attentional focusing

strategies, cognitive re-structuring, problem solving skills, and self-instruction skills, as well as utilizing arousal relaxation methods or relaxation counter-conditioning. He found the cognitive part of the program to be more effective than the relaxation counter-conditioning, but both to be more effective when presented simultaneously.

Novaco's methods were used by other researchers with some success. For example, Denicola and Sandler (1980) using Novaco's procedures to treat abusive parents and found a decrease in parent and child aversive behaviour, maintained at three months.

Spirito, Finch, Smith and Cooley (1981) reported the successful application of this approach to the anger problems of a ten year old boy, and improvements among groups of institutionalized youth have been reported by Schlicter and Horan (1979) and Schrader et al (1977).

Feindler and Fremouw (1983) found this approach effective in controlling explosive behaviour among adolescents, and Feindler et al (1980) found that child care workers in a residential facility could implement an anger control program with beneficial effects for their wards (Novaco, 1985).

Novaco (1985, p.30) has summarized the research by making some general statements about anger management programs. He notes that: "there is sufficient evidence from a variety of studies to conclude that problems of anger and aggression can be remediated. Treatment effects have been maintained at

follow-up, but this has been demonstrated to a lesser degree".

There has continued to be research contributions in this area over the past few years, especially but not exclusively in the area of programs for battering husbands.

Edleson (1984) describes a group program for men who batter their spouses, with the program containing both progressive relaxation training as well as cognitive-behavioral therapy as outlined by Novaco.

Saunders (1984) describes a program called Alternatives to Aggression which is another program for battering husbands, and one which uses systematic desensitization and cognitive-behavioral therapy to teach clients alternate methods of dealing with their anger. Saunders describes the screening process for the program, the types of clients who appeared to do well in the program, and so on. Sessions were evaluated by having the clients complete anonymous written tests each week, with results inconclusive but promising in terms of short-term effects. The participants showed significant decreases in levels of depression and sex-role rigidity from before to after treatment.

Edleson (1985) reports results of an evaluation of the group program outlined in his 1984 article referenced above. His findings revealed that the incidence of self-reported battering behaviour dropped dramatically during the program and that battering had not resumed in the majority of cases after a six-month follow up.

Deschner et al (1986) describe a group program for treating couples together, again designed to treat battering husbands. Groups broke up into separate men's and women's groups, and then met as a larger group for a part of each session. Components of this program included a cognitive-behavioral portion as well as assertion training. A seven-step model of family violence is also proposed for future research. In the evaluation of their program, Deschner et al found that, in general, participants had significantly fewer arguments, displayed lower intensity of anger when provoked, and rated their marriages as being more satisfactory than before. Fifteen couples (54% of the total number of participants) responded to a follow-up survey conducted eight months later, with eight couples reporting no violence, and five couples reporting 1-4 minor altercations. A further follow-up one year later found 85% of those contacted did not use violence again.

Deffenbacher et al (1986) completed two studies, both using first year psychology students as subjects. In the first study, students were classified as either 'high-anger' or 'low-anger' individuals, and compared in terms of their heart-rates after experiencing a provocation. Findings were that there was no difference in terms of heart-rate, but a secondary finding was that the 'high-anger' students also experienced a much higher level of general anxiety. In order to follow up on this finding, a second study was designed in

which 'high-anger' subjects were treated for high anxiety with relaxation training. It was found that this training successfully reduced general anger reported by the subjects at five-week and one year follow-ups as compared to control groups. Deffenbacher notes that this was true even though the students did not report lower anxiety, the problem that the treatment was designed to alleviate. He concludes that the relaxation training is helpful in dealing with anger management, countering Novaco's findings that relaxation therapy alone was ineffective in dealing with anger problems.

In a later study, Deffenbacher et al (1988) followed up on their earlier study and examined the relative effectiveness of cognitive and cognitive-relaxation conditions in reducing general anger. Their sample consisted of a group of 45 introductory psychology students who: (a) scored high on an Anger Scale; (b) described themselves as having significant anger problems and desiring help for it; and (c) volunteered to take the program when contacted over the telephone. The students were broken up into two groups, with one group being given the cognitive training only while the other group received cognitive as well as relaxation training. Findings were encouraging but similar for both groups over a fifteen month follow-up period, with a maintenance of treatment effects for approximately fifty percent of the two groups as compared to a control group.

Kendall et al (1990) compared the effects of a cognitive-

behavioral therapy with those of a supportive psycho-dynamic therapy in a psychiatric day hospital for treatment of conduct-disordered youths. It was found that cognitive-behavioral treatment led to significant improvements in teachers' blind ratings of class-room behaviour, indicating a reduction in impulsivity, as well as on measures indicating increases in appropriate behaviour and adaptive functioning. Both treatments produced some significant gains, and some measures did not find any therapeutic change.

The study was not designed to address long term treatment effects. However, it did include data obtained four months after the first application of cognitive-behavioral treatment for one of the groups (a cross-over design was used so two groups each received alternate treatments, then switched and took the other one). An absence of maintenance of treatment gains was found, suggesting the effects of the treatment did not last very long after the program was completed.

In summary, there is continuing interest in the presentation of anger management and related programming to various groups both in the community and particularly, in juvenile institutions. Although there could certainly be more research done on programs such as those reviewed above, there also is a great deal of interest in measuring the effects these programs have on their participants. In the next section, issues associated with measuring the effectiveness of correctional treatment programming will be discussed.

EFFECTIVENESS OF CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT PROGRAMMING

In 1964, Robert Martinson and a team of colleagues were commissioned by the New York State Governor's Committee on Criminal Offenders to undertake a comprehensive survey of what was known about rehabilitation. Their review of over two hundred studies (they included only those which they felt met basic standards of social science research) indicated that while there were some exceptions, in general, rehabilitative efforts reported up to that date had not been found to have an appreciable or significant effect on recidivism rates.

Their review focussed on the following types of programs in particular - education and vocational training, programs for youths and adults, individual counselling, group counselling, transforming institutional environments, medical treatment, sentencing, decarcerating the convict, psychotherapy in community settings, probation or parole versus prison, intensive parole supervision, 'treatment effects' versus 'policy effects', and community treatment. In general, their findings were that none of these programs had been proven to reduce recidivism rates amongst offenders after their release to the community. This was not a popular view at the time. Martinson noted that the researchers fought a losing battle to have the final report of their study released to the public, and that it finally became public only

when an attorney subpoenaed it from the state as evidence in a trial in the Bronx Supreme Court.

Far from being a reactionary, unsympathetic or superficial review of correctional treatment programming, Martinson's review appears to be thoughtful and incisive-features that made it all the more damaging to those who were supportive of the expansion of correctional treatment programming.

Martinson concluded his review with some suggestions for research and one suggestion for programming that the research showed might have some promise. Martinson stated that while the research seemed to indicate that we couldn't do more for inmates, we could safely do less for or to them, meaning we could safely and more cheaply release low-risk criminals to the community sooner (Martinson, 1974).

Martinson's research suggestions were fairly simple - conduct better research on all programs, even programs that are rooted in correctional tradition (e.g. sentencing to achieve deterrence) so that those programs that are beneficial can be identified and used more and those that are not beneficial can be discontinued.

The publication of Martinson's article sparked a good deal of controversy in corrections, and it was not long before another researcher published a paper arguing that correctional treatment programs did in fact work.

Palmer (1975) attempted to refute Martinson's

conclusions, commencing his article with a discussion of how Martinson's comments may have 'sounded the death knell' for correctional intervention. He also reviewed all of the literature Martinson had listed as showing positive effects, indicating that this would illustrate the excessive pessimism that those influenced by Martinson's article were expressing. Palmer built on these trends, illustrating those areas where he felt there was adequate evidence, showing some programs had different outcomes than others when recidivism was measured. He discussed offender characteristics and their relationship to recidivism rates, interaction with treatment settings, matching of workers and youths, and pointed out that offenders who are described as 'middle risk' are more likely to be placed in more open settings, and receive and benefit from treatment programming than those offenders who are described as 'high-risk'. Palmer concluded by suggesting that Martinson's question was possibly incorrect, and that rather than asking 'what works', we should be asking what works best for each type of offender.

Martinson subsequently responded to Palmer's article. He rejected Palmer's assertion that he had somehow 'glossed over' studies which were positive in nature, pointing out (correctly) that Palmer was quoting these studies from his paper, and so they clearly had not been ignored. He, in turn, questioned some of the methods used by Palmer in arguing against his conclusions. In particular, he took Palmer to

task for a table used in his article in which studies were characterized as having positive, partly positive, ambiguous, or negative results, and the positives and partly positives were added together and expressed as a percentage of the total number of studies reviewed. Martinson described this table as 'meaningless' and 'sophomoric', asking whether 'partly positive' was something like being 'partly pregnant'. He further criticized Palmer for introducing new research into the discussion which he did not have access to at the time his article was published. Martinson further explained that his intent was not to disillusion practitioners but rather, to provide important and valuable information to everyone working in corrections.

