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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Though prisons have been called reformatories and correctional institutions, most prisons have, in fact, remained penal institutions. Most programs in these facilities are inadequate, insufficient, and possibly wrongly directed so that the national norm remains at 65% recidivism in spite of the fact that many prisons have incorporated academic and vocational programs.¹ One successful exception to this national trend is PACE Institute (Programmed Activities for Correctional Education), a private institution located inside the Cook County Jail; PACE boasts a 25% recidivism rate.

PACE Institute has been providing correctional education for the past eight years. This program has provided basic educational and pre-vocational skills to trainees volunteering from the Cook County Department of Corrections. In addition, PACE has given extensive counseling, job development and follow-up services to permit each trainee to satisfactorily re-enter the outside society and achieve job stability. The efforts have been unusually successful. In spite of these achievements, it has become evident that the process of providing opportunities to learn intellectual and manipulative skills, as well as providing other

services, is still insufficient to readily secure jobs in the business world. While pursuing job openings, the actions and attitudes displayed by PACE trainees frequently created unfavorable reactions in the employer during job interviews. Therefore, the program developed in preparation for this thesis was designed to identify deficient behaviors, devise procedures for changing them into more desirable traits, and establish confidence in the prospective employee to use these actions more successfully.

Other rehabilitation programs have dispensed information to the trainees, but it was intended that the video-taped program developed herein was devised to encourage trainees to re-adjust, re-evaluate, and change their attitudes toward a particular area of their social environment: the world of work. The program emphasized and fostered self-readjustment.

This thesis includes writing a program designed to encourage men to:

a. become more aware of the necessity of getting along with others while learning how this skill could enhance the chances of success for themselves.

b. identify particular weakness in their own attitudes toward work while allowing opportunities to correct, practice, and obtain feedback on problems they have chosen to improve.

Through an actual role playing procedure, the trainee was given an opportunity to cope with rejection, as well as improve on the deficiencies he identified in himself. The procedure was accomplished by role playing essential areas in the world of work. Activities included taking an interview, performing a job containing unexpected obstacles,
and viewing the resulting reactions to the obstacles using video-tape. Branched programs were included to suggest alternative behaviors depending on the trainee's responses. The trainee performed three different roles commonly found in an organization (worker, foreman and boss) so he could better understand the necessity of an industrial pecking order. The design of the program also allowed a man the opportunity to practice the behaviors which he perceived as preferable. Using this multi-media approach, the trainee was able to assess himself, as well as be evaluated by standards used in the world of work. This educational unit was constructed making use of advanced audio-visual techniques in which the trainee participated in the form of role playing while being video-taped. Later during replay of the scenes, he evaluated the attitudinal characteristics displayed and learned how to secure an improved image of his conduct.

The entire video program varied from emphasis on the standard "what to do" rules for jobs and interviews to understanding the job related conditions with which one is expected to comply in order to maintain satisfactory employment. That is, a great deal of time was taken to explain the dynamics of social interaction and the criteria which an authority figure uses for evaluation. Only a minimum of instruction was given to the trainees explaining when to talk, what to say, or how to articulate when in uncomfortable situations. Instead, explanations were given which described how one would be judged in these circumstances and the reasons behind these judgments. The emphasis was placed on a
trainee making decisions for himself which he felt would encourage the outcome of an uncomfortable situation to be in his favor. The trainee was then given a chance to carry out the actions which were necessary as a result of the decision he made. Lastly, he determined if the outcome of the uncomfortable situation matched the best he could expect under the given set of conditions. The "how to," "when to" and "what to" suggestions were generally made spontaneously by the trainees when responding to the replay of the video-tape.

This social skills program was basically designed as an action program on the part of the participants. There was always an introduction to each activity in the program before a trainee performed a particular task or was evaluated on his performance. If the work was performed unsatisfactorily, according to his evaluator (one of his peers), the trainee repeated the task until the evaluator was satisfied. In addition to the instructions which were given on the television set concerning each of the three roles of worker, foreman and boss, there were two lessons which were offered to those men who participated, but were not selected, during the interview portion of the program.

After writing the script for this educational unit, the lessons were video-taped. The various scenes, video and audio, were edited and compiled into a series of lessons. Fourteen trainees were then given this battery of lessons with each trainee performing the various roles associated with the assigned tasks. Tests were given to each trainee before and after participating in the series of lessons in an attempt to approach a measure of the change in attitudes after taking the short
course.

Three instruments were used to measure the extent that the program affected attitudinal changes in the trainees: (1) a standardized personality test, the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire,\(^2\) (2) an instrument which was devised by this writer to measure the attainment of his particular behavioral objectives, the Attitudinal Scale, and (3) the Trainee Questionnaire to be filled out by the trainees so that reactions to the program could be recorded.

Increases in skills were demonstrated and the importance of these data are included in the chapters "Results" and "Evaluation of Results."

CHAPTER II

PROBLEMS AND PAST APPROACHES

The literature concerning curricula produced directly for penal corrections was rather meager. As corrections has been a relatively new field, programs which have been considered to be traditional in normal schools were new in rehabilitation since the area was still in its infancy. For example, much of the literature re-iterated that if a man was given an opportunity to learn basic education, he would be better equipped to enter the world of work.\(^1\) Certainly statistics verified this truism as many correctional populations have had less than a fifth or sixth grade level\(^2\) and minimal marketable skills.\(^3\) However, it is also a truism that most ex-inmates have had difficulty presenting themselves in the best light to prospective employers, and


men released from jail have had problems maintaining acceptable relationships with both their fellow employees and supervisors. Though many ex-inmates have lost their jobs, few were fired because they lacked the ability to perform their job acceptably. Instead, a sizeable portion of the problem has been attributed to lack of social skills or negative attitudes toward the routine and requirements imposed in a working situation.

The Syracuse University Research Corporation claimed that "the education department in the modern prison looks like the school system in a backward neighborhood." The fact remains that ideas have been tried, but they were creative only because these ideas had not been attempted in a prison setting before. One program gave the credit of their success to the relationship established between an inmate and instructor. Another held to the traditional belief that an ex-inmate's


primary need was a trade if he was to remain free. One of the more progressive experiments has been the Draper Project (associated with the Alabama State Penitentiary) which implemented programmed instruction in behavior modification model.

According to the PACE philosophy, each of these approaches was valid and worthwhile in that each approach attempted to deal with one aspect of a man's life. PACE has gone a step farther and attempted to piece together a program designed to service the total man. As many other programs have dealt with basic education and prevocational skills, these areas only had to be adapted to the particular needs of the PACE program. Unfortunately, very little meaningful work had been done to develop relevant curricula in the extremely important area of social skills. Some notable exceptions were Saskatchewan NewStart in


9

Canada and Ken Cook Transnational in Wisconsin.13

The Saskatchewan project appeared to be creative. It was a serious attempt to develop a correctional therapeutic community through a logically ordered counseling curriculum. Although the objectives and the desired resulting modifications had been identified, the program remained open-ended. Reaching the desired behavior changes depended a great deal on what ideas the participating inmates happened to share with the group on a particular day. The later publications seemed to be an improvement as the later programs appeared to be more specific and refined. Though the author's at Saskatchewan NewStart approach was certainly refreshing, there was a possibility that important ideas and experiences might be left out of the discussions within any one course cycle. It was questionable how repeatable, standardized or measurable this approach could be.

The Ken Cook program contained an audio-visual approach which allowed nearly all educational levels to take advantage of the material. The Ken Cook course used a direct approach to making a man aware of information that was needed in the search for a job. This program taught the basics of job hunting—such as filling out an application—especially to those functioning at a remedial level. Naturally, the

Ken Cook program had the advantage of being repeatable, though it only skirted the area of social skills. The writers of the Ken Cook program apparently started with the traditional school premise that the inmates wanted to learn how to fill out an application form. It seemed, however, that trainees often displayed such fatalistic rationalizations that they had not yet equated the possibility of their being turned down for a job with their inability to fill in the answers on a job application. If this observation was correct, the basic approach taken by the Ken Cook course on job readiness was dubious. Trainees probably needed a more involved experience than awareness before they were likely to change their attitudes.

As the curricula in the field of social skills and attitudinal change seemed limited in the correctional field, readings were made outside the field of corrections. Most exciting were three publications prepared by George M. Beal and his associates Bohlen and Rogers. Though their research was conducted in rural agricultural communities, it seemed that the stages Beal listed as necessary to internalize attitudinal change applied to all geographical areas. His research

showed the following five stages were needed:

1. **Awareness**: At this stage the individual learns of the existence of the idea or practice but has little knowledge about it.

2. **Interest**: At this stage the individual develops interest in the idea. He seeks more information about it and considers its general merits.

3. **Evaluation**: At this stage the individual makes mental application of the idea and weighs its merits for his own situation. He obtains more information about the idea and decides whether or not to try it.

4. **Trial**: At this stage the individual actually applies the idea or practice—usually on a small scale. He is interested in how to apply the practice: in amounts, time and conditions for application.

5. **Adoption**: This is the stage of acceptance leading to continued use.15

The social skills program which was developed in preparation for this thesis was unique for corrections in several ways: the course was repeatable, included opportunities for each of Beal's stages for internalizing change to take place, allowed for self-discovery, and was evaluated both subjectively and objectively. The course used a role-playing approach which had been established as an effective device in that "it has a corrective influence on various beliefs and attitudes which underlie chronic difficulties in human relations."16 The program attacked one very small but important area of the social skills field...the world of work. Though it was hoped that some educators would be able to take

---


the ideas and approaches suggested here and apply them to other correctional facilities, the scope of this study was limited to participants of the PACE program who were incarcerated at the Cook County Department of Corrections.
CHAPTER III

PROGRAM AND POPULATION CONSIDERATIONS

SELECTION OF PROGRAM MATERIAL

For purposes of selecting appropriate material for the program, a key problem area was identified: inmates were undertrained and under-educated. This problem was well-known among penal authorities and many basic education and skill training programs have been provided within institutions with varying degrees of success. At PACE there was a measure of progress as judged by the lowered rate of recidivism. But even with the PACE experience, men were still leaving jail with poor interpersonal skills, lack of self-confidence and very little order in their lives. Most trainees had poor work histories, often holding numerous short-term jobs. This lack of experience rarely allowed one to develop meaningful rapport on jobs. Therefore, they acquired little understanding of the authority-structure within an organization. The trainee disliked the system that had already rejected him and he might have resented the way it "picked on him" when he showed up late for a job. His personal life was frequently without order or direction, and he could not appreciate the necessity of limitations and restrictions required in work situations. It seemed that sometimes trainees attempted to apply the skills they had developed in their personal lives to work situations. This approach did

not work and the ex-prisoner had reinforced his negative belief about
the system. Maintaining meaningful personal lives appeared to be
closely related to continuing purposeful professional lives; prisoners
had neither personal nor professional experience which would help them
grow, and so one weak area could not build from the other.