Martinson (1976, p.190) expanded on his conclusion that 'nothing works' in corrections with the following comment:

"Let me essay a more accurate statement: the addition of isolated "treatment" elements to a system (probation, imprisonment, parole) in which a given flow of offenders has generated a gross rate of recidivism has very little effect (and, in most cases, no effect) in making this rate of recidivism better or worse. The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment can be reduced to this scrap of knowledge. It is a mere scrap because we are unable to say why it is so."

Martinson asserts that rather than searching for methods that would work for everyone, he was reporting information to the public about the programs presently in operation. He states that information such as this is important in the search for knowledge in corrections.

These articles were reviewed in order to provide a background to the reader on correctional treatment programming and why it is viewed as a controversial area in corrections. Many later authors seem to choose sides between Martinson or Palmer, describing the debate as 'polarized' or 'emotional' in nature, and then going on to their particular topic, often using Palmer's initial article and several others that he later published as providing evidence that somehow Martinson's conclusions were erroneous. (e.g. Gendreau and Ross, 1979, Van Voorhis, 1987, Andrews, 1979, Evans, 1980).

Gendreau and Ross (1979) reviewed literature dealing with the effectiveness of correctional treatment programming five years after Martinson's article first appeared, using data from studies completed after Martinson's review was completed (from 1968 and on). They too (as Martinson did in 1974) found very few studies that were methodologically sound to base their comments on. However, they were able to conclude that a good deal of evidence existed to support the notion that some programs did in fact 'work' for some people. In particular, they noted examples of behaviour modification programs such as Achievement Place, a community-based program for adolescents in which recidivism rates of graduates was 35% lower than the rates of two other groups of adolescents used as controls, and several other behavioral programs with similar results.

They continued along this vein to discuss counselling

programs, diversion, bio-medical assistance, and miscellaneous other treatment programs that had all been found to have some success in reducing recidivism rates among clients. Other types of programs in which literature and research was reviewed were alcohol treatment programs, drug treatment programs, and sex offender programs. While pointing out that some programs had been found to be ineffective, they noted that others had been found to be effective for certain types of offenders.

In their discussion of implications and theory for future programs, Gendreau and Ross (1979) addressed the view that 'nothing works' in corrections by discussing problems of previous research efforts under the following headings: release as a single treatment method, release as a single outcome measure, interactions and individual differences, not enough treatment, and lack of interrelation among agencies.

In their conclusion, they commented that by maintaining a negative outlook towards correctional treatment even though there was evidence to the contrary, the correctional system was able to avoid responsibility for attempting to provide appropriate programs to meet the needs of offenders.

In a somewhat more recent article, Vito (1983) discusses an evaluation of an in-prison treatment program for substance-abusing offenders based on the unit management concept. Participants in the program were placed on a separate treatment unit. Vito had already co-authored and published

an article on the evaluation of the program, in which the researchers indicated that although there were measurable changes in the offenders as they went through the program, these effects did not seem to carry on once the offender was released to the community. In this article, he discusses methodological problems that might explain the lack of findings.

The first possible solution that Vito suggested was the failure of the research to follow a time-series format, which he felt may have provided better information, with the second being the failure to adequately measure the effect of treatment, and the third being erosion of the treatment effect. Of special interest to this paper is a statement that Vito (1983, p. 19) makes regarding the erosion of the treatment effect: "Indeed, a prison based program would have to have an extremely potent treatment in order to affect the individuals' behaviour in the outside world. For this reason, the expectations of project officials may have been somewhat unrealistic." He concludes by indicating the intent of his article was to assist others involved in this type of research in determining the limitations of correctional treatment programming.

Ayers et al (1980) describe an educational program at the University of Victoria in which the cognitive development of offenders was encouraged by providing them with academic courses with a core curriculum of English and History and

also, by attempting to foster the sense of an 'alternate community' in which the beliefs and attitudes of the students could be safely challenged and discussed.

Their evaluation of this program compared 74 program participants to a matched group of 74 non-participants. Their findings revealed the recidivism rates to be 16% for the participants over a follow-up period ranging from six months to four years with an average of twenty months as opposed to 52% for non-participants over a similar time period.

Ross and Fabiano (1981) review the literature related to cognitive development based programs starting with the University of Victoria program described by Ayers et al (1980), and including several additional studies of programs which were similar in nature. The main thrust of their review and discussion was to point out the possibility that cognitive deficits could be linked to criminal activities, and that programs aimed at reducing criminal activity should include a component which would assist the participants to develop their cognitive skills. They point out some shortcomings in the literature and suggest areas where further research should be done, asserting that:

"Research on the efficacy of correctional intervention indicates that many programs which focus on broadening the offender's view of the world, improving their ability to comprehend the thoughts and feelings of other people, enhancing their reasoning skills and their interpersonal problem-solving skills, and helping them to develop alternative interpretations of their social environment have been effective in reducing recidivism rates among large groups of juvenile and

adult offenders". (Ross and Fabiano, 1981, p.73)

This theme continues to be developed by other authors and by particularly Ross in later works.

Van Voorhis (1987) asserts that the extreme 'nothing works' orientation characteristic of correctional officials and practitioners has had the effect of preventing them from implementing programs even where there is sufficient research evidence available to recommend that changes be made. She goes on to cite a considerable amount of research evidence supporting the following three policy suggestions:

1) interventions must target institutions and groups as well as individuals (ie., families, peer groups, schools, etc.);

2) differential treatment programs are more likely to be successful than programs which treat all clients the same; and

3) ample evidence exists to justify discontinuing the use of traditional training schools for youths.

Van Voorhis (1987) documents research evidence to support these suggestions for policy change, and lays the blame for lack of action in these areas to a simple unwillingness on the part of many decision-makers to follow through with decisions that might cost money. She cites examples of some states that have closed their traditional training schools for youths with positive results, and states that there is really no excuse to continue to 'hold back' replacing these facilities elsewhere as well. She concludes her article with the comment

that correctional agencies are at a disadvantage when trying to advocate any change as politicians need fear no political recriminations if they seek to cut budgets in the correctional field.

Gottfredson (1987) reviewed evaluations of programs based on the Guided Group Interaction concept, in an effort to determine what had been learned about this program during the roughly thirty years that it has been utilized in various settings in North America. He started out reviewing several well-known studies such as the Highfields, Provo, Silverlake and Collegefields experiments, and then discussed other studies of various institutional and school-based programs. He notes that the Guided Group Interaction Program developed into a 'fad' and was used in various new institutional and school settings. He also comments on the appropriateness of the evaluations completed on many of these programs (indicating that many of them were self-serving and claimed to have accomplished more than any empirical evidence would suggest).

Gottfredson's analysis is interesting in that it points out how a particular philosophy or program can proliferate even in the absence of any research evidence showing that the program works. Gottfredson (1987, p. 709) concludes that:

"because the efficacy and beneficial nature of these interventions has not been consistently demonstrated, these interventions should be applied only in an experimental context...Second, GGI in the context of community treatment has support as an alternative to incarceration. The combination has

achieved superior or similar results at a lower cost than has confinement. Third, community treatment using GGI as an alternative to traditional probation also has some support. Fourth, there is no credible and consistent evidence of benefits of GGI derivatives in schools, and there is some evidence that they occasionally have unintended negative effects."

As a final comment, Gottfredson (1987) states that in contemplating future trials, it might be useful to seek ways to avoid delinquent peer interaction entirely rather than try and modify it through a GGI program.

This article relates back to Martinson's articles in that it has the effect of 'de-bunking' claims made by proponents of a particular program on its effectiveness. Whereas Gottfredson is fairly generous in his recommendation that Guided Group Interaction programs be maintained as an alternative to imprisonment, he bases this recommendation on the fact that this type of program is cheaper rather than because it has been proven to have better results than imprisonment of young offenders.

Andrews (1989) discusses the concept of risk assessments in relation to reducing recidivism rates among offenders, and is clearly in support of the notion that it is important to 'target' offenders with certain types of problems and provide these offenders with appropriate programming. He asserts that services should focus more on the higher risk offenders wherever possible, and that lower risk offenders be simply identified and diverted out of the criminal justice system as

soon as possible.

According to Andrews (1989), research evidence suggests that programming such as intensive parole supervision has been shown to reduce recidivism rates among higher-risk offenders. However, it has not had the same impact for lower-risk offenders who are more capable of fending for themselves. (In fact, they may even increase recidivism rates for the lower-risk offenders). He then goes on to discuss the issue of providing programming for inmates based on their real needs rather than generic programming. Related to this issue is his discussion of the responsivity of programs, and in which he points out some programs that have been found to be effective in corrections and others that have been found to be ineffective in recent literature in the area.

In closing, Andrews (Andrews, 1989, p.17) takes issue with what he terms to be the 'antiprediction' or 'antirehabilitation' themes that he feels are "deeply woven into much of mainstream criminology".

Unfortunately, however, rather than discussing the issue of the effectiveness of treatment programs on the basis of research or theoretical development, his stance is a combative one, as he deals with the criticism of these criminologists by ridicule, rather than by using reason.

According to Evans (1990), Canadian researchers have provided support for rehabilitative efforts. He discusses the importance of encouraging efforts into improving research

and programming in corrections in general. Once again, the contention that programs within institutions are worthwhile is being supported in this article, with the suggestion that a Canadian perspective is developing because much of the recent work supporting rehabilitative efforts within corrections has been done in Canada.

SUMMARY

A review of the literature on the effectiveness of correctional treatment programming shows a continuing conflict between those who are providing services to offenders, and those who are given the responsibility of evaluating these programs. It would appear, however, that there is a definite resurgence of the rehabilitative ideal, particularly in the Canadian correctional literature.

One issue that should be discussed in this section is the question of evaluating programs on the basis of the ability of the program to reduce recidivism rates among those who have completed the program. Several of the studies reviewed earlier in this paper indicated that this is sometimes an inappropriate yardstick to use in measuring program effectiveness (ie., Palmer, 1975; Gendreau and Ross, 1979; Van Voorhis, 1987) as recidivism is a complex issue that may be influenced by many variables both in and out of the institution, and unlikely to be explained by participation in one or more programs.

As noted by Van Voorhis (1987), the community and/or family situation an individual must cope with upon full release to the community is often either the same situation or a very similar situation to that which contributed to his or her initial criminal behaviour. Attention should be paid,

therefore to carefully consider the community situation when searching for reasons why correctional treatment programs do or do not work.

Vito (1982) also makes a similar point, indicating that in order to affect recidivism rates, a program must be very potent indeed, a statement that supports Martinson's (1976) conclusion that adding treatment elements to a system such as probation, imprisonment or parole has very little effect in terms of making the recidivism rates any better or worse.

Despite problems which may prevent changes in recidivism rates, it is evident that recidivism rates have been influenced by some programs within institutions (ie., Ayers et al, 1980) and when there are results that show a program to be effective, it seems to be appropriate to have asked the question and report the answer.

Perhaps the best way to look at the issue of long-term effectiveness would be to more carefully clarify the goals of a program during the evaluation process. Many programs may list the reduction of crime as a long-term goal and are evaluated on that basis when the program they are running can have little to offer in the way of long-term treatment for criminal behaviour. A good example of this are half-way houses which have often been criticised for not being able to prove reduction in criminal activities among their residents. A review of the goals of these half-way houses would likely reveal that many of these houses simply exist to provide

housing and food for destitute inmates. It would therefore be appropriate to ask whether these houses are doing a good job of providing shelter or food in evaluations, although it may also be important to find out if they can have an effect on recidivism.

In summary, the question of the effectiveness of correctional treatment programming is in many ways a very difficult one to deal with, as there are intelligent and important points made on both sides of the question. It appears that those wishing to evaluate programs of this nature must confine their evaluations to the objectives of the programs, and conversely, those who provide correctional treatment programming should confine their objectives to what the program can realistically hope to accomplish.

The practical implications of the argument are that the program in question should be evaluated as thoroughly as possible to determine what effects, if any, it had on its participants. In the next section, the implementation of the Anger Management Program intervention will be discussed.

III. DESCRIPTION OF INTERVENTION

The intervention consisted of four separate tasks, as follows:

- (1) Research in Anger Management and similar programs that have been presented to groups in the past;
- (2) Development of the Program and the Program Handbook;
- (3) Presentation of the program to a group of participants; and
- (4) Evaluation of the program.

RESEARCH

As an Anger Management Program had been offered previously at Stony Mountain Institution, some information was available which described the content of the program. The initial task was to gather all of the information available on the old program, and then expand the search for information. Because the information was held separately by the individuals who had originally presented the program, each of these people was interviewed to determine what their experience with the program had been like, and to garner any comments or advice they might wish to offer to this project. This was a fruitful exercise as these individuals had much to

offer in respect to some of the issues which were likely to be encountered, as well as information on issues such as portions of the program which did not seem to be appropriate for the target group.

The second part of the research component of the practicum consisted of a review of the literature in the area of anger management programs. As much of this literature has already been discussed in the review of the literature section of this report, it will not be expanded upon further at this time except in a general way.

Anger management programs have been offered to various groups, notably young offenders and battering husbands for many years, commencing around the mid-seventies and continuing to expand to new communities as a sort of movement to provide previously unavailable services to these clients up to and including the present time. The formats of these programs appear to vary from group to group depending on the target groups, the resources available, and the goals of the specific programs. The content of the programs in terms of the information discussed within the groups appears to have been similar in many cases, as many of these groups tended to follow a cognitive behavioral model, and as the nature of the problems being discussed are similar.

Most of the programs reviewed include cognitive skills training as well as relaxation training or systematic desensitization training, and many also incorporate other

types of training such as assertiveness training, communications skills training, life skills training, and so on.

The task in this practicum was to develop a program that was appropriate for the setting (ie. appropriate for offenders currently incarcerated in a federal penitentiary), and structured so that the program could be offered on a regular basis even if there was a turn-over of staff providing the training. It was envisioned that those people involved in training would be Institutional Case Management Officers. Although the educational backgrounds of these individuals vary, most would have an undergraduate degree in Arts with some knowledge of Psychological and Sociological theory, and most would have a good understanding of the inmate subculture and group dynamics because of the nature of their jobs. Few, however, would have had the opportunity to provide training to inmates, and even fewer would have the opportunity or time to actually develop program materials for a program such as the Anger Management Program.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROGRAM

As noted above, the major task of this practicum was to develop and test an anger management program for inmates of a federal institution, and to describe the program in a handbook so that future trainers (normally Case Management Officers working full-time in the institution) would be easily able to prepare themselves to present the program. In discussions with the Head of Case Management, it was decided that the program be documented in a fashion which would provide the trainers with all of the information they would need to present each session and which could be easily understood and implemented. Accordingly, the handbook was developed with separate modules for each different major topic discussed, with the objectives of each module, presentation guides for each session, and material for each session carefully outlined.

In conjunction with the handbook, a manual was developed for the participants which would have all of the handouts and assignments incorporated within it so that they could prepare for each session and follow along with the presentations if they so desired. Having the handouts and other materials in a participant manual form also serves the purpose of preventing loss of paper and consolidating the material in one place for future reference.

The presentations in the handbook were developed largely

from the handouts which were in the participant manuals, and so the participants had a summary of the program in the written material handed out to them. In addition to this, copies of the transparencies used in the program were included in the participant manuals for those who might wish to take notes as they followed the presentations. This material was intended to provide the opportunity for participants to prepare for the sessions if they so desired, as participation from the group members through the discussion of the topics is the mode of presentation of much of the material.

The format of the program was discussed with the Head of Case Management, and it was decided that the old program format would be changed to incorporate some new components, notably additional role-playing as well as relaxation exercises at the end of each session since these both appeared to be important components of programs for similar groups cited in the literature (eg. Novaco, 1985).

FORMAT OF THE PROGRAM

The format of the final program included an initial introductory session in which pre-tests were written, seven sessions dealing with anger management, two sessions on communication skills, and two sessions on assertiveness skills, followed by a wrap-up session in which the post-tests were written.

Each participant was expected to complete a daily Anger

Log in which he recorded incidents which caused him to experience anger each day, along with his reaction to the events, and the consequences of the event. These logs were to be reviewed at the beginning of each session. In addition to this, each session ended with a relaxation exercise which progressed over time to a relaxation exercise with systematic desensitization procedures during which participants were asked first to fully relax, then imagine themselves in a provocative situation which they normally have difficulty handling, and then relax again while imagining themselves dealing with the situation in an appropriate manner.

There were two half-day sessions each week of the program, with each session starting with a review of the anger log, followed by a presentation of material, using 'brainstorming' or other exercises intended to encourage discussion. After a coffee break, the sessions continued with either the presentation of more material, a written exercise or role-playing to demonstrate information presented earlier. After the exercise was completed, each session was completed with the relaxation exercise.

Trainers who were selected to be involved in presenting the program were provided with the first half of the handbook well in advance of the beginning of the program, and the second half shortly after the program started, so they had sufficient time to review the information and prepare for the sessions. As the program unfolded, however, it became clear

that these staff members were reluctant to assist in the presentations, preferring to observe and assist in tasks such as setting up the room, making coffee, assisting in the role-plays, and reading through the relaxation exercises with the participants.

PRESENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

After the program was developed, a group of participants was selected among the inmates at Stony Mountain Institution to participate in the initial program, which was provided during a six week period in October and November of 1990. A team of two trainers was selected from among the Case Management staff at Stony Mountain Institution, with the understanding that they were to participate in the program by observing and assisting in any way they felt comfortable, and from their experience decide whether they wished to become involved in organizing later programs.