To have developed a meaningful rehabilitation program, one must
have dealt with the total man. Certainly, these trainees had experiences
and skills to draw from in their personal lives, but many of these skills
were not an asset in the middle-class world of work. Therefore, to be
effective, the personality problems of the inmates needed to be identi­
fied, and a program developed to compensate for these problems. The
educator also needed to provide a framework within which this new edu­
cation would become a useful and integral part of the inmate's life.
If the newly taught skill was viewed by the trainee as alien to him, or
something only to be used when he would get a job (and he did not want
to work), then it would not be accepted with much enthusiasm. Further­
more, if the reinforcement came too slowly, or the skill was viewed as
"something I'll use after I get out and start looking for a job," the
trainee would hardly put much of his own enthusiasm into the learning
process. In summary, there were three areas which were frequently over­
looked in most institutional programs:

2James B. Williams and Edward A. Mardell, Curriculum Guide: Life
Skills Course in Corrections, second edition (Prince Albert, Saskat­
The total needs of a man had to be dealt with in order to assure a trainee's ability to cope with life's multiplicity of problems. It was not necessarily one area of a trainee's life that kept him from performing, but rather his weakest skill needed when overcoming an obstacle.

New skills needed to be incorporated as an integral part of the trainee's existing value structure and not separate from his own.

The trainee needed to have the opportunity to try the new skill and, as a result, reap immediate rewards from using it when it was carried out correctly.

It was within this framework that a program was designed to help the trainee, while still incarcerated, prepare for the world of work. PACE was already providing basic education and vocational training. So to satisfy the first criterion, a social skills program was added in order for a man to know when and how to use the information taught in basic education and shop. Hopefully, this approach would allow him the freedom and the confidence he would need to perform his job successfully.

To satisfy the second criterion, a role-playing approach was employed. Every man was given each of three roles to play (worker, foreman, and boss). The criteria by which he would be judged as successful or unsuccessful in each of these roles were explained and these roles approached job expectations as closely as possible. The trainee was given suggestions on how he might perform in these roles to control the outcome in his favor, but never given rules which he had to follow. The normal demands and rewards were included on each role. A man could

advance to the higher roles only after he had pleased his superiors (who were played in the video program by peers who had already been successful). As the job tasks were performed by the worker, and instructions were given by the foreman and boss, the activities were video-taped. On the video-taped replay, the men were free to criticize their own as well as their peers' performances. When a chore was not completed correctly, regardless of whose fault it was, the instructions were repeated by the foreman and boss. Again, the worker was required to complete the chore. By using this method, a worker soon discovered it was his role to get the job out regardless of who was in error. As the worker was promoted to the levels of foreman and boss, he invariably found himself acting out his foreman and boss roles in much the same manner he had been treated when he was working on a job. Facing the same frustration for work being finished late or incorrectly, and being dependent on the performance of a worker for receiving his own rewards, the trainee in the boss role usually did everything in his power to encourage production. He chose the man in the interview who he thought would do the most work for him and then usually proceeded to use all the power he could find to coerce his worker into completing the job correctly.

To satisfy the third criterion, immediate gratification came in three forms. One, the video-tape gave an instant replay of the activities and a chance to see how one appears to a third party. The second form of feedback came after seeing each other in the replay. This period was an excellent time to have mini-discussions about the behavior...
each man showed and a chance to replay the activities until the three men could determine among themselves what the appropriate behavior should have been. It was also a chance for the instructor to point out mannerisms and behavioral responses which would have normally gone unnoticed. The third form of feedback came when a man reached the boss role. At the end of the boss role there was one activity which had a standard time established. If a worker listened to the instructions carefully, performed the job right the first time, and worked quickly, he could finish in the required time. If the worker did finish within the standardized time, the boss was rewarded with a pack of cigarettes. (Cigarettes happened to be in short supply and took on an inordinate value in the jail at that time.)

INMATES IN THE COOK COUNTY JAIL

The video program, which is the basis of the project to be discussed in this thesis, utilizes a very select segment of our society. The fact that a man was incarcerated in the Cook County Jail would tend to put several limitations on him. An inmate there would have tended to be (1) low on the socio-economic scale, (2) poorly educated, and (3) living in the inner city. As the jail is maintained for short-term incarceration, all sentenced inmates are serving sentences of one year or less. (Many inmates remain in the Cook County Jail more than a year while awaiting trial. However, upon receiving a sentence longer than one year, the men are shipped to the state penitentiary.) Armed robbery is probably
the most common offense committed by men incarcerated at the Cook County Jail; drug related offenses are also prevalent.

RECRUITS TO THE PACE PROGRAM

To be accepted into the PACE program, an inmate must have been sentenced to the Cook County Department of Corrections and must have at least three months remaining on his sentence. He must also make a verbal commitment that he is ready to change his life in order to stay out of jail. Normally, the members of the PACE staff are not informed as to trainees' offenses as it is felt that this knowledge may prejudice their dealings with the trainees. By the limits of a one year sentence, it is common that the offenses for which the inmates are serving in the Cook County Jail are not particularly serious. However, as it is normal to have trainees with previous penitentiary experience, the inmate population in Cook County Jail could not necessarily be distinguished from other institutions.

RECRUITS TO THE VIDEO-TAPED PROGRAM

To be in this video-taped social skills program, an inmate must have taken the initiative to volunteer to be in the program and have agreed to be tested before and after the program with the instruments which will be described later. All fourteen participants were male, as the equipment was set up inside the Cook County Jail. (The women were housed in a totally separate building.)

None of these criteria were designed to weed out or make the population participating in this program exclusive. However, because of
the stipulations associated with being in the Cook County Jail, PACE Institute, and the social skills program, the resulting population might have been somewhat exclusive and not necessarily representative of a typical inmate population. It should be kept in mind that the social skills program described here was written especially for men participating in the PACE program. No attempt was made to reflect the needs of all inmate populations or of women.

SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

To secure suitable recruits, the scope of the program was explained in an assembly to all the trainees in PACE and names of volunteers were collected. Some subjects became curious when they saw the equipment. Others became interested when they saw their associates participating. Seriousness of offense, number of previous incarcerations, age, achievement in school (the exception was a seriously retarded nonreader who was rejected) or any other history related criteria were not considered. There was one criterion which affected who would volunteer for the program: the trainees would have to volunteer to participate each evening from 7-9 PM (in addition to the 8:30-11:00 AM session in which they already would be participating as it was part of the normal school day) until they completed each step of the entire program. As many trainees were unwilling to voluntarily give up their free time to participate in this program, this requirement served in part as a selecting process.

A second limiting process was the interviewing procedure. The
program was designed that only one trainee would be chosen for a given job from the three taking the interview. It was found that trainees who either possessed relatively good interviewing skills from the start, or trainees who could cope with repeated failures would be likely to complete the program. When a trainee was not chosen initially, it produced a fair amount of anxiety; he experienced others being chosen over him repeatedly and he often wanted to quit. This uncomfortable situation was a real incentive to some, and it was a source of extreme tension for others. For four others, the interviewing procedure resulted in an excuse to give up and quit. (The scores of the four trainees quitting were placed in Tables 11 and 12.) Rather than seeing themselves as quitters when under stress, some worked very hard to remain in the program, even after repeated failures. Since most of the trainees had to work through some discomfort in order to get themselves chosen for the worker role of the program, the trainees took the program seriously, feeling they had invested part of themselves. That is, the trainees had worked through some of the difficulties and discomforts of getting themselves chosen. They were not inclined to waste the chance to benefit themselves after they had expended the effort to be chosen.

The fourteen trainees who actually participated in the entire video program had been incarcerated on the average of a little over three months and had been enrolled in PACE for an average of 57 days. The longest a man had been incarcerated prior to participating in the video program was eight months, and the shortest stay was three weeks. The longest any of the fourteen had been in the PACE program was five
months, while the newest trainee had only been enrolled in PACE two and one-half weeks when he began the video lessons. The trainees had an average of 66 days remaining before being released. One trainee had six months to serve on his sentence, and one trainee had only nine days left to serve when he began the video program. The trainees had been sentenced on the average of one and one-half times before this sentence. Six of the participants had not been incarcerated before, and one had served six sentences prior to this one he was serving. The average age was twenty-five, with the oldest trainee being thirty-eight and the youngest twenty. The trainees were reading on an average of 8.0 grade level, working math at 7.8 grade level, and using language arts skills at a 6.9 grade level, as determined by the California Achievement Test Battery.

SELECTION OF EVALUATION STANDARDS

The goals of the video program were to increase the effectiveness of the trainees in their abilities to:

1. Communicate to an interviewer in actions and words, a series of favorable attitudes toward obtaining and holding a job.

2. Observe and evaluate behaviors demonstrated by others in various job related experiences. The trainee should be able to recognize behavior acceptable or not acceptable for the particular roles of worker, foreman, and boss, and be able to suggest better ways for others to perform in that role.

3. Observe and evaluate behaviors demonstrated by himself in various job related experiences. The trainee should be able to recognize behaviors as acceptable or unacceptable for the particular roles of worker, foreman, and boss, and be able to perform more advantageously in that role.
McKee stated that "...unlike tests of academic achievement, none exists for assessing the offender's social skills deficiencies."\(^4\)

Though it was found that no instruments or tests have been devised yet which would measure the goals of this program directly, the goals of this program do in fact involve modifying behaviors which the trainee could demonstrate. The favorable and unfavorable behaviors could be observed while the trainees participated in the video program, but it was felt that keeping a tally of examples of favorable behaviors while the trainees discussed their responses would have destroyed the spontaneity of the lessons. It was also felt that this approach would be too subjective and lack repeatability as the tallies would be expected to vary according to the observer making the tallies. Lastly, specific behaviors have not been identified or isolated as preferable or unsatisfactory to prevent recidivism. However, it was believed that one could fairly accurately estimate the attitudes of the trainees by using a combination of approaches while maintaining the repeatability of the measuring devices.

To grasp the trainees' attitudes as closely as possible, it was decided that data should be collected from three separate sources: (1) from an objective and standardized test, (2) from an instrument devised by this writer which quantified the attitudes which the trainee incorporated as a result of the video program, and (3) from the trainees who

---

had participated in the program.

The three instruments used to approximate the effectiveness of the program were: (1) a standardized personality test, the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, (2) the Attitudinal Scale devised by this writer to be rated on a continuum with ratings from one through seven, and (3) the Trainee Questionnaire, also prepared by this writer, to determine the trainee's own evaluation of the video program.

Pre-tests and post-tests were given to measure any changes that might have occurred as a result of the experiences obtained in the program with two of the instruments: (1) the 16 Personality Factor and (2) the Attitudinal Scale. The Trainee Questionnaire was administered only after the trainees finished the video program. In an attempt to encourage as many honest answers as possible, the trainees were told that their responses may help determine if the video program would be used at PACE in the future, and they were assured that no other staff member would be allowed to see the results of their tests. Time was taken to explain to each trainee that his answers would have absolutely no bearing on the normal evaluations made of him for the regular functions of the PACE program. Also, the trainees were shown and explained the results of their own tests if they so requested.

The Attitudinal Scale, devised by this investigator, was composed ———-

of a series of statements involving problems found on job situations; the trainee indicated his response on a continuum of one through seven: from "one" if he totally disagreed, to "seven" if he was in complete agreement. In order to prevent a "halo effect," positive and negative statements were included. Sometimes "one" was the favorable direction while in other cases, "seven" was considered the favorable direction. Purposely, so one would not automatically give the same answer as he went from statement to statement, most of the statements posed problems which were sophisticated and involved enough to expect a "most of the time," "sometimes" or "it depends on the situation response (which would be shown by marking between two and six)." For example, "I should do everything possible to adapt to my boss's expectations." The **Attitudinal Scale** can be found along with the tallies of responses given by the trainees on Tables 8 and 9 located in Chapter Four. Table 10 contains the mean averages for the responses to the **Attitudinal Scale**.