As noted above, these staff members did not assist in the presentation of the program, preferring to observe and assist in the exercises instead. While the program was being offered, these trainers had difficulty finding time to attend sessions and were unable to prepare extensively for the sessions because of the demands of their regular jobs. This highlights one of the problems with providing programs in an institutional setting - the lack of resources allocated to program activities. If programs of this nature are to be offered in a relatively professional way with well-trained and experienced instructors, it would make sense to hire people who have the qualifications to do this type of work and in sufficient numbers that they can do the job. The present policy of the Correctional Services of Canada is to make

appropriate programs available to the inmates. However, fiscal restraint makes this policy difficult to implement.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

Referrals for the course were solicited from the Case Management department by sending them a letter outlining the program and the type of participants who would most likely benefit from the program. It was felt that this method would elicit sufficient referrals since the department has access to the correctional treatment plans of all of the inmates of the institution. A total of twelve referrals were received, all of whom had been approached by their Case Management Officers and had indicated an interest in involving themselves in the program. Each person referred was then interviewed by a panel consisting of the Head of Case Management, the author, and the two co-trainers. Of those twelve referrals, nine participants were selected to participate in the program. The three who were not selected were screened out for various reasons. In one case, a participant had been scheduled to be transferred to the Regional Psychiatric Centre in Saskatoon while the program would be running. In another case, the inmate refused to participate after being given the information about the nature of the program, stating that it was "not for him". The last person screened out had just started a lengthy sentence and although he very much wanted to attend, bowed out because there was an "incompatible" (an

enemy of his) scheduled to attend the program at the same time.

In retrospect, it would have been preferable to spend more time and effort selecting participants, possibly by gathering more information about them in a separate interview, finding out from their Case Management Officers how they were likely to behave in a group situation, and so on. The compatibility of group members was a problem that resulted in the failure of two group members to complete the program. The inmates of an institution have a good deal of contact with each other outside the group. Conflicts can arise as a result of information shared within the group, or other issues. Careful selection with compatibility as one of the criteria for acceptance into a particular group should certainly be stressed in any future groups.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GROUP

The selection process being completed, we were left with nine reasonably motivated individuals who had all been informed of the nature of the program and had agreed to some basic ground rules related to attendance and acceptable behaviour within the group. Of these nine participants, two dropped out of the program prior to completion as a result of the interpersonal problems noted above. The characteristics of the seven remaining participants who completed the program are outlined below. This information was collected from the

inmate admission forms and criminal record sheets.

Because the institution is for male offenders only, all group members were male. The average age of the participants was 26.8 years, with the youngest participant being twenty years of age and the oldest participant being thirty-three years of age. Three of the participants were Caucasian, while three others were status Indians, and the final member was Metis. At the time of admission, four of the seven participants were involved in common-law relationships, while two were married and the final one was single. Six of the seven were Manitoba residents at the time of their arrest, with one being a resident of Saskatchewan. The average educational level for the participants was slightly below grade ten, ranging from grade seven to grade twelve. There were no participants who had Community College or University level educations.

Four of the participants were serving their first federal sentence, with two of the remaining participants serving their second sentence, and the final participant serving his fourth federal sentence. Six of the participants had a record of at least one prior sentence served in a provincial gaol (for sentences of under two years), while the one participant with no record of provincial sentences was also the one who was then serving his fourth federal sentence. Of the six participants who had a record of prior terms served in provincial gaol, the average number of provincial sentences

served was 3.5, with the actual numbers ranging from one to eight sentences. All of the participants could therefore be described as having spent significant periods of time in either provincial or federal correctional institutions.

The major offenses of four of the participants were either Assault or Aggravated Assault, with one of the remaining three participants serving a sentence for Break and Enter, one being convicted of Manslaughter, and the final one being convicted of Second Degree Murder. Sentences for the Assault and Break and Enter charges ranged from two (2) to three and a half (3.5) years, with the average sentence being two years, seven months, and two days. The sentences for the remaining two participants were sixteen years and life with no eligibility for parole for a period of ten years. The individual convicted of second degree murder had no prior record of violent offenses, while all of the others had a prior record of at least one conviction for assault (and, in one case, nine prior assaults and one manslaughter).

The average number of assault convictions listed on the criminal records of these six individuals was 3.8. Only assault, one conviction for attempted forcible confinement and one conviction for manslaughter were included in this calculation. Convictions for all other offenses, including robbery, break and enters, forgeries, and so on were not tabulated because the focus of the program was on violent behaviour. These other convictions, it should be pointed out,

numbered well into the hundreds of offenses, and represented a significant amount of criminal activity in addition to the convictions for violent behaviour outlined above. Robbery was not included as a violent offence, as there was no way to determine from the criminal records whether violence occurred.

CO-TRAINERS

The two co-trainers who were to assist in presenting the program were both Case Management Officers working full-time at Stony Mountain Institution who expressed an interest in becoming involved with a program of this nature. Their role in the presentation of the program was to assist in selecting the group members, to observe how the program was run, and assist in any way they felt comfortable in presentations. One of them had experience with the relaxation exercises. Therefore, she took responsibility for that part of the program, as well as helping out with some of the role-plays, setting up equipment, making coffee, etc. The other one was uncomfortable presenting to the group and observed the sessions, helping by becoming involved with some of the role-plays, setting up equipment, making coffee, and so forth.

Both of these individuals were interested in the process and indicated an interest in future involvement in similar programs, provided they could arrange for sufficient time away from their regular jobs to prepare, get involved in related training and professional development, and so on. This

institutional assistance may be forthcoming in the future. However, at the present time, there does not appear to be much incentive for staff members to get involved with programs of this nature.

PROBLEM AREAS

During the first few sessions of the program, it emerged that one of the participants in the group had a reputation among the other inmates as being "crazy", and the other inmates tended to ridicule him and were extremely rude and cruel to him during the sessions and in breaks. Although this behaviour was generally controlled by the trainers during the sessions, an incident eventually occurred in which this individual and another group member got into a "shoving match" just prior to a session. The two of them were separated and agreed to reconcile. However, a different group member got into another altercation with the person who was identified as being "crazy" later on that evening, with the result that they were both placed into segregation and could not finish the program. This incident was extremely unfortunate, putting a damper on the rest of the group members, and making it impossible for those two group members to finish the program.

This incident clearly illustrates the importance of selecting group members to ensure they are more or less compatible with each other, especially in an institutional setting where group members have a lot of contact with each

other between sessions. It also illustrates some of the problems that trainers can expect to have to deal with when working with a group of people who have poor control of their tempers.

ATTENDANCE

Attendance in the group can be characterized as good for the majority of the group members. As noted, two members did not complete the group. One had only attended four of the eight sessions that had been given before that time and in the sessions he did attend did not appear to have much commitment to or interest in the program. The other had attended seven of the eight sessions up to the point when he was placed into segregation, but in the sessions had not shown a great deal of interest in or understanding of the material.

LOG-BOOKS

Completion of log books or diaries itemizing the number and type of incidents in which the group members became angry was required of all group members, partly as a way of sensitizing them to what types of things made them angry and also to provide a self-reported measure of anger frequency. This has been done in several of the studies completed on similar programs in the literature (for example, Currie, 1987). Unfortunately, the group members were unable or unwilling to do this in a comprehensive or consistent fashion.

Part of the reason for this was obviously related to the poor writing skills of some of the group members. However, a large part of the problem seemed to result from a lack of trust in the trainers and other participants in the program, especially during the initial stages when the participants did not know each other or the trainers well. The two group members who fairly regularly filled out their log book pages stated in the follow up interview that they felt that writing down the things that made them angry was useful in allowing them to realize the specific situations that angered them. Because of the poor response to completing the Anger Log, the portion of the sessions devoted to discussing log book entries was shortened, and the evaluation component of the program based on self-reports of violent behaviour in log book entries was dropped.

Some alternate types of log books could be tried in future groups of this nature, including providing the participants with dictaphones that they could use while taking the program for later transcription and analysis, providing very directive closed-ended questions on each page of the log-books, and so on. As the use of log books assist the group members in clarifying their own needs and feelings for discussion in the groups, it may be worthwhile to pursue alternative methods of recording log books to accommodate group members who have difficulty expressing themselves in writing or who do not wish to share the information in the

log-books with other group members.

IMAGINAL SCENES

The participants were asked to complete written detailed descriptions of five imaginal scenes of situations they found particularly difficult to deal with. These scenes were to be kept by each participant in their manuals, and used in conjunction with the relaxation exercises to assist them in systematically desensitizing themselves to these scenes. The participants would go through the relaxation exercises, then be asked to look at their written scenes to remind them of the scenes, then to imagine themselves in the scene, and then imagine themselves coping with the scene successfully while remaining relaxed. The participants again seemed to have some difficulty completing these sheets even though they required very few written skills. In order to adjust the program to compensate, participants were instructed to imagine a scene that they had problems with, or look at their sheets.