The **Trainee Questionnaire** was devised by this writer and was given to each of the trainees finishing the program to determine how they felt the instructions and experiences would benefit them. The responses collected from the questionnaire seemed accurate as they were generally consistent with the spontaneous oral comments given while interacting throughout the video program. The trainees were asked to evaluate the program and none of the trainees expressed any kind of displeasure with being asked for this evaluation. Also, none of their responses were commented upon by their instructor so as not to elicit any preferred responses. By giving neither negative nor positive feedback, it was
hoped that the trainee felt his evaluation was accepted as valid as he viewed it, and the instructor was not trying to encourage particular responses. There were two exceptions when two different trainees thought the questionnaire referred to the entire PACE program. In these two cases, the trainees were given the same questionnaires again and asked to limit the responses to the video-taped program.

The Trainee Questionnaire seemed particularly useful in that in addition to collecting the trainees' direct responses, the information was presented from the participant's point of view. That is, the trainees gave some interpretations which, though brief, served as a guide while interpreting some of the data collected on the standardized 16 Personality Factor tests. In reverse, the 16 Personality Factor aided in putting a value on the strength of the responses on the questionnaire. A summary of the comments made by the trainees can be found in Table 2, and a complete listing of the trainees' statements for each question is provided in Appendix B. The written responses seemed to be representative of the oral comments made by the trainees while participating in the program. The trainees did not appear to be apprehensive about answering the questionnaire, and most seemed to be pleased their opinions were valued.

In preparing both the Attitudinal Scale and the Trainee Questionnaire, other staff members in each department of the PACE project were consulted for suggestions and comments on the two instruments. The suggestions made by the staff employed in the shop and follow-up departments were given particular attention as their expertise with job-related
and post-release problems were deemed particularly valuable. Some questions were changed and others were added to reflect the suggestions made from each department in the PACE program. The final instruments were approved by each expert in its final form before being used.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

GENERAL ATTITUDE

The approach of the participants toward the video program was generally positive. A number of positive statements were made by the trainees concerning the program. Other indicators which were used as measures of a favorable attitude toward the program were the trainees' willingness to give and receive criticism. Normally, trainees will not receive or give constructive criticism to each other. The usual response to a trainee giving suggestions to another is, "Who is he to tell me what to do? He's an inmate just like me!" This statement or similar ones were not heard even once concerning activities of the video program.

Another statement that seemed indicative that one trainee was perceiving this set of lessons differently came after a foreman had given him instructions to strip some paint from a chair. The trainee was shown the chair, told what to do, handed the paint and varnish remover, and left to strip the chair. As the worker, he dabbed a little paint and varnish remover onto the chair, but did not really take much interest. The foreman returned to tell him to get to work as time was running out, and the worker replied, "You mean I'm really supposed to do it? I thought I was just supposed to 'act' like it."
It makes one wonder if that trainee viewed the educational process as a facade instead of real. At the completion of the last role, this same man stated, "This is what PACE ought to be doing. That math and reading is all right, but hey man, when I get out of here, I need a job!"

As there was only one TV monitor and one video player-recorder, the students had to wait while another trainee viewed a lesson they had already seen. No one was told to look at the same lesson twice, but more often than not, the trainees chose to view it again. It was felt that choosing to see some lessons twice may have provided some over-learning. Perhaps after the trainee had been through the activity, it may have been easier to understand the rest of the lesson. Also, if a trainee was able to by-pass either of the two lessons contained in the branched portion of the program by being picked initially in the interview, he almost always wanted to see what was in the lessons he missed. \(^1\) (The response was usually negative, however, if a trainee had failed the interview so many times that he was repeating the branched lessons already given him.) The fact that the trainees would prefer to observe the lessons in lieu of talking to their associates, seemed to be indicative of genuine interest, as this was not the norm at PACE.

The positive attitude very quickly changed to negative for the trainees who were not chosen for the worker role. (The program was designed such that three inmates would apply for a worker role, but one

\(^1\)The flow chart for using the video-taped lessons can be seen in Table 1. The portion of the diagram described as "lesson explaining what interviewer is looking for" comprises the branched portion of the program for the two rejected trainees.
TABLE 1

FLOW CHART FOR USE OF VIDEO-TAPED PROGRAM

Stage 1
3 trainees interview from monitor (evaluated by boss)

Lesson explaining what interviewer is looking for

rejected

accepted

Stage 2
1. lesson describing why he was hired
2. directions for next step
3. becomes "worker"

Stage 3
1. job #1 done by "worker"
2. performance recorded on video tape
3. evaluation by foreman

accepted

rejected

Stage 4
1. evaluation of foreman and worker by boss
2. boss automatically rejects -- foreman reprimanded by boss

1. evaluation of foreman and worker by boss
2. boss automatically rejects -- foreman and worker reprimanded

Stage 5
observe video-tape of job #1

observe video-tape of job #1
TABLE 1---Continued

Stage 6
1. foreman evaluation
   procedure explained
   on monitor
2. worker shown why fore-
   man was in trouble but
   worker wasn't
3. suggestions on how
   worker could handle
   obstacle in job #1
   better

Stage 7
1. job #2 done by "worker"
2. performance recorded on
   video-tape
3. evaluation by foreman

Stage 8
evaluation of
foreman and worker
by boss

Stage 9
observe video-tape
of job #2

Stage 10
return to stage 6a
and repeat remain-
der of program

Stage 10
return to stage 6b
and repeat remain-
der of program
TABLE 1---Continued

Stage 11

1. if worker completes task in given time, boss is rewarded with cigarettes
2. no reward if worker scores longer than norm

Boss

1. if worker completes task in given time, boss is rewarded with cigarettes
2. no reward if worker scores longer than norm

Foreman

1. foreman promoted to boss
2. lesson explaining expectations in new role

Worker

1. worker promoted to foreman
2. lesson explaining expectations in new role
out of the three would be chosen. The two who were rejected were given a brush-up lesson to give them the advantage when they tried again.) The trainees very often had to be encouraged to complete the program as they commonly wanted to quit if they were not chosen. It is suspected that the selection process was interpreted as personal rejection by many trainees taking the interview as they were rejected by their own peers. If a staff member had rejected these men, it was doubtful that the evaluation would have been so threatening. It was convenient for trainees to view the staff as part of the "system" that they felt has been rejecting them before. It was not new to be rejected by part of the "system." However, when a peer determined that he felt one trainee would be more valuable to him than the other two, the two losers were forced to deal with the reality that they had, in fact, been rejected by someone who understood who they were. Recognizing this reality caused a great deal of stress in most of the trainees. The majority could be encouraged to continue with a few words of support. A few required extensive counseling. Four trainees would not respond to either and gave up. The 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire and Attitudinal Scale for these four drop-outs are shown in Tables 11 and 12.

**Trainee Questionnaire**

The Trainee Questionnaire was designed to be open-ended so that the trainees would be free to express their feelings toward experiences of the video program. Though the approach was convenient for collecting
the trainees' responses, the comments were not in a suitable form for collating into meaningful trends. Therefore, the comments made on the questionnaires were assigned to categories indicating the parts of the program to which the trainees' remarks referred. The summaries are shown on Table 2, and a complete listing of the responses is shown in Appendix B (with spelling and grammar corrected). Fourteen trainees participated in the entire program and completed the questions asked on each of the measuring instruments. However, the reader will notice that the sums of the answers did not always total fourteen. Sometimes a question was left blank by a trainee; at other times a trainee mistakenly included two answers when only one was needed. This phenomenon is evident in Table 2.

No attempt was made to test either the validity or reliability of the Trainee Questionnaire, and the following data should be interpreted with this fact in mind.
TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES MADE TO THE TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE AFTER PARTICIPATING IN THE VIDEO-TAPED PROGRAM²

1. Is there anything you thought you understood about the world of work before you started this series of lessons that you found you really didn't? If "yes," what was it?
   Yes 6  No 7  No Response 1

2. What part of the program did you enjoy most?
   General 7  Boss 4  Foreman 3  Worker 0  Interview 0  Advancement 2

3. What part of the program made you feel the most uncomfortable?
   General 0  Boss 3  Foreman 0  Worker 5  Interview 4  Other 2

4. Do you feel that taking this class will help you later when you are released?
   Yes 14  No 0
   How?
   General 9  Boss 0  Foreman 0  Worker 0  Interview 5

5. What will you do differently than before you took this class?
   General 6  Communicate Better 4  Dress Properly 3  Nothing 1

²A complete listing of responses which the trainees made can be found in Appendix B.
TABLE 2---Continued

6. What would you change to improve the program?
   Nothing 9    Other 5

7. Did you believe that most of the lessons' information was true?
   Yes 14    No 0
16 PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

There was an absence of instruments designed to predict convicts' success in the world of work; there was even a dearth of reliable tests which could be used to determine if any person was "job-ready." Unfortunately, researchers have been unsuccessful in equating particular behaviors which result from one possessing a specific attitude. Because of the scarcity of research in measuring criminals' attitudes and relating them to job-readiness, it soon became obvious that choosing any standardized test would be for less than ideal reasons. However, the 16 Personality Factor seemed to have several characteristics which made it a logical compromise.

In the Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook it was found that the 16 Personality Factor had withstood two faultfinding critiques. Though Thomas J. Bouchard felt some of the claims of validity and reliability were without sound basis, he still remarked "...this program has a great deal of potential; it provides much useful information that is typically unavailable to a test interpreter..."\(^3\) Leonard G. Rorer criticized the lack of research data being made readily available, but he still concluded, "In conception and design, the 16 Personality Factor is unique, 

and a priori may well be the best personality inventory there is. Furthermore, after twenty years of research, much of the data, which would allow the instrument to be evaluated on its merits, must exist.\(^4\)

Thus, with the extended period of time, the 16 Personality Factor had withstood the test of durability. In checking the bibliography included in the Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook, it was found that the 16 Personality Factor had enjoyed wide use for a variety of purposes. Though it lacked the specificity of application with inmates, the writers claimed the test was able to identify basic dimensions of one's personality and to quantify the frequency of these traits. The separation into distinct and separate characteristics appeared to be in a usable form. The 16 Personality Factor seemed to be a worthwhile instrument that would allow one to get a handle on the attitudes of the trainees participating in the video program, provided proper interpretations of the results were made.

The 16 Personality Factor was convenient to use. That is, it required a relatively short testing time; it was not particularly threatening to take; and it was easily hand-graded using the answer stencils and charts provided with the tests.

The 16 Personality Factor had two forms ("C" and "D") which were

designed for use when individuals were reading at "grades six and over."  
Except for low literates, Form C was given as a pre-test and Form D as a post-test. Form E of the 16 Personality Factor was designed for use with low literates with "reading levels grades three through five."  
For the low literates the same Form E was given in the pre-test and post-test.

The 16 Personality Factor was administered to each of the fourteen inmates prior to beginning the video-taped program and within a few days after his completing it. To increase the chances of accurate data, the trainees were informed prior to answering the test questions that their results would not be shared with other staff members, and that their results would not influence their status in the total PACE program, as no one except this instructor would have access to the data. If the trainees requested, their own results were explained to them.

The tests were taken without hesitation or observable apprehension. The totals for each of the personality factors are shown in Tables 3 and 4. The second order scales of Q_I, Q_{II}, Q_{III}, and Q_{IV} were also calculated according to the directions using Table 7.1 in the Manual for the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. The totals for these data are shown


6Ibid.

in Tables 3 and 4. The totals for these data are shown on the follow­ing two pages using a revised personality factor profile sheet to reflect the four second order factors as well as the standard sixteen personality factors.