RELAXATION EXERCISES

The relaxation procedures used were those developed by Jacobson (1978). Verbal instructions were given in which the participant was asked to close their eyes and breath deeply, regulating their breathing as instructed by the trainer while also contracting and then relaxing all of the muscles in their body one group at a time until they were fully relaxed.

The procedure was repeated at the end of each session, and normally took approximately ten minutes to complete. The relaxation exercises appeared to be rather well-received by the participants with the exception of one participant who did not appear to understand the necessity of them and behaved inappropriately (ie. making loud noises or smoking during the exercise). The trainers had to instruct him on several occasions to respect the rights of other group members to participate by at least not disturbing them during the exercises.

GROUP DYNAMICS

This group was difficult to facilitate in many ways because some members tended to be verbally loud and aggressive while others were very withdrawn. All group members expressed considerable hostility toward the institutional policies and procedures, and at times it was difficult to convince the group members to focus on their behaviour in a variety of situations, rather than institutional activities only. As the group members became more comfortable with the co-trainers and each other, they were more willing to risk sharing of their feelings about non-institutional situations such as family relationships, their offenses, drugs and alcohol, and so on.

FACILITIES

One problem which delayed startup of the program and made

several sessions particularly uncomfortable was the lack of adequate space to run programs of this nature in the institution. Whereas short-term programs do not appear to cause many problems, longer-term programs such as this one which lasted for six weeks, with two sessions each week appeared to cause significant scheduling problems. In a large institution such as Stony Mountain, facilities are at a premium, and trainers interested in offering programs must be well-organized and persistent to obtain and maintain access to the limited better quality facilities that are available.

AUDIO-VISUAL

The initial plans were to use transparencies for the basic information presentations and to use a flip-chart for 'brainstorming' and recording the groups' ideas about various topics. The flip-charts worked well, however the transparencies did not, mainly because the physical layout of the room did not allow for the projector to be anywhere near the area where the trainers were working. We therefore dispensed with using transparencies for the most part, working from the flip-charts almost exclusively.

We used two films entitled "You're not Listening" and "You're not Communicating" (available through the National Film Board or Winnipeg Public Libraries) in the "communications" module of the program, and the participants seemed to find them helpful explaining the concepts. They

found the particular films we used to be dated, however.

Because many of the group members had been involved in a different program which used films extensively, they were quite receptive to watching films as an integral part of a program. It may well be a good method to use when discussing such topics as family violence and parenting as a way of stimulating discussion within the group.

EVALUATION

Three separate techniques were used to evaluate the Anger Management Program; pre and post-tests, self-reports of the incidence of violent behaviour recorded in log books by the participants, and post-program interviews with each participant. Using the institutional offence records of the participants to obtain direct measures of behaviour was considered as well. However, this did not appear to be practical since the participants involved did not necessarily have poor institutional records, and this measure was therefore considered unlikely to yield any results.

PRE AND POST-TESTS

The group members were asked to write a series of three short tests before starting and after completing the Anger Management Program. The Spielberger Trait Anger Scale (Spielberger et al, 1983), the Anger Inventory (Novaco, 1974), and the Buss Durkee Inventory (Buss and Durkee, 1957) were specifically designed to measure Anger, and were used because they have proven to be effective in measuring change within other groups participating in similar programs cited in research into programs of this nature.

All three of the tests were administered to the group during the first session of the program and again during the final session of the program. Results were tabulated as group

means because of the small size of the group. Because two group members did not finish the program and could not complete the post-tests, their pre-tests were not included in the following analysis.

1) Spielberger Trait Anger Scale

pre-group mean _____ 20.14

post-group mean _____ 20.71

This scale is designed to measure general or trait anger, and consists of a 10 item questionnaire with a Likert scale (1 = almost never, 4 = almost always) in which the respondent describes how he/she generally feels. Findings show very little change in the mean scores on this test over the duration of the program, on average. Both the pre and post tests indicate a moderate, rather than a high level of anger when compared to other studies, for example Deffenbacher et al (1988) who describe three groups (total n = 45) of college students which were compared, one of which was provided with a cognitive development program, another which was provided with a cognitive-relaxation program, and a control group. Prior to the treatment, the mean score of the first treatment group was 25.46, the mean score of the second treatment group was 26.93, and the mean score of the control group was 27.27. The mean scores of the two treatment groups were reduced

following exposure to the program (to 20.40 in the case of the first group and 18.80 in the case of the second group), while the scores for the control group remained unchanged. The post-group scores of the two treatment groups discussed by Deffenbacher et al (1988) compare more favourably with both the pre and post tests of the Stony Mountain group than any of the three groups discussed in the article. Deffenbacher et al (1986) in another study using similar measures describes a 'high-anger' group of college students as having an average score of 23.81 and a 'low-anger' group of college students as having an average score of 16.26 on this scale (Deffenbacher et al, 1986). Again, the group involved in the Stony Mountain Institution program was moderate compared with these two groups in both the pre and post tests.

2) Anger Inventory

pre-group mean	_____	236.71
post-group mean	_____	257.42

This scale is designed to measure anger across a wide variety of situations, and consists of a 78 item questionnaire with a Likert (1 = not at all, 5 = very much) scale on which the respondent indicates the degree to which the incident described in the item would provoke them. In previous studies, both the Anger Inventory and the Spielberger Trait

Anger scale have been shown to correlate positively with each other and discriminate high anger individuals from other groups (Deffenbacher, et al, 1988).

Findings show a small increase in scores on this test after completion of the program. This is opposite to what would be expected in a program of this nature and in variance with other similar programs. For example, Deffenbacher (1988) compared three groups (total N = 45) of college students, one of which had been provided with a cognitive program, while the second was provided with a cognitive-relaxation program and the third was a control group. Average scores for the Anger Inventory prior to treatment for the first group was 323.27, while the average score for the second group was 322.73, and the control group was 334.13. Post treatment mean scores for the first group were 272.27, for the second group 256.13, and 335.60 for the control group. Deffenbacher (1986) compared scores on this scale for 'high-anger' and 'low-anger' groups of college students, with the mean for the high-anger group being 317.62 and the mean for the low-anger group being 235.32.

Once again, the Stony Mountain group could be described as being moderate in the post-test and low anger in the pre-test using these previous studies as comparison groups. The movement from low to moderate anger is in the opposite direction to what would be expected, and of course, is indicative of a problem in either the measurement or the

program itself. It would be worthwhile exploring this finding further by studying the results of several similar programs so that there would be sufficient numbers of subjects to compare subgroups by variables such as age, race, pre-program test scores, educational level, and so on in order to more thoroughly analyze findings of this nature.

It should also be noted here that in studies such as Deffenbacher (1988) describes, the participants were selected using high scores on the Anger Inventory as the main criteria. Individuals who scored low in their pre-tests were not given the opportunity to become involved in the groups, and therefore the amount of change that they would have experienced was not measured. The researchers were able to do this as they had a large group of college students to select their groups from, and were specifically interested in treating high-anger cases.

Although this program was also interested in treating high-anger cases, we did not incorporate the measures into the selection procedures and exclude those who did not score high on this scale from participation in the program. It was simply not possible to be as selective in terms of screening participants, and it was thought that by seeking referrals in the fashion that we did through referrals from Case Management Officers, that we would end up with the most appropriate candidates. Perhaps if the program is offered in the future the hypothesis that high-anger cases would respond better to

treatment could be tested by measuring candidates and running a program exclusively with participants could be classified as high-anger individuals.

In addition to possibly masking findings in tests intended to measure change, there is also the possibility that providing the program for a group of individuals who are 'mixed' in terms of their level of anger management skills could have a negative effect on the group experience, as group members may not be able to offer assistance or understanding to those with more serious problems.

One other possible reason for findings indicating a higher level of anger after completion of the program could be that the participants were less willing to be candid in the pre-tests than they were in the post-tests. This could happen as a result of the participants establishing a "rapport" with the instructors and feeling more willing to answer questions honestly after participating.

3) Buss-Durkee Inventory

pre-group means _____ 39.00

post-group means _____ 38.57

Buss-Durkee Inventory Subscales

Area	pre-group means	post-group means
Assault_____	5.71	5.42
Indirect_____	5.28	5.71
Irritability__	5.57	5.42
Negativism____	4.00	3.71
Resentment____	4.85	3.71
Suspicion_____	5.28	5.14
Verbal_____	8.85	9.42

The Buss Durkee Inventory (1957) was designed to measure different forms of aggression and hostility, and can be interpreted in terms of total scores as well as seven subscales covering the areas of assault, indirect, irritability, negativism, resentment, suspicion, and verbal aggression. This Inventory has been widely used as a measure of aggression and hostility, and has been found to possess construct validity in several studies (Edmunds and Kendrick, 1980).