Table 5 lists the pre-test and post-test mean scores for each of the sixteen personality factors as well as the derived second order factors. The shift which was observed was figured in the column labeled "difference in means." For convenience, a shift toward the low score factor is indicated as negative and a shift toward the high score factor is considered positive.

Naturally, a major concern is whether the trainees going through this program actually get jobs and stay on them. To carry out such a longitudinal study as this is far beyond the scope of this project. However, eight ex-PACE trainees who had stayed out of jail two years or more were given the 16 Personality Factor and their responses were compared with the results obtained in the pre-tests and post-tests of the trainees participating in the video program. The eight ex-PACE trainees were picked at random, and no known differences in characteristics were known except that they had spent the last two years out of jail and had participated in the PACE program two years before. This approach was taken because inmates who were successful in breaking the in-and-out-of-jail cycle may have required unique personality characteristics that the rest of society may not have needed to remain on the
### TABLE 3

**PRE-TEST RESULTS: A TALLY OF TRAINEES' TRAITS BEFORE PARTICIPATING IN THE VIDEO-TAPED PROGRAM AS DETERMINED BY THE 16 PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally less stable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedient</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthright</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-dependent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisciplined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outgoing**

**Bright**

**Emotionally stable**

**Assertive**

**Happy-go-lucky**

**Conscientious**

**Venturesome**

**Tender-minded**

**Suspicious**

**Imaginative**

**Astute**

**Apprehensive**

**Experimenting**

**Self-sufficient**

**Controlled**
TABLE 3---Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Anxiety</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | Tense | Extroversion | High Anxiety | Tough Poise | Independence |

---

8Eleven trainees took Form C and three trainees took Form E of the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire.
TABLE 4

POST-TEST RESULTS: A TALLY OF TRAINEES' TRAITS
AFTER PARTICIPATING IN THE VIDEO-TAPED PROGRAM
AS DETERMINED BY THE
16 PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally less stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough-minded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisciplined self-conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally stable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy-go-lucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venturesome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender-minded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimenting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4---Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>0 1 1 1 4 3 1 2 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>0 0 1 2 4 3 2 2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Anxiety</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 2 7 2 0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>0 3 2 0 2 4 0 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 5 3 2 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

**Mean Averages for Traits of Trainees Participating in the Video Program As Determined by the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Score Description</th>
<th>Pre-Test Mean Average</th>
<th>Post-Test Mean Average</th>
<th>Difference in Means</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>High Score Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally less stable</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>+0.93</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Emotionally stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>+0.93</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Happy-go-lucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedient</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Venturesome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough-minded</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Tender-minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>+0.57</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthright</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>+0.36</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Astute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assured</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>+0.43</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>+0.21</td>
<td>Q₁</td>
<td>Experimenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-dependent</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>+0.79</td>
<td>Q₂</td>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW SCORE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>PRE-TEST MEAN AVERAGE</th>
<th>POST-TEST MEAN AVERAGE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE IN MEANS</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>HIGH SCORE DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undisciplined Self-conflict</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>+0.07</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Extroversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Anxiety</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>QII</td>
<td>High Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>Tough Poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>+0.36</td>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[10\]

In the pre-test, eleven trainees took Form C and three trainees took Form E of the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. In the post-test, eleven trainees took Form D and three trainees took Form E of the same test.
status quo. It would seem more logical to expect a trainee to possess traits similar to a man who had been successful after being released from jail than to the average middle class American who may have different pressures. In an attempt to encourage accurate answers, the successful ex-inmates were tested by other staff members in the program who did not have answer keys to the 16 Personality Factor. The tests were graded by this investigator without knowledge of the ex-trainees' identities. The ex-trainees had this approach explained to them before they answered the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. The tally and average means for the ex-trainees who had stayed out of jail more than two years can be found in Tables 6 and 7.

**ATTITUINAL SCALE**

Normally, academic questions can be answered with relatively specific responses. Unfortunately, attitudes are ways of thinking, acting or feeling. These mannerisms do not carry with them the same well-arranged, exact, or easy to reach measureability commonly found in most academic pursuits. Therefore, in an attempt to quantify a trainee's state of mind or course of action, an Attitudinal Scale was devised. This scale required a trainee to respond from "one" to "seven" depending on how strongly he agreed or disagreed with statements describing situations commonly encountered when working. This scale was administered before
TABLE 6

EX-TRAINEE RESULTS: A TALLY OF TRAITS OF EX-TRAINEES WHO HAVE SUCCESSFULLY REMAINED OUT OF JAIL FOR TWO YEARS AS DETERMINED BY THE 16 PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally less stable</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedient</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough-minded</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthright</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assured</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-dependent</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisciplined self-conflict</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>🟠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>Low Anxiety</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 1 3 1 1 1 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 3 0 1 3 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 3 1 1 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 2 1 1 1 2 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 0 3 2 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 All eight of the ex-trainees took Form C of the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire.
TABLE 7

MEAN AVERAGES FOR TRAITS OF EX-TRAINEES WHO HAVE SUCCESSFULLY REMAINED OUT OF JAIL FOR TWO YEARS AS DETERMINED BY THE 16 PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Score Description</th>
<th>Mean Average</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>High Score Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally less stable</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Emotionally stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Happy-go-lucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedient</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Venturesome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough-minded</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Tender-minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthright</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Astute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assured</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>Q₁</td>
<td>Experimenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group-dependent</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>Q₂</td>
<td>Self-sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisciplined self-conflict</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Q₃</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7---Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Score Description</th>
<th>Mean Average</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>High Score Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Q_4</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>Q_1</td>
<td>Extroversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Anxiety</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>Q_2</td>
<td>High Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>Q_3</td>
<td>Tough Poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>Q_4</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 All eight of the ex-trainees took Form C of the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire.
and after the trainees had participated in the program and in conjunction with the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. The Attitudinal Scale was administered with the responses being given on a continuum scale with a "one" response indicating the trainee strongly disagrees with the statement and a response of "seven" indicating the trainee strongly agrees with the statement. The tallies of responses the trainees made before and after participating in the video program are found on Tables 8 and 9. The means for the pre-test and post-test scores were determined and the differences in means between the pre-test and post-test scores were figured. This information is included in Table 10.

The responses from the trainees invariably were "one" or "seven". While taking the test for the first time, one man said, "The way I see it, you should believe in something all the way or not at all." Another trainee, who was brighter and had more job experience than most, explained almost apologetically when he handed in his test after taking it a second time, "I want you to understand that I really don't feel any worse about this item. I just realized that things can be seen from both sides." Few trainees were able to come to this realization and they continued to believe one should respond as completely agreeable or totally disagreeable. It is not understood why these responses were given as these responses are not consistent with the manner which the trainees responded throughout the program.

Though it is not understood why the responses were given as they were, one can make some hypotheses. Perhaps, as the one trainee indicated
TABLE 8

PRE-TEST RESULTS: A TALLY OF TRAINEES' RESPONSES
BEFORE PARTICIPATING IN THE VIDEO-TAPED PROGRAM
AS DETERMINED BY THE
ATTITUDINAL SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I should do everything possible to adapt to my boss's expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My boss wants a job done one way, but I know a better way. If I can't get the boss to see it my way, I should give in and do the job the boss's way.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I feel my fellow workers owe me more understanding on days when I'm in a bad mood.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>To show the man I want to work, I should dress differently when applying for different kinds of jobs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>If my boss acts in a particular way, I automatically have the right to do the same things.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To make things go more smoothly for me, I should do my work so things will go well for the boss too.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I know the difference between a foreman and a boss.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I need to show an interviewer who I really am, and that I'm willing to work and do a good job.</td>
<td>1 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If I'm an interesting person in my private life, I'm more likely to be an interesting person on my job.</td>
<td>2 0 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>It is important that I am at my position ready to begin work at the precise time I'm expected to be there.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I can ruin a good work record by just creating a few problems.</td>
<td>3 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>For me to get along with others, we must have the same ideas about life.</td>
<td>8 1 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I can't predict the future, but I can tell when a problem is about to jump off, and I can change before the action starts.</td>
<td>2 1 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>If I have a boss that just likes to cause trouble, I will try very hard to work with him.</td>
<td>5 0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I will make sure I explain things on an interview in words the interviewer will understand.</td>
<td>0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The way I act when problems occur on a job can tell me a lot about the kind of man I am.</td>
<td>1 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>If I ask for extra work on a job, the respect I'll get from my foreman will help things go better for me in the future.</td>
<td>0 0 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I know what the interviewer is looking for, and I am able to supply him with the information he wants.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>There are skills a worker can use which will keep people from bothering him.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>If I work steady on a job it will help me a lot more than if I work real hard from time to time.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The boss should be understanding of my personal problems.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Being skilled in my occupation should be all my boss should expect of me.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I should have a clear understanding with the boss as to just what duties I am to perform on the job.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>If I'm working at a job I like, I act differently than if I'm working at a job I don't like.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I should only do the job I was hired for even if the boss or foreman should ask me to do something else.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9

**POST-TEST RESULTS: A TALLY OF TRAINEES' RESPONSES**

**AFTER PARTICIPATING IN THE VIDEO-TAPED PROGRAM**

**AS DETERMINED BY THE**

**ATTITUDINAL SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I should do everything possible to adapt to my boss's expectations.</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 2 2 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My boss wants a job done one way, but I know a better way. If I can't get the boss to see it my way, I should give in and do the job the boss's way.</td>
<td>1 0 1 1 1 1 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I feel my fellow workers owe me more understanding on days when I'm in a bad mood.</td>
<td>3 3 0 2 1 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>To show the man I want to work, I should dress differently when applying for different kinds of jobs.</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 1 4 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>If my boss acts in a particular way, I automatically have the right to do the same things.</td>
<td>10 4 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To make things go more smoothly for me, I should do my work so things will go well for the boss too.</td>
<td>1 1 0 1 0 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I know the difference between a foreman and a boss.</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. I need to show an interviewer who I really am, and that I'm willing to work and do a good job.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If I'm an interesting person in my private life, I'm more likely to be an interesting person on my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. It is important that I am at my position ready to begin work at the precise time I'm expected to be there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. I can ruin a good work record by just creating a few problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. For me to get along with others, we must have the same ideas about life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. I can't predict the future, but I can tell when a problem is about to jump off, and I can change before the action starts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. If I have a boss that just likes to cause trouble, I will try very hard to work with him.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. I will make sure I explain things on an interview in words the interviewer will understand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The way I act when problems occur on a job can tell me a lot about the kind of man I am.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. If I ask for extra work on a job, the respect I'll get from my foreman will help things go better for me in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I know what the interviewer is looking for, and I am able to supply him with the information he wants.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 3 2 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. There are skills a worker can use which will keep people from bothering him.</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 1 4 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. If I work steady on a job it will help me a lot more than if I work real hard from time to time.</td>
<td>1 0 0 2 1 1 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The boss should be understanding of my personal problems.</td>
<td>7 4 0 2 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Being skilled in my occupation should be all my boss should expect of me.</td>
<td>3 1 4 3 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I should have a clear understanding with the boss as to just what duties I am to perform on the job.</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 2 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. If I'm working at a job I like, I act differently than if I'm working at a job I don't like.</td>
<td>4 0 2 2 0 0 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I should only do the job I was hired for even if the boss or foreman should ask me to do something else.</td>
<td>10 1 1 1 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 10

**MEAN AVERAGES FOR RESPONSES OF TRAINEES PARTICIPATING IN THE VIDEO PROGRAM AS DETERMINED BY THE ATTITUDINAL SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION #</th>
<th>PRE-TEST MEAN</th>
<th>POST-TEST MEAN</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE IN MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>+0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>+1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>+0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>+0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>+0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>+0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>+0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>+0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>+1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reader can find the statement that each of these numbers represents by referring to Tables 8 or 9.
scoring toward the middle was expected to indicate less interest or understanding. Since the trainee took the test at the first and knew that he had scored toward the extreme, it seems possible that he would not want to indicate he was less interested after he had a better understanding.