Findings for the Stony Mountain group indicate totals that are almost identical in both the pre and post tests. The subscales did have some variations, with almost identical scores on three of the subscales: irritability, negativity,

and suspicion. Somewhat lower scores were evident in the areas of assault and resentment, and higher scores emerged in the areas of indirect and verbal aggression. Once again, as this was such a small group, there were not enough cases to generate much information from these scores. As the totals are virtually identical, it can be said that there are no appreciable difference in the pre- and post-test results as a result of participation in the Anger Management program.

The collection of more information through the study of greater numbers of subjects could assist in shedding further light on the general lack of findings in this area. However, it is also possible that the tests themselves were inappropriate for the group being studied. Poor writing skills among some of the group members made it difficult for them to complete the log books, as will be discussed in the next section, and it may well be that the same individuals who had difficulty with their written assignments had difficulty reading and responding appropriately when completing the tests.

SELF-REPORTING

In order to provide a second measurement by which the program could be evaluated, participants were asked to complete daily log-book entries listing incidents which occurred during the day where they became angry, and outlining their behaviours and the consequences of the incident. These

entries were to be analyzed in terms of the frequency with which feelings of anger were experienced as well as the frequency of violent behaviours. Unfortunately, despite the fact that the use of this log was carefully explained and routinely encouraged by the trainers, only a few of the participants used the log books, and only one participant continued to use it for the duration of the program. As the participants were not willing or able to regularly keep up the log book entries, there was very little information gathered by this particular evaluative technique.

In questioning the participants on the problems they experienced while filling out the log books, several indicated that they felt they simply had nothing to write as their lives were very regulated within the institution, and that they therefore did not become angry.

This was clearly not the case with many of the participants who described anger provoking situations which they were involved in within the institution quite frequently. Examples of situations which were frequently discussed related to the institutional staff searching their cells and disturbing their personal papers and photographs, being ignored by the institutional staff for a length of time they felt was unsuitable when they asked to be let onto or off of their range of cells, being fed late or with food they didn't like, having noisy or "crazy" neighbours on their ranges, having "bad visits" with their family members, and so on.

It is clear from the quality of the entries that were turned in that several of the group members had difficulty completing the log books because they simply didn't have adequate writing skills to complete the task. This may explain the reluctance of at least some of them to participate in the written exercises.

Another reason that the participants may have been somewhat unwilling to fill in the log books may have related to an unwillingness to provide staff members with information about incidents happening within the institution. Although the staff members involved in the program were not security staff, they were case management officers who work in the institution on a regular basis, and perhaps this would make at least some of the participants unwilling to complete the log books as well.

POST-PROGRAM INTERVIEWS

A third and final method used for evaluating the program was to conduct an interview with each participant after the program was completed asking them for their comments on the effectiveness of the program and suggestions for changes in future programs of this nature. Interviews were conducted rather than having the participants complete questionnaires in order to ensure that information was gathered from those participants who had poor writing skills as well as those for whom this was not a problem.

In general, the participants were pleased to participate in the interviews and appeared to be quite open in their answers. The questions asked in the semi-structured interview and the responses given by the participants are outlined in appendix A. To summarize briefly, the participants stated that they generally found the information they discussed in the program to be useful to them, and the format to have been appropriate to the setting. Some of them had some suggestions which they felt would improve the way the program was presented such as having three or five sessions a week rather than two, being given more homework to do, or having more and/or more varied role-playing and other exercises to do within the group.

When asked if they would recommend the program to other inmates, several of them indicated that they had already done so, and others indicated that they would if someone asked them for their opinion.

When asked how they would handle it if they felt they were going to be violent again, four out of the seven individuals who completed the program indicated they would talk about it with the other person or think about it before they did anything (both behaviours that would be considered appropriate in terms of the information discussed in the group). One of the others replied that he would only fight if he was "cornered" and had no other choice (this implies using other alternatives to fighting and reserving fighting

as a last response, although this may not be a good indicator as individuals differ greatly in terms of deciding when they feel "cornered" and what type of incidents leave them "no choice". The other two had less appropriate responses, with one saying "I don't even think like that any more" and the other simply saying "I don't know how to answer that question" (in both cases there was no expressed technique of dealing with their own anger) .

In general terms, the participants perceived the program in a positive fashion as a worthwhile experience to them. Only one of them, however, indicated any immediate benefit from attending the program (stating that he had not been going to "the hole" since attending the program), and it was clear from the interview responses that not all of the participants (four out of seven) had a good grasp of what they should do if they found themselves in a situation where they might become violent. Whether this indicates that these four individuals would actually be less prone to becoming violent in such a situation is of course impossible to predict without further research.

Although several group members mentioned that they felt the role playing was beneficial to them, none of them spontaneously mentioned having the perception that the relaxation exercises were of any benefit to them.

IV. EVALUATION OF THEORY

In order to complete this practicum, the literature related to Anger Management was reviewed and the theory behind the type of program eventually designed was outlined. The type of program selected was a cognitive-behavioral program, which is the type of program that appeared to be most appropriate and likely the most effective for a correctional setting. As the results of the evaluation were inconclusive, it is difficult to discuss the relevance of the theory with conviction.

The literature related to the controversial area of the effectiveness of any program offered in a correctional setting was also reviewed, and the lack of findings in this program lends some support to the assertion that correctional programs offered within an institution simply don't work. It was such a small group, however, that this cannot be said with any certainty either.

As programs of this nature are being offered by a growing number of correctional and other types of agencies in Canada every year, there should certainly be much more research evidence available than there is. Hopefully as various groups develop standardized programs and start to use similar

evaluative techniques, more information about the effectiveness of these types of programs will emerge.

Efforts to organize this type of standardized program evaluation system are being made by such groups as the National Clearinghouse for Family Violence, Health and Welfare Canada in publications such as The Abusive Husband (Currie, D. W., 1987). Hopefully, these efforts will succeed in the ongoing development of information about this important area of program development.

Much like the Guided Group Interaction program that was discussed earlier in the review of the literature (Gottfredson, 1987), there has been a proliferation of Anger Management Programs in the area of corrections over the past few years with insufficient attention being paid to the evaluative components of these programs. This proliferation of programming even in the absence of information on effectiveness in a correctional setting is disturbing, as it shows a disregard for the research process through which evaluations are used to guide program development. It is also unfortunate as providing the programming without gathering information which would be useful in later evaluations fails to provide information to those that would possibly have the resources and interest in studying the area at a later date.

If correctional treatment programs are to be offered, especially in large organizations such as federal or

provincial corrections, there should be an effort made to provide the necessary resources to ensure evaluations are completed on these programs and the results of these evaluations are made available to those interested in research and development in the field. There are many practitioners in the field of corrections who are providing services to various client groups and who would be able to make use of information of this nature.

The dilemma of the practitioner in the field of corrections is a very real one, and one that should be considered carefully. Many practitioners dealing with offenders feel that it is better to try and provide programming to inmates with records of violence while they are in the institution, and hope that these programs do some good, rather than withholding treatment simply because the rate of success for such attempts is low. This is a difficult problem, and one which applies not only to corrections, but also to many social service agencies which deal with violent clients or their victims. Often field workers are placed in the position where they feel an obligation to provide at least some service when the alternative is the provision of no services at all.

Seligman (1990, p.34) discusses the issue in terms of deciding whether to provide programming or choosing the option of 'no treatment', and in fact recommends no treatment be provided to groups such as clients at risk of not responding

to treatment, including "clients who are poorly motivated and not incapacitated, clients with antisocial or criminal histories, clients with malingering or factitious illnesses, and those who seem likely to become infantilized by the therapeutic process..."

Although she was not writing specifically about corrections in her book, she clearly captures many of the individuals incarcerated within institutions in this comment. Motivation is often a problem in a correctional setting, and there are many inmates who have anti-social personalities, and all have criminal histories.

While suggesting that this 'no treatment' option has benefits such as saving client and therapist time, delaying therapy until the client is receptive to treatment, and to support prior gains, she also acknowledges the fact that clinicians do not frequently use this option because they do not wish to risk withholding treatment from a client who really will be able to benefit from it.

This same dilemma faces correctional officials who make decisions about providing treatment programs within institutions. It makes sense intellectually to provide correctional treatment programming even in the absence of evidence of the efficacy of such programming because the inmates are congregated together in a fashion convenient for programming of this nature, they are frequently dangerous people who have the potential of committing violent crimes

against innocent citizens in the community upon their re-entry into society, and many of them really do want to involve themselves in treatment programming of one sort or another while they are in penitentiary.

The main danger in providing this type of program in institutional settings is not that the participants do not benefit from it but rather that those in danger of being hurt by the particular participant in question be lulled into believing that they are no longer in danger and perhaps (for example in the case of a battered wife) reunite with an individual who is still a danger to them or their children. Another problem with provision of programs of this nature is the possibility that correctional officials will base release decisions on participation in programming which again may have been ineffective in preventing a particular participant from becoming violent in the future.