It also seems likely that the trainees actually had difficulty distinguishing degrees or shades of understanding. This all or none "gut" response may have relevance in the development of attitudes and particularly extreme behaviors which the trainees may allow as a result of these attitudes, but these data are not directly related to measuring the effectiveness of this video-taped program. Unfortunately, the Attitudinal Scale did not seem to effectively measure the attitudes of the trainees participating in the social skills program. The test statements were given along with the tallies of the trainees' responses to these statements in Tables 8 and 9 for readers to examine as they like. Table 10 lists the means along with changes which occurred between the pre-test and post-test. No attempt was made to analyze these data as it was felt that the instrument did not effectively measure the attitudes of the trainees who participated in this program.

The trainees' behaviors and comments which were noted while participating in the video program did not indicate the trainees would be likely to agree or disagree with the statements as strongly as they had marked on the Attitudinal Scale. This inconsistency was the basis for determining the likelihood that the Attitudinal Scale did not provide an accurate measure. Therefore, the test was deemed invalid.
DROP-OUTS

In the course of trainees participating in the first step of interviews for a worker's job, it was necessary for one trainee to be chosen out of three to perform the tasks of worker, then foreman and finally boss. The two trainees not chosen were given a lesson which included suggestions and information to give them the advantage over the new interviewee the next time the cycle was repeated. The experience proved to be quite traumatic for most of the trainees, as they equated rejection from the interview as personal inadequacy. On one extreme was a trainee who was rejected five times before he was chosen, but fortunately, with the help of some individual counseling and tutoring, he stuck it out and was finally accepted. On the other hand, four trainees quit after being rejected. (Of the four, three quit after only trying once.) These trainees could not be encouraged to continue and most of them indicated that, (1) they knew they could do well if they had to, or (2) they did not need to know how to do better; they had gotten by before. Both excuses were interpreted as rationalizations since they did not, in fact, get chosen by their peers.

The results of the 16 Personality Factor for these drop-outs were given in Table 11, and the results of the Attitudinal Scale in Table 12 without interpretation as it is believed that with a population of only four, one should not attempt to identify trends.
TABLE 11

DROP-OUTS RESULTS: A TALLY OF TRAINEES' TRAITS WHO DROPPED OUT OF THE VIDEO-TAPED PROGRAM AS DETERMINED BY THE 16 PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW SCORE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>STANDARD TEN SCORE (STEN) Average</th>
<th>HIGH SCORE DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>OUTGOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS INTELLIGENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>MORE INTELLIGENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFECTED BY FEELINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>EMOTIONALLY STABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMBLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>ASSERTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>HAPPY-GO-LUCKY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPEDIENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>VENTURESOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUGH-MINDED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TENDER-MINDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SUSPICIOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACTICAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>IMAGINATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORTHRIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>ASTUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ASSURED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>APPREHENSIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three trainees took Form C and one trainee took Form E of the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire.
# TABLE 12

**DROP-OUTS RESULTS: A TALLY OF TRAINEES' RESPONSES**

**WHO DROPPED OUT OF THE VIDEO-PROGRAM AS DETERMINED BY THE ATTITUDINAL SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I need to show an interviewer who I really am, and that I'm willing to work and do a good job.

   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

9. If I'm an interesting person in my private life, I'm most likely to be an interesting person on my job.

   | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

10. It is important that I am at my position ready to begin work at the precise time I'm expected to be there.

   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |

11. I can ruin a good work record by just creating a few problems.

   | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

12. For me to get along with others, we must have the same ideas about life.

   | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

13. I can't predict the future, but I can tell when a problem is about to jump off, and I can change before the action starts.

   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

14. If I have a boss that just likes to cause trouble, I will try very hard to work with him.

   | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

15. I will make sure I explain things on an interview in words the interviewer will understand.

   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |

16. The way I act when problems occur on the job can tell me a lot about the kind of man I am.

   | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

17. If I ask for extra work on a job, the respect I'll get from my foreman will help things go better for me in the future.

<p>| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 0 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 1 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0 2 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I know what the interviewer is looking for, and I am able to supply him with the information he wants.

19. There are skills a worker can use which will keep people from bothering him.

20. If I work steady on a job it will help me a lot more than if I work real hard from time to time.

21. The boss should be understanding of my personal problems.

22. Being skilled in my occupation should be all my boss should expect of me.

23. I should have a clear understanding with the boss as to just what duties I am to perform on the job.

24. If I'm working at a job I like, I act differently than if I'm working at a job I don't like.

25. I should only do the job I was hired for even if the boss or foreman should ask me to do something else.
CHAPTER V

EVALUATION OF RESULTS

PRESENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

The instructor observed that the trainees usually gave relatively astute comments as to what would be acceptable for the role they were playing. Prior to taking the social skills class, it seemed the trainees had generally been uninterested in taking time to analyze or understand the restrictions used by segments of society to measure its members. Most trainees had never realized that one's actions differed according to the role he was playing in society. After this role identity was well understood by the trainees, they had little difficulty accepting the rules which had been reiterated throughout the years.

Probably a valuable lesson was the development of analytical skills. It seemed that most of the trainees realized for the first time, as they moved into the roles of foreman and boss, that guidelines for the evaluation of their performance differed for each of these roles. For example, the trainees discovered that a worker usually decided that he had done a good job when he had tried hard or had done his best. However, a boss usually measured a worker's performance as acceptable if the work was completed on time, regardless of extra problems that had come up. One of the realities for being successful within a worker's
position was to bridge this gap in measuring adequate performance on a job while still remaining within the expectations of one's role. The closer the worker's standards matched those of the one who was measuring him, the less room there was for genuine disagreement, anxiety and stress. The lessons explained the parameters of the role expectations and when a role could be determined to be completed successfully. As the trainees viewed the replay of themselves, they offered suggestions on what should have been said, when it should have been said, and how one would go about it. Usually, the same kind of comments were made, regardless of the participants, and most suggestions were in line with expected behavior on a job. As these suggestions came from their peers, it was more readily accepted.

Surprisingly, the trainees seemed to need a lot of help to initially identify unacceptable behavior. The trainees seemed to lack the ability to differentiate between statements which would be helpful to them and those that they normally made on jobs which caused conflict. When the instructor gave prompts by asking questions like, "What could you have said that would have helped you more?" the trainees would usually respond with appropriate suggestions. The trainees who had been promoted as far as the boss role became more skilled at differentiating between acceptable and good responses, but they seldom developed a quick eye for these observations.

PRESENTATION OF THE TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire was administered soon after the trainee com-
pleted the last activity of the program. In order that the trainee would not be influenced by the instructor, the only directions were, "Please answer these questions about the video-taped program you have just finished." The answers seemed representative of the trainees, and they responded willingly to the questionnaire.

Most encouraging of the results was the total agreement among the trainees that the information presented in the lessons was real-life. This view was particularly important as the trainees had a habit of brushing off information as "He doesn't know what he's talking about" in an attempt to keep from dealing with sensitive issues in their lives. The fact that everyone involved was willing to admit that the information was real-life from his own perspective indicated, not only that the content was realistic, but also that the trainees were in fact willing to participate. Similarly, it was asked in question one, "Is there anything you thought you understood about the world of work before you started this series of lessons that you found you really did not understand?" In answering this question, roughly half of the trainees answered "yes." It seemed particularly difficult for inmates to admit they were in error, so to have nearly 50% admit to a mistake in understanding seemed especially refreshing.

Question numbers four and five were as follows: "Do you feel that taking this class will help you later when you are released?" and "What
will you do differently than before you took this class?" With a few exceptions, the trainees responded with actions which they would be taking themselves. When dealing with trainees who generally felt rejected by a society in which they had to live, it was not surprising that they often expressed the feeling that their fate was externally controlled. It was encouraging to see them mentioning areas which they would take the initiative in order to control the outcome in their favor.

When asked, "What part of the program did you enjoy most?" the responses were placed in these categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to, "What part of the program made you feel the most uncomfortable?" the responses were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that students generally favored being boss and foreman and disliked the interview and worker positions. This observation took on particular interest as the men would most likely spend the majority of their lives as interviewees and workers. An ideal program would be to teach men to enjoy taking orders as is required in worker roles. It seemed more realistic, however, to remove the threats involved with
being in a worker role and to teach one to maneuver effectively within that category. After understanding the dynamics involved with maintaining these roles, and at least passively accepting their necessity, one could tolerate adverse conditions and would hold less anxiety toward superiors. It would seem that if the fact that inmates did not want to be interviewees and workers, was common to other penal institutions as well, then some errors have been made in the emphasis placed on certain phases of rehabilitation. With the understanding that these trainees would most likely be taking orders, it seemed preferable to teach them skills of how to take orders, how to show interest, how to demonstrate good listening ability, and how to answer criticism effectively. It also seemed worthwhile for workers to understand the requirements which the foreman and boss needed to fulfill in order for them to keep their jobs. Thus, by undertaking the role of his superiors, the worker better appreciated the latter's concerns. As one satisfied his boss' needs, it was important to know how to make the boss aware of a properly completed job, and when it was in the worker's interest to assert himself.

Question number seven asked, "What would you change to improve the program?" Nine answered "nothing," while the others mentioned relatively unrelated complaints. Though nine of the participants listed the interviewee or worker roles as the ones that made them most uncomfortable in the program, none mentioned that these areas should be omitted or even changed when asked for suggestions to improve the program. It is thought that although the trainees were uncomfortable with the interviewee and worker roles, the trainees who finished the program were proud of their
success of making it through the difficult roles and saw the value of learning how to control the situation within the requirements of the roles.

PRESENTATION OF THE 16 PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

The 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire's reliability had been established through more than twenty years of use. The test seemed to be a fairly accurate measure of the trainee as far as could be determined. That is, the statements and responses made by the trainees while participating in the program usually seemed consistent with the trends indicated from the data collected. The 16 Personality Factor had the particular advantage of suggesting personality changes in specific areas with indications as to how these traits compared with others in society. The standardization and specificity proved convenient for identification, direction and magnitudes of changes. For the purposes of this discussion the totals of scores one, two, or three are called "low" factor scores and totals of eight, nine and ten are termed "high" factor scores. As indicated on the 16 Personality Factor profile, a score of high or low would be demonstrated by less than 16% of a standard population. Here only gross changes are discussed and these changes are only indicators of possible trends. For the purposes of this discussion, it was decided that a change of near 25% would be needed in the high or low categories before they would be considered. With the small population of fourteen

used in this study, it would be unrealistic to suggest that these data necessarily demonstrated that the same changes would result if repeated on a different population. Instead, an attempt was made to isolate and identify possible changes which were measurable and might be indicative of attitudinal changes.