V. CONCLUSION

This practicum report described the process through which an anger management program was developed, offered to a group of participants who were at that time inmates of Stony Mountain Institution, and then evaluated.

The first part of the practicum included the development of the program, and involved a good deal of research into other programs of this nature, including their relative effectiveness. It also included finding out the details of how these programs were operated, the characteristics of the groups they were designed for and presented to, the types of materials used, the presentation styles used, and so on. The review of the literature which is included in this report was largely completed during this part of the practicum. It too revealed a good deal of information about programs with similar goals being offered to groups of participants such as college students or battering husbands, as well as information on programs with different goals that had previously been offered to inmates of institutions. A good deal of important information both about the design of programs of this nature and the efficacy of various programs within institutional settings was gathered in this review.

A large part of this task included the development of a trainer's handbook outlining how the program was to be operated on a day to day basis. This was done so that staff members in the institution could be trained to run the program. It was initially envisioned that this program would be regularly offered to the inmates by Case Management staff designated to run this type of program. Whether the program will in fact be offered again by institutional staff depends very much on whether or not resources are allocated for this type of activity. It was clearly identified during this program that the time required to train staff to present programs of this nature, prepare for the sessions, attend the sessions, and complete the post-group work is simply not available to Case Management Officers who are handling other responsibilities on a full-time basis.

The second part of the practicum involved the presentation of the program to a group of participants with the assistance of institutional staff. Once again, this was a challenging task and a great deal of preparation was needed for each session in order for the trainers to be familiar enough with the information to present the material. In addition to preparing for the sessions, getting to know the group members and the staff members involved, dealing with the institutional routines, and spending two mornings a week with the participants discussing often emotional issues is a time consuming, emotional, and often rewarding experience for those

involved in the group in any way.

This portion of the practicum was very helpful in identifying which material was useful and which was inappropriate, the types of exercises the participants were interested and willing to involve themselves in and those that they were not, and so on - illustrating how important practical experience can be in gathering information on program effectiveness.

The final portion of the practicum involved the evaluation of the program. Participants were asked to write pre- and post-tests as well as to be interviewed about their perceptions of the program after its completion. To summarize briefly, pre and post-tests were used to measure changes in how the participants viewed their own levels of anger and indicated that there were no measurable changes in scores as a result of participation in the program. The individual interviews conducted with each participant indicated that despite the findings in the pre- and post-tests, they found the information relevant and useful to them, and would recommend it to other inmates.

These findings emphasize the need for further research into the effectiveness of programs of this nature offered in correctional settings to determine the types of programs which are most effective for a given client in this type of setting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrews, D. "Recidivism Is Predictable and Can be Influenced: Using Risk Assessments to Reduce Recidivism," Forum on Corrections Research, vol. 1, no. 2, 1989, pp.11-18.
- Averill, James R. Anger and Aggression: An Essay on Emotion Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.
- Ayers, D., Duguid, S., Montague, C. & Wolowidnyk, S. Effects of University of Victoria Program: A Post-Release Study. Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, 1980.
- Bandura, A. Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973.
- Budd, K.S., Leibowitz, J.M., Riner, L.S., Mindell, C., and Goldfarb, A. "Home-Based Treatment of Severe Disruptive Behaviours," Behaviour Modification, 1981, 5, 273-298.
- Currie, David W. The Abusive Husband: An Approach to Intervention. National Clearing House on Family Violence Ottawa, Ontario, 1987.
- Deffenbacher, Jerry L. et al. "High General Anger: Correlates and Treatment," Behaviour Research and Therapy, vol.24, No.4, 1986, pp.481-489.
- Deffenbacher, Jerry L. et al. "Cognitive and Cognitive-Relaxation Treatments of Anger," Cognitive Therapy and Research, vol.12, No.2, 1988, pp.167-184.
- Denicola, J. and Sandler, J. "Training Abusive Parents in Child Management and Self-control Skills," Behaviour Therapy, 1980, 11, 263-270.
- Deschner, Jeanne P. et al, "A Treatment Model for Batterers," Social Casework, Jan., 1986, pp.55-60.
- Edleson, Jeffrey L. "Working with Men who Batter," Social Work, May-June, 1984, 237-242.
- Edleson, Jeffrey L., et al, " Group Treatment for Men Who Batter," Social Work Research Abstracts, 1985.

Edmunds, G., and Kendrick, D.C., The Measurement of Human Aggressiveness Ellis Horwood Ltd., West Sussex, England, 1980.

Ekstedt, J.W., and Griffiths, G.T. Corrections in Canada: Policy and Practice Butterworths, Toronto, Ontario, 1988.

Ellis, Albert Reason and Emotion in Psychotherapy. New York, Lyle Stewart Press, 1962.

Evans, D.G., "Challenges Facing Community Corrections In the Nineties," Forum on Corrections Research, vol. 2, no. 2, 1990, pp.15-17.

Feindler, E.L., and Fremouw, W.J. "Stress Inoculation Training for Adolescent Anger Problems," in D. Meichenbaum and M. Jarenko (Eds.) Stress Reduction and Prevention. New York, Plenum Press, 1983.

Feindler, Eva L., Marriott, S.A., and Iwata, M. "Group Anger Control Training for Junior High School Delinquents," Cognitive Therapy and Research, vol.8, No.3, 1984, pp.299-311.

Foy, D.W., Eisler, R.M., and Pinkston "Modelled Assertion in a Case of Explosive Rages," Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1975, 6, pp.135-137.

Fredrickson, L., Jenkins, J., Foy, D., and Eisler, R. "Social Skills Training to Modify Abusive Verbal Outbursts in Adults," Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1976, 9, 117-125.

Gendreau, P. and Ross, R. "Effective Correctional Treatment: Bibliotherapy for Cynics," Crime and Delinquency, 5, 1990, pp.463-489.

Goldfried, M., and Davidson, G., Clinical Behaviour Therapy New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Goldstein, Arnold P., and Glick, Barry Aggression Replacement Training. Champaign, Ill.: Research Press, 1987.

Goldstein, A.P., and Krasner, L. Prevention and Control of Aggression. New York: Permagon Press, 1983.

Gondolf, E.W. and Fisher, E.R. Battered Women as Survivors: An Alternative to Treating Learned Helplessness. Lexington Books, Toronto, 1988.

Gottfredson, Gary D. "Peer Group Interventions To reduce The Risk of Delinquent Behaviour: A Selective Review and a New Evaluation," Criminology, 25, 3, 1987, pp.671-714.

Hutchinson, Bonnie (Enterprises) Breaking the Cycle of Family Violence: A Resource Handbook Prepared for the Staff of Correctional Services of Canada. Ottawa: Queen's Printers, 1988.

Jacobson, Edmund., You Must Relax (5th Edition) New York, McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Kaufman, L., and Wagener, B. "BARB: A Systematic Treatment Technology for Temper Control Disorders," Behaviour Therapy, 1972, 3, pp.84-90.

Kendall, Philip C. et al, "Cognitive-Behavioural Treatment of Cognitively Disordered Children," Cognitive Therapy and Research, vol.14, No.3, 1990, pp.279-297.

Lange, A.J., Jakubowski, P. Responsible Assertive Behaviour: Cognitive/Behavioural Procedures for Trainers. Research Press, Champaign, Ill., 1976.

Lee, D.Y., Hallberg, E.T., and Hassard, H., "Effects of Assertion Training on Aggressive Behaviour of Adolescents," Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1979, vol.26, No. 5, pp.459-61.

McMahon, Maeve, "Net-Widening: Vagaries in the Use of a Concept," The British Journal of Criminology, 30, 2, 1990, pp.121-149.

Martinson, Robert, "What Works? - questions and answers about prison reform," Public Interest, Spring, 1974, pp.22-54.

Martinson, Robert, "California Research at the Crossroads," Crime and Delinquency, April 1976, pp.180-191.

Martinson, Robert, and Wilks, Judith, "Save Parole Supervision," Federal Probation, Sept, 1977, pp.23-27.

Matson, J., and Stephens, R. "Increasing Appropriate Behaviour of Explosive Chronic Psychiatric Patients with a Social Skills Training Package," Behaviour Modification, 1978, 2, 61-76.

Matson, J. and Zeiss, R. "Group Training of Social Skills in Chronically Explosive, Severely Disturbed Psychiatric Patients," Behaviour Engineering, 1978, 5, 41-50.

Megargee, E.I. "Undercontrolled and Overcontrolled Personality Types in Extreme Antisocial Aggression," Psychological Monograph, 1966, 80, (3, whole No.611).

Novaco, R.W. Anger Control: The Development and Evaluation of an Experimental Treatment, Lexington Mass., D.C.Heath, Lexington Books, 1975.

Novaco, R.W. "Treatment of Chronic Anger Through Cognitive and Relaxation Controls," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 681-696.