The mean scores and the changes which resulted between the pre-tests and post-tests were calculated (see Table 5). As most of the mean scores were in the average range both before and after participating in the video program, it was felt that, as a group, the trainees did not indicate traits uncommonly found in society. However, the number of individual trainees scoring toward the limits of the scale varied significantly. It was thought that trainees exemplifying extreme behavior would be most vulnerable to censure by society. Therefore, this discussion emphasizes the tendency to move toward or away from uncommon traits which are indicated by high or low scores on the scale. A brief discussion of the mean scores is also included to suggest the general effect the video program had on the trainees as a group.

One should be very careful to use a good understanding of the trainees producing these scores when interpreting these data. In the end, it was the interpretation of these data that had importance and not the scores themselves. With this thought in mind, one should be very cautious and tempered in judgment of these scores. It was very possible that the successful survival scores used in a middle-class society would be ineffective for a trainee living in the inner city. It was also quite possible that a trainee must acquire certain traits which would be peculiar
to the individual terminating the cycle of in-and-out-of jail. Not enough research had been done in these areas, so one was left to hypothesize when interpreting these data. As inmates appeared to have rather unique problems, one is tempted to "interpret" and "hypothesize" rather freely. However, a limited study was made of eight ex-trainees who had remained out of jail for a minimum of two years, and the results suggested that one's interpretations should remain rather tempered. The 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire was administered to the successful ex-trainees to determine if there were particular personality traits which helped them remain free. It seemed likely that there might be uncommon characteristics which could be important to an ex-inmate who was attempting to overcome the stigma of having been incarcerated in order to join the mainstream of society. The results obtained from the eight ex-trainees did not indicate that they possessed any extraordinary characteristics. Surprising, the results seemed to be particularly typical. With the exception of Factor M (Practical versus Imaginative)² which was a borderline 6.50 average, all twenty scales of the ex-trainee population had a mean average within the normal range of the 16 Personality Factor scale.

The ex-trainee population (eight) was roughly one-half that of the trainees participating in the video-taped program (fourteen). Based on the differences in population size one would expect about one-half

the number of ex-trainees to have scored in the extremes of the 16 Personality Factor scale ("one's" or "ten's") as trainees participating in the video program. However, this was not the case. There were only two instances of ex-trainees scoring either "one" or "ten" on the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. This occurrence compared with twenty-four examples on the pre-test and seventeen cases on the post-test trainees participating in the video program. The considerably smaller number of scores appearing in the extremes of the 16 Personality Factor scale tended to substantiate that characteristics of successful ex-trainees deviated less from those most commonly found in society than the trainees who had not yet been successful.

The data obtained from the eight successful ex-trainees seemed to reflect the likelihood that there were unique characteristics which helped ex-inmates overcome the stigma of being incarcerated. Instead, these data suggested that successful trainees tended to blend with the characteristics commonly found in society rather than possess unique traits which helped them overcome the stresses caused by their past acts.

Some of the questions on the 16 Personality Factor were not expected to be 100% culture-fair. For example, question number fifty-five on the adult Form C stated: "Things go wrong for me: (a) rarely, (b) occasionally, (c) frequently." Answering "a" contributed to a high C Factor score of "Emotionally stable, mature, faces reality, calm." Answering "frequently" contributed to a low C Factor score of "Affected by feelings, emotionally less stable, easily upset, changeable." It seemed likely that the pressures involved with jail existence might, in fact, have
caused a number of things to go wrong rather than be an indication of one's lack of ego strength.

Question number seventy-seven of the same test stated: "If I could go back in time, I'd rather meet: (a) Columbus, (b) uncertain, (c) Shakespeare." An answer of "Shakespeare" supported a "Tender-minded, sensitive, clinging, overprotected direction," and an answer of "Columbus" contributed toward a "Tough-minded, self-reliant, realistic," or low score I Factor. It was thought that several of these trainees, with an average reading level of 8.0, would have scored differently on the test because they may have heard one name more than another rather than because of differences in opinions toward either of the two historical figures. These two examples were not intended to be representative of the 16 Personality Factor. These examples were included to demonstrate that the population involved in this study was a unique one and might not have answered according to the norms which were established when this test was developed.

Occasionally, making an interpretation of the results of the 16 Personality Factor was difficult as the data seemed inconsistent with the actions demonstrated by the trainees while taking the class. In these instances, the results collected from one test were used to help interpret the other.

Not all sixteen of the Personality Factors are discussed here. This study was undertaken to determine the feasibility of initiating attitudinal changes, and not describing the Personality Factors of a given inmate population. For that reason, only those factors which
had scored differently enough to suggest attitudinal changes were discussed. Factors included were: "C," affected by feelings versus emotionally stable; "E," humble versus assertive; "G," expedient versus conscientious; "I," tough-minded versus tender-minded; "L," trusting versus suspicious; "M," practical versus imaginative; "O," self-assured versus apprehensive; "Q₂," group-dependent versus self-sufficient; "Q₃," undisciplined self-conflict versus controlled; "Q₄," relaxed versus tense; and "Q₁₁," low anxiety versus high anxiety.²

One who is familiar with the 16 Personality Factor will remember that the questions asked to determine the personality factors scores generally referred to all facets of life. Only a fraction of the questions related directly to social interaction on a job. On the other hand, most of the instructions and examples in the program referred directly to the world of work. Therefore, a large difference in the specific area of one's attitude on a job would not necessarily have measured as large change when mixed with wide range of questions covered on the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire.

Factor C: "Affected by feelings" versus "Emotionally stable"³

The person who scores low on Factor C tends to be low in frustration tolerance for unsatisfactory conditions, changeable and plastic, evading necessary reality demands, neurotically fatigued, fretful, easily emotional and annoyed, active in dissatisfaction, having neurotic symptoms (phobias, sleep disturbances, psychosomatic complaints, etc.). Low Factor C

²Ibid., 18.
³Ibid.
score is common to almost all forms of neurotics and some psychotic disorders.\textsuperscript{4}

Before the video program, six trainees scored low on Factor C. After having completed the program, only two of the participants scored in this area, representing a change of more than 25%. The Manual for the \textit{16 Personality Factor Questionnaire} emphasizes the importance of this factor by pointing out "...a good C level sometimes enables a person to achieve effective adjustment despite underlying psychotic potential."\textsuperscript{5} Providing the decrease in low Factor C tally was an indication of actual attitudinal changes, this change seemed to be a very favorable response to the program. It was known that ex-PACE trainees were often moody and quite vocal in their dissatisfaction to their employers, a trait which placed them under the close scrutiny of their supervisors. Ex-trainees were typically emotional and easily disturbed when things did not go their way and, unfortunately, most of their experiences did not occur according to their own preferences. Therefore, an improvement in the mean "C" level from 4.57 to 5.50 was interpreted as a healthy change.

According to the responses from the questionnaire, the trainees indicated they found the worker's role the least desirable even after finishing the program. However, it was probably the position which they would most often fill. Judging from the trainees' discomfort with the role of worker, it followed that the trainees most likely viewed

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., 18.
\textsuperscript{5}Ibid.
their working experience as a disagreeable, annoying and an unsatisfactory necessity to be tolerated. Realizing a trainee's approach toward employment, it seemed that a realistic first step toward increasing a trainee's tolerance for the world of work was helping him understand the social dynamics involved in maintaining a functioning group through experience. By performing a particular role, it was hoped that the trainee would reach the conclusion that work was not really as threatening as he thought. Obviously, there were several conditions attached to this approach. The process of changing attitudes toward work involved many more aspects of living than could be directly included in the scope of this program. It seemed that one prerequisite for a trainee changing his attitude toward employment rested on his acceptance or rejection of the concept of role expectations on actual jobs. It was believed that if a trainee entered a worker role with a realistic understanding of the social structure and with the basic social skills for maneuvering within that structure, he would choose to perform according to the expectations made of him.

Though it seemed likely that the experiences provided in the video program may have contributed to raising the mean score 0.93 points on the scale, there was no increase in the number of trainees exhibiting high Factor C, "Emotionally Stable." These results seemed reasonable in that the explanations and experiences of dealing with criticism in this program only provided for understanding inter-personal and group dynamics. It was expected that the confidence and security involved in developing realistic emotional behavior (high Factor C) would grow
slowly and over a considerable length of time. Being emotionally stable was much more involved than maintaining a realistic understanding of group dynamics. Stability also required a series of healthy, successful experiences from which to draw. In other words, developing emotional stability involved a much more extensive program (both in length and depth) than this one provided.

Factor E: "Humble" versus "Assertive"\(^6\)

The person who scores low on Factor E tends to give way to others, to be docile, and to conform. He is often dependent, confessing, anxious for obsessional correctness. This passivity is part of many neurotic syndromes.\(^7\)

The pre-test results showed three trainees scoring low (humble, mild, accommodating, conforming, submissiveness) and six trainees scoring high in Factor E (assertive, independent, aggressive, competitive, stubborn, dominant). In the post-test results, no trainee scored low and seven trainees scored high for the same factor. Though the change in the high end of the scale is insufficient to suggest a trend, the change from the low Factor E may be large enough to warrant consideration when further research is conducted using a larger population. The mean score shifted upward 0.93 points on the scale indicating that as a whole the trainees tended to be more assertive and independent after participating in the video program.

Though it was questionable if these data were indicative of a trend, it was most likely a desirable one if it did exist. It seemed

\(^6\)Ibid., 6.

\(^7\)Ibid., 18.
that a person who had reached the bottom of the social scale, as most of these inmates had, needed to be rather independent in order to assert their worth on others. Generally, society had rejected inmates as social outcasts. If ex-inmates were going to break this stereotype, they would probably need to do more than conform to the expectations of a society that anticipated their failure. It seemed that a tendency toward being assertive would be a desirable trait. However, the manner in which a trainee asserted himself seemed to be of more importance—a characteristic which was not measured in Factor E. 

Factor G: "Expedient" versus "Conscientious"

The person who scores low on the Factor G tends to be unsteady in purpose. He is often casual and lacking in effort for group undertakings and cultural demands. His freedom from group influence may lead to anti-social acts, but at times makes him more effective, while his refusal to be bound by rules causes him to have less somatic upset from stress.

The person who scores high on Factor G tends to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, persevering, responsible, planful, 'fills the unforgiving minutes'. He is usually conscientious and moralistic and he prefers hard-working people to witty companions.

One of the basic approaches in presenting the program to the trainees was to emphasize that society had some basic conditions to which it required its members to adhere. If one chose to accept these conditions (regardless if he considered them as fair or unfair, good or bad or agreeable or disagreeable) society tended to accept him. It was explained

---
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that a person was fairly free to function within the boundaries established for a particular role or expectation. If one chose to express his freedom outside these boundaries, society would often retaliate with persuasion or even force. So each man had an obligation to himself to discover the extent of these restrictions, the strength of these requirements, and then decide which ones he would choose to abide by in order to receive the kind of freedom he desired.

The presentation was as straight-forward and direct as possible. An attempt was made to have the trainees role play stress situations which are commonly encountered on a job with the participants receiving the same limitations, power, and rewards as a person in that role. Some of the spontaneous remarks and actions made by the trainees indicated they discovered that even in relatively powerful roles of "bosses," one was required to respond within fairly rigid limits. If he did not, he would not remain as "boss" very long.

Basically, the approach to the socialization process presented in this program had very little to do with caring for others. Instead, it was a pragmatic, ego-centered attempt for each man to analyze, decide and then practice how he would modify his behavior into a form that would help him get what he wanted. It was with this understanding that an interpretation could be developed for the data collected for the G Factor.

The data showed that two more trainees scored low in the post-test G Factor while two fewer scored high on the post-test G Factor. The G Factor showed the largest single change in mean score on the 16
**Personality Factor.** The score dropped from 7.07 on the pre-test to 5.79 on the post-test which is a change of 1.28 points. (It should be noted that though there seemed to be a shift toward "expedient," the mean score of 5.79 is well within average on the **16 Personality Factor** scale.)

After completing the program, there seemed to be more of a tendency toward evading rules and a weaker super-ego. This was not necessarily a desirable result in that "his freedom from group influence may lead to anti-social action." There were two possible conclusions one could draw from these data though only further research could establish either's validity. One possible explanation that the trainees complied with some of society's rules, as long as he determined it would benefit him to acquiesce.

If this explanation should prove to be true, then any new rule that the trainee had not yet evaluated as being worthwhile or advantageous to him was free to be broken. Judging from the spontaneous comments given by several of the trainees while participating in the program, this explanation may have validity.

The second possible conclusion may have resulted from the make-up of the test itself. Most of the questions in the **16 Personality Factor** dealt with the interaction among one's peers, acquaintances and family---not job acquaintances or problems with authority figures on a job. The limitations of the **16 Personality Factor** have been reached.

---
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because the test asked questions about social interactions but the responses have been applied to a different situation—namely the world of work. It seems possible that the limitations of the test were ignored if one assumes responses toward peers, would be the same as those made toward co-workers. If we interpreted these data as they related to the trainees' peers, the responses might very well have been desirable. In this case one could interpret these data as meaning trainees would no longer feel bound by the rules of their peers. For example, the rules of inner-city living said it was "square" to study in school. If a man felt the strength to master group influence, then performing an "anti-social act" like studying or going to school, might very well have been a positive step. Just as in several descriptions of personality factors that are to follow, precise interpretations were far beyond the scope of this study.

Factor L: "Trusting" versus "Suspicious" ¹¹

The person who scores high on Factor L tends to be mistrusting and doubtful. He is often involved in his own ego, is self-opinionated, and interested in internal, mental life. He is usually deliberate in his actions, unconcerned about other people, a poor team member.¹²

Approximately one-third of the population scored high on Factor L (Suspicious) before the program and approximately one-half of the trainees scored high on the same factor on the post-test. These data indicate that the suspicions of the trainees participating in this program probably increased as a result of the experiences in the video program.

¹¹Ibid., 6.
¹²Ibid., 20.
The increase in mean scores from 6.50 on the pre-test to 7.07 on the post-test...an increase of 0.57...supports the probability that the trainees augmented their tendency toward doubting and mistrust. It may have been of consequence that the mean score increased beyond the bounds of average in suspicious factor.

Factor 0: "Self-assured" versus "Apprehensive" 16

The person who scores high on Factor 0 tends to be depressed, moody, a worrier, full of foreboding, and brooding. He has a childlike tendency to anxiety in difficulties. He does not feel accepted in groups or free to participate. High Factor 0 score is very common in clinical groups of all types. 17

The pre-test tally showed four trainees scored high in apprehension and the post-test revealed an increase of two trainees to bring the tally up to six. The mean average increased from 6.57 on the pre-test to 7.00 on the post-test. As one can see, the mean average shifted upward after participating in the video program out of the average range of the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. The demonstrated increase toward guilt proneness was not necessarily a desirable change, though it could have been indicative of reaching a stage on the way to an end. If a trainee were to realize that he had many changes to make in his personal life, it seemed likely that worrying and being troubled would be a likely result even if the trainee knew the direction he needed to go. The confidence a trainee would have needed to move toward being

16Ibid., 6.
17Ibid., 21.
self-assured would be expected to result only after repeated successful encounters in real-life situations. It was hoped that the "childlike tendency to anxiety in difficulties"¹⁸ description did not apply to the trainees completing the video program. As the reader will observe as he reads the Q₁ description discussed later in the paper, the anxiety level seemed to decrease after the trainee completed the program.¹⁹

The scores for Q₁ Factor through Q_IV Factor are derived from the scores of the sixteen personality factors A through Q₄.

Factor Q₂: "Group-dependent" versus "Self-sufficient"²⁰

The person who scores low on Factor Q₂ prefers to work and make decisions with other people, likes and depends on social approval and admiration. He tends to go along with the group and may be lacking in individual resolution.²¹

The person who scores high on Factor Q₂ is temperamentally independent, accustomed to going his own way, making decisions and taking action on his own.²²

There seemed to be a subtle trend away from group dependency ("likes and depends on social approval and admiration")²³ and toward self-sufficiency. ("The person who scores high on Factor Q₂ is temperamentally independent, accustomed to going his own way, making decisions

¹⁸Ibid.
¹⁹Ibid.
²⁰Ibid., 6
²¹Ibid., 22.
²²Ibid.
²³Ibid.
and taking action on his own."\textsuperscript{24} There was a comparatively large shift on the mean score of 0.80 points toward self-sufficiency. This trend might be worth close scrutiny when further research is conducted on a larger number of participants. As the trainees often blamed gang-related and drug-related crimes on the need for acceptance, this trend might very well take on weighty proportions.

Factor Q\textsubscript{3}: "Undisciplined Self-conflict" versus "Controlled"\textsuperscript{25}

The person who scores high on Factor Q\textsubscript{3} tends to have strong control of his emotions and general behavior, is inclined to be socially aware and careful, and evidences what is commonly termed 'self-respect' and regard for social reputation.\textsuperscript{26}

Only two trainees scored low on Factor Q\textsubscript{3} before they participated in the program, however, five trainees scored low on Factor Q\textsubscript{3} after completing the program. "He may feel maladjusted"\textsuperscript{27} and it might be interpreted that the trainee had recognized that he had serious deficits in the realm of social adjustments and had not had time yet to shape his behavior into what he considered advantageous to him. Though normally one would not judge "undisciplined self-conflict" to be a favorable response participating in a behavior modification program, it might be

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., 6.

\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., 22.

\textsuperscript{27}Ibid.
an indication that the trainees had reached the "evaluation" stage in the process of acceptance. This interpretation might very well be valid when compiled with the responses given by the trainees themselves. With the exception of one participant, none of the trainees reaching the level of worker or higher expressed feelings or showed behavior that could be interpreted as negative. Beal and Bohlen stated "changes which involve new skills or techniques usually require longer periods of time." It was suggested that trainees who expressed more self-conflict were actually trying to make a mental application of the ideas presented in the video program. They might have realized how drastic a change they had to make and how many new skills and techniques they had to develop. This new realization might have been threatening but not unhealthy if it were a step toward a trainee being willing to change his life. Perhaps these trainees represented the slower "adopters" in the attitudinal acceptance scheme described by Beal and Bohlen.


29Ibid.

30Ibid., 5-6.
The pre-test results showed only one trainee scoring high on the Q3 Factor, while five trainees, or approximately one-third of the participants scored high on the post-test scores. These results tended to indicate that participation in the program helped a trainee develop more social awareness and the confidence that he could participate in this newly found social structure. The overall change as seen in the mean score for Q3 Factor was an unimportant 0.07 point.

Factor Q4: "Relaxed" versus "Tense" 31

The person who scores high on Factor Q4 tends to be tense, excitable, restless, fretful, impatient. He is often fatigued, but unable to remain inactive. In groups he takes a poor view of the degree of unity, orderliness, and leadership. His frustration represents an excess of stimulated, but undischarged, drive. 32

More than half of the trainees (eight) scored above average in the tension factor before participating in the video program. After completing the program, approximately one-fourth (4) of the trainees scored above average. Similarly, six trainees scored high in Q4 Factor before beginning the program and only three scored high afterwards. The mean score shifted 0.64 points toward "relaxed" for trainees on the post-test. This factor was particularly important in that most of the trainees leaving PACE entered jobs at a worker level and often for large industries which operated on order. These companies required ex-trainees to take direct orders and instructions. By one-half of the trainees scoring

31Manual for 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, 6.
32Ibid., 22.
"average" tension levels after completing the course, it seemed that these trainees should have come closer to reacting acceptably to the stress which order and authority required in large organizations.

**Factor QII: "Low Anxiety" versus "High Anxiety"**

The person who scores high on this Factor is high on anxiety, as it is commonly understood. He need not be neurotic, since anxiety could be situational, but it is probable that he has some maladjustment, i.e., he is dissatisfied with the degree to which he is able to meet the demands of life and to achieve what he desires. Very high anxiety is generally disruptive of performance and productive of physical disturbances.

It seemed to be of consequence that six trainees scored high on the anxiety factor before the course while only two scored high after completing the course. Though the video program may have contributed to reducing the number of trainees exhibiting high anxiety, the overall affect on the trainees as judged by the mean scores was a less prominent 0.28 point move toward "low anxiety." Most important was the increase in satisfaction with "the degree to which he is able to meet the demands of life and to achieve what he desires." Contrary to the stereo-type many individuals have had of offenders, most did not choose their anti-social behavior. Rather, they were taught through experience that the deviant behaviors were functionally adequate to deal with the social stresses of their inner-city environment. Unfortunately, these behaviors

---
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were often inappropriate when functioning in a large organization. The dichotomy which developed between behaviors which a trainee learned are successful life skills from daily experience but were failures when used in job situations caused a great deal of tension, frustration and anxiety. It seemed that helping a trainee fit together the behaviors he considered successful from experience with those incorporating middle-class values he considered true to life, was a major step toward reducing anxiety. A trainee who was willing to incorporate previously alien behaviors into his own performance was certainly demonstrating an attitudinal change.

It was basic to the concept of the social skills program that a trainee chose his behavior in order to increase his chances of success. There was no attempt to moralize about the good or bad of the "system," instead it seemed important that each trainee recognized the requirements and conditions the "system" placed on him and then have the trainee determine how he could best function within society's written and unwritten laws. It seemed from the results of the Q system Anxiety Factor that there might have been a trend toward meeting the demands of life in order to achieve his desires.
CHAPTER VI

LIMITATIONS AND PROBLEMS

The video-taped social skills program was not without its problems and limitations. With PACE being situated in two separate buildings without ready access from one building to the other, and with the PACE trainees living in two separate areas of the jail, getting the three participants to the right room at the proper time took on disproportionate quantities of time and effort for such a simple task. At the time these data were collected, the jail was experiencing the largest number of jailbreaks in its history. It was understandable that the officers were trying to cut down on as much unnecessary traffic as possible from one part of the jail to another. Naturally, requests to have trainees moved from their tiers to participate in the social skills project was usually heeded hesitantly or, sometimes, not at all. There were also numerous activities which inmates were expected to participate in as soon as called. Some of these included head counts, clean-ups, line-ups, special assemblies, commissary, and hospital calls. Unfortunately, it was usually imperative that each of the three trainees be present in order for anyone in the group to participate in their roles. Perhaps it would have been more expedient if the program were constructed without the necessity of all three roles being present in order to function smoothly considering the environment in which the program was designed.
to operate.