Novaco, R.W. "Anger and its Therapeutic Regulation," in Chesney, M.A., and Rosenman, R.H. (Eds.) Anger and Hostility in Behavioural and Cardiovascular Disorders, Hemisphere Publishing Company, Washington, 1985.

Owen, R.G. and Ashcroft, J.B. Violence: A Guide for the Caring Professions. Croom Helm, Dover, N.H., 1985.

Palmer, Ted, "Martinson Revisited," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, July, 1975, pp.133-152.

Patterson, G.R. "Intervention for Boys with Conduct Problems: Multiple Settings, Treatment, and Criteria," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 471-481.

Patterson, G.R. et al "Direct Intervention in the Class Room: A Set of Procedures for the Aggressive Child," in F.W. Clark, D.R. Evans and L.A. Hammerlynck (Eds.) Implementing Behaviour Programs for Schools and Clinics Champaign, Ill: Research Press, 1972.

Patterson, G.R., Ray, R.S., and Shaw, D.A. "Direct Intervention in the Families of Deviant Children," Oregon Research Institute Research Bulletin, 1969, 8, (9).

Patterson, G.R. and Reid, J.B. "Intervention for Families of Aggressive Boys; A Replication Study," Behaviour Research and Therapy, 1973, 11, pp.1-1.

Pentz, Mary Ann Wood, "Assertion Training and Trainer effects on Unassertive and Aggressive Adolescents," Journal of Counselling Psychology, 1980, vol. 27, No. 1, pp.76-83.

Rimm, D.C., Hill, G.A., Brown, N.H., and Stuart, J.E. "Group-Assertive Training in Treatment of Expression of Inappropriate Anger," Psychological Reports, 1974, 34, pp.794-798.

Ross, Robert R. and Fabiano, Elizabeth, Time to Think - Cognition and Crime: Link and Remediation, Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa, 1981.

Saunders, Daniel G., "Helping Husbands who Batter," Social Casework, 65(6) 1984, pp.347-353.

Saunders, Daniel G., and Parker, Jennifer C. "Legal Sanctions and Treatment Follow-Through among Men who Batter: A Multivariate Analysis," Social Work Research Abstracts, Sept., 1979.

Schlichter, K. and Horan, J. "Effects of Stress Inoculation on the Anger and Aggression Management of Institutionalized Juvenile Delinquents," Paper presented at the meeting of the Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979.

Schrader, C. et al "An Anger Control Package for Adolescent Drug Abusers," Paper presented at the 11th Annual Convention of the Association for the Advancement of Behaviour Therapy, Atlanta, Dec., 1977.

Seligman, Linda. Selecting Effective Treatments, a Comprehensive, Systematic Guide to Treating Adult Mental Disorders, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1990.

Solicitor General for Canada, Corrections and Conditional Release: Directions For Reform. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1990.

Spence, Susan H., and Marzillier, John S., "Social Skills Training with Adolescent Male Offenders-I. Short-Term Effects," Behavioural Research and Therapy, Vol.17, 1979, pp.7-16.

Spence, Susan H., and Marzillier, John S., "Social Skills Training with Adolescent Male Offenders-II. Short-Term, Long-Term, and Generalized Effects," Behavioural Research and Therapy, vol. 19, 1981, pp.349-368.

Spirito, A., Finch, A.J., Smith, J., and Cooley, W. "Stress Inoculation for Anger and Anxiety Control: A Case Study with an Emotionally Disturbed Boy," Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 1981, 10, 67-70.

Stuart, R.B. (ed.) Violent Behaviour: Social Learning Approaches to Prediction, Management, and Treatment. Brunner/Mazel, N.Y., 1981.

Toch, Hans Violent Men: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Violence Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago, 1969.

Vito, Gennaro F., "Does it Work? Problems in the Evaluation of a Correctional Treatment Program," Journal of Offender Counselling, Services and Rehabilitation, Vol 7(1), Fall, 1982, pp.5-21.

Webster, C.D., "On The Willful Induction Of Mental Disorder," Forum on Corrections Research, 1990, vol 2, no. 3, pp. 4-17.

Wright, Kevin "An Examination of Recidivism Trends in Relation to Organizational Rather Than Program Differences," Journal of Offender Counselling, Services and Rehabilitation, Vol.4(1), Fall 1979, pp.63-80.

Zillmann, Dolf, Hostility and Aggression
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Hillsdale,
N.J., 1979.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF GROUP EVALUATIONS

BY INTERVIEW ITEMS

First of all, do you have any comments about the program in general?

Respondent#1- "I don't get angry very often-I'm able to walk away from situations and handle it that way. When I'm straight, nothing pisses me off."

R2- "I thought the program was good-I haven't been going to the hole any more."

R3- "The main thing I picked up was that I'm aware of alternative ways of handling things rather than reacting immediately. Gives me time to think about it."

R4- "I felt the program was helpful."

R5- "No."

R6- "It was OK-repetitive-took positive peer culture at Portage for a year and a half and dealt with the same stuff."

R7- "No."

Item # 1. What were the most helpful aspects of the program for you?

R1- "Where it shows you ways of dealing with anger situation where there is one. Just basic ways to talk it over. I understand anger more than before.

R2- "One thing I learned was that if you analyzed why you get mad, it is usually over nothing-it's just a big laugh! I never really analyzed why I was shooting off at the mouth before."

R3- "Presentation of information and time taken to explain answers to questions. Group discussions were sometimes not helpful."

R4- "Talking about issues- talking about it helped him to understand- handouts were pretty good."

R5- "All about anger- made him understand how to suppress anger and deal with it instead of having a tantrum or outburst."

R6- "Probably when trainers asked questions and group members gave their own (answers). Liked to be able to talk freely."

R7 "The discussions-should have been more role-playing out different situations. (There should have been) more role-plays for outside the institution (such as) husbands and wives, etc."

Item # 2. What were the least helpful aspects of the group program?

R1- "(I) didn't like it when the outburst occurred in the group-that didn't have to happen."

R2- "(I) didn't like some of the role-plays."

R3- "Relaxation therapy didn't work for me. I'm able to relax a certain way and that helps."

R4- "Didn't think any of it was a waste of time."

R5- "(I) felt it was all helpful to me. The films made the point."

R6- "(I) didn't like the movie. (The) relaxation exercises did not help him much. (He) has his own way of relaxing-working out and then he feels calm."

R7- The information was ok. (The) Anger Logs (are) hard in here because the routine doesn't make you angry. Would have had to really stretch things to have anything to put in the log."

Item # 3. Were there things that you would have liked to get out of the group but didn't?

R1- "Not really."

R2- "(I) got what I needed basically. (I) still have the binder from the program and look at it once in a while-I like to have information to keep."

R3- "(I) got what I expected. Helped to realise what I

already knew."

R4- "I don't know."

R5- "(It was) hard to express feelings in front of other inmates. (I) don't trust other people in here so much."

R6- "No."

R7- "More role-playing."

Item # 4. What changes would you suggest that might make the program more effective?

R1- "Changes? Not really."

R2- "I got a lot out of it the way it was. Maybe the next guy is different though."

R3- "Sticking with one person as a presenter is OK. Didn't like --- for some reason. Four weeks in length would be better (than six weeks). From tuesday to thursday the interest was there (because the groups were close together), but from thursday to tuesday. The films were OK."

R4- "Keep it at the same level. More talking and more handouts and maybe more homework would have been OK. (The) anger log wasn't useful as I don't get angry often."

R5- "I Liked the way it was set up- I liked the classes twice a week as it gave me time to think about it. Over seven weeks it allows people time to open up."

R6- "Maybe get group members to give a little bit of a life history and their anger problems at the first session."

R7- "(The) classes should run more frequently- like two weeks solid in mornings or afternoons with a follow-up. Every day would be better so you can get into the information better."

Item # 5. If you have had individual counselling, how did the group experience differ?

R1- "Yes, I have had some counselling, but only a couple of times since I got here."

R2- "I never had any individual counselling."

R3- "I have had some counselling before. The issues were the same."

R4- "I never had any counselling."

R5- "I don't see a counsellor, but I see an elder regularly, however."

R6- "I never had any individual counselling."

R7- "I am in counselling with a John Howard Society worker and am therefore getting the same information from the other counsellor."

Item # 6. Would you have preferred more or less direction from the trainer?

R1- "It was OK the way it was."

R2- "Was about right."

R3- "Was about right. The group wouldn't initiate the conversations."

R4- "It was alright the way it was."

R5- "About right as it was."

R6- "More direction would have been good."

R7- "It was OK."

Item # 7. Did you feel that the topics discussed in the group sessions were generally related to your own problems?

R1- "OK"

R2- "Some of them, yeah."

R3- "Topics were OK- they covered everything really."

R4- "Topics were good. Could have said more."

R5- "Topics were about right."

R6- "Some of them were."

R7- "Topics were OK- maybe more on community situations like family relationships."