In its present form, the video-tape program was designed to only handle three participants at a given time and using one instructor. It would seem that there would be little need to have this course taught by a certified teacher, as a knowledgeable, well-experienced (maybe even retired) industry worker would be ideally suited for the job.

As the trainees progressed through the stages of the program, it was found that they made similar comments at seemingly identical stages of the program. It was suggested that in the future, these moments of self-awareness be carefully recorded and logged so that the proper input could be put on the video-taped portion of the lessons and perhaps eliminate the need for an instructor at each stage of the program.

Another problem became evident as trainees began answering the questions from the taped interview. Several trainees wanted to quit but they were encouraged to continue, while four others quit entirely. The trainees equated not being chosen with personal rejection. (On the other hand, it is thought that the trainees who were chosen felt that they had, in fact, accomplished something worthwhile. Perhaps this accomplishment accounted for some of the high motivation of the participants.) Though the trainees that quit had a lesson in observing how they dealt with obstacles themselves, they might not have accomplished anything from this understanding if they were unable to gather the strength to overcome their deficiency. It is suggested that in the future trainees
be taken through several steps prior to answering the interviewer's questions. That is, additional steps building up to an interview might have had the effect of allowing one to work out this weakness before he was actually called upon to answer the direct and somewhat difficult questions which he already saw as a threat. It was also expected that some of the personal rejection could have been alleviated if the trainee had anticipated the extent of these rejection feelings and been prepared for them through the video-taped lessons. It is not expected that these additional steps would be particularly difficult to include in the program in order to reduce the threat of failure, and minimize the number of people who dropped out before they had the chance to test the remainder of the program.

Lastly, one should be very cautious in projecting these results onto other populations as the program was written for and administered to a very specific group of individuals. The several serious limitations which make this population unique are described fairly specifically in Chapter Three. Naturally, one would expect that there would be several similar characteristics which would be common with other jails and prisons. However, these mutual characteristics have not been established and neither have the importance of suspected similarities. Therefore, one should limit his interpretation having relevance to those trainees participating in the social skills program at PACE Institute. If one chooses to project these results onto other populations, he should realize that his interpretation could not be substantiated as more than speculation.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

In writing a social skills program specifically for the inmates attending the PACE Institute at the Cook County Jail, it was found that changes could be encouraged and identified as a result of an individualized video-taped program. Though this study only involved a small population to establish the feasibility of further research, changes did occur which seemed positive in respect to socialibility and job readiness. It was found that the trainees involved in this study disliked the roles of interviewee and worker most, yet, these are the roles in which they would most likely start as soon as they are released from jail. Probably the greatest number would spend the majority of their lives in the roles of workers. This preference seemed logical as most of us would prefer to make decisions for others rather than have others make decisions for us. It seemed, however, that a lot of trainees failed to understand that by using the correct skills and techniques they could maneuver quite well even while remaining in the worker role. Trainees did not appear to use the dynamics of social interactions (especially when related to work) to their own advantage. To help the inmates identify appropriate responses to difficult interactions, a model was constructed which was viewed by the inmates themselves as real-life. This model could be repeated over and over to provide practice with key job-related
experiences. The evaluation of these experiences came from new vantage points as the trainees were able to evaluate themselves in the situations described below:

a. When viewing themselves as a third party through the video playback.

b. As the trainees received suggestions showing exactly where they could have changed their behavior in order to affect the results.

c. As the trainees practiced evaluating the behavior of their peers.

d. As the trainees became more refined in the judgment toward others and themselves.

e. As the trainees played the roles of foreman and boss.

Probably playing the roles of foreman and boss was the most important. Many found themselves making precisely the same requirements of others which they had rebelled against when they were in the roles of workers. By performing the three separate roles, trainees were able to develop a hierarchy of expectations which each role required. The trainees also learned how they, as workers, could fulfill those expectations without sacrificing their own individuality. Realistically, it would be difficult or impossible to cause someone to prefer a worker's role. However, one could be taught the reasons for some of society's expectations and remove some of the anxieties and threats from a misunderstood authority institution. A trainee could be helped to realize that he would make the same requirements if he were in the management position, because he already had when he played the boss role. This video-taped program seemed to be successful on this limited population in increasing ones' tolerance and threshold as shown by the decreased tension and increased stability on the 16 Personality Factor scales. It
also seemed commendable that the trainees were able to transfer some
of the material which was directed toward a work situation in the
program and apply it toward their everyday lives.

The Trainee Questionnaire also indicated that a meaningful job-
related program could be developed for men while they were still incar-
cerated which they would use after being released. One hundred per
cent of the trainees stated they believed the information was real-life.
This response seemed particularly worthy of mention in that the PACE
program was undergoing a great deal of turmoil at the time these data
were collected; the trainees were particularly negative and anxious to
find fault with most actions that were staff-initiated at that particular
time. Some of the trainees who appeared to be masters of complaining
also seemed to be experts at imposing the responsibility for correcting
complaints on someone else. Most of these same "experts" indicated
that they expected to be initiating some changes within themselves.
This internalization of the problem-solving process may very well be
the most important single change observed in the entire program. The
majority of trainees understood that improving themselves had to begin
with them initiating modifications in their lives and then being willing
to carry out the actions which would cause these modifications to occur.
To understand their predicaments and then be willing to work through
their difficult situations, could have profound consequences in the
rehabilitation of these trainees.

It can be said that the program was successful within the very
specialized and limited population used for this study. The results,
however, should be recognized for what they are. In general, the results were measures of how the trainee felt he would respond in a given situation. Naturally, the real tests should be how well trainees respond to actual stresses, how successful they are in obtaining and then keeping jobs, and how many trainees are able to remain free from incarceration. The duration of this observed improvement was not measured. The population studied remained small (fourteen trainees) and limited to the PACE Institute located inside the Cook County Jail. Again and again, there are many variables which leave numerous unanswered questions. Though many questions are left without answers, there are definite data which suggest progress in a particularly difficult area of rehabilitation which has been ignored for years. Perhaps the ideas and procedures used here, coupled with meaningful basic education and vocational training programs could result in successful rehabilitation and, more importantly, successful human beings.
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APPENDIX A

READERS' AUDIO SCRIPT FOR VIDEO-TAPED PROGRAM
INTRODUCTION

This is about seeing and understanding.

1. What you see in yourself.
2. What you see in others.
3. What others see in you.
4. Making sure others see in you exactly what you want them to see.

..."Hey Jack, I'm all right."

"He's the one."

When we really understand each other, we usually get along better. Some people know how to get along pretty well with almost anybody... even the ones that have different ideas and attitudes. These people that know how to get along with all kinds of people are said to have good social skills. These lessons are designed to help you get it all together in the area of social skills.

This course is going to be a kind of class that you've probably never had before. We're not going to tell you anything you don't already know. We're just going to be looking at the same old things, but in new ways. If we're lucky, one of the most important "same old things" we'll be looking at is the same old you! We're going to change the way we look at ourselves and be more exact about how we see ourselves and others. We'll be taking apart a lot of our actions and dis-
cussing how others see us...and how WE see ourselves. Some things we talk about, you'll need to use; some you won't. It will be your job to pick out what's good for you and what isn't. There are some skills that you won't need today that you'll need a year or two from now. Caution! When a new problem presents itself, we don't want to need some understanding that we chose to throw away earlier because we said we didn't need it at that time. Since no one knows what the future brings, we need everything going for us that we can. What might not have been very important to you before you were locked up might be very important to you right now---like maybe a friend who'll write you a letter. Letters would have been nice out on the street, but not all that important. But now the conditions have changed and it surely would be beautiful to receive 3-4 friendly letters today, especially if she enclosed a check! It's too late now to find and make new friends who would like to write. You have to make do with what you already have.

"If I'd only known what was going to happen. I could have gotten it all ready."

The fact is that we don't know and will never be able to predict the future. The best we can do is be prepared for a lot of the problems that will present themselves. We'll be ready for some problems that will never happen. But being prepared for a problem and not having to use it never caused anyone any problems. It's those ones we have not prepared for that come our way. Those cause the problems!

A few years ago there was a humorous play in Chicago called "Don't
Bother Me, I Can't Cope." The idea was, "Don't bring me problems because I cannot deal with them." However, problems must be faced! Even dogs must contend with problems and, in fact, they may be better than people at using these coping skills. Generally, dogs know how to get along with even the nastiest people. They seem to have an instinct that tells them "If I bite the wrong person or act mean at the wrong time, I'll get put away." For the ones which ignore this instinct and turn on their owner, they are, in fact, taken to the dog pound and "put away."

There are a multitude of ways of coping with problems when they confront us. Probably everyone will agree that if you are going to deal with someone, you want to do it in a way that will help yourself the most. The ways we rap, walk, and carry ourselves when someone irritates us is important. How we display our reactions to these unpleasant situations is for us to choose. Our experiences often involve intense feelings and emotions and may cause serious problems. A true man is one who has the ability, strength and confidence to take care of himself under these tough circumstances. He needs the quality of standing up for his rights while recognizing the rights of others.

This course is built to be interesting and enjoyable. While the topics are being presented in a light manner, the serious result will be to see yourself as you have never seen yourself before and to do some evaluating that you have never done before. To carry out this project, we will need some ground rules. Let's state them here:
1. First of all, this is a doing lesson and not one we just talk or read about. Nobody can learn how to do something sitting on his bottom. You'll be given a lot of directions describing what you are to do. So be ready to carry out these instructions the best you can instead of just talking about what you should do.

2. Listen to the instructions given you and follow them as closely as possible.

3. Each step must be completed before progressing to the next, unless special instructions are given on the TV monitor.

An employment situation will be constructed using a worker, a foreman, and a boss. As the worker, you will be told what chore is to be accomplished at each step along the way. Your foreman and his boss have been given instructions on how to evaluate how good you do your job and how much work you do. Situations will be provided on purpose which are difficult and uncomfortable. These problems will be as real as possible and will deal with people. Just like in real life, you will be judged by the things you do and the way you carry yourself while doing them. There's a big difference here though. Here you get some feedback and a chance to try again. Most of us never get a chance to try our hand at being boss in real life, but we will here! Be sure to do the very best that you can and act in the way that you feel will be most valuable to you. Although many of the results cannot be foreseen, you can be assured of these two things:

a. Regardless of how good you think you are, you will see ways to
improve yourself. (Provided, of course, as in all situations, you are for real.)

b. No matter how little you think of yourself, you will find some things you like about yourself. (Again, providing you approach the whole program sincerely.)

In the first step, you will be having a job interview with an employer who is on the TV monitor. As in real life, the personnel manager will interview more prospective employees than he has jobs to be filled, and then he will select the one he believes will be most suited in skills, reliability and performance. Here you will be compared against two other men. Only one of you will be given the job. In this set of lessons, there are three roles: "worker", "foreman", and "boss."

Here you are applying for a worker's job in a furniture refinishing company as a stripper's helper. Here is a copy of the ad taken from Sunday's paper:
WANT AD FOR FURNITURE STRIPPER


Now, think about what you should say. When you are ready, tell your instructor you are ready for your interview.
Interviewer: Good morning. You're here in response to our add in yesterday's paper, right?

Interviewer: Do you have any experience working with metal or wood in a shop like ours?

Interviewer: Why do you think you can do this job?

Interviewer: You will find out that this job is dirty and smelly and the stripping fluid is hard on your hands. Are you still interested in getting the job?

Interviewer: The shop foreman has been with us several years and has a record of getting the work out on time. Do you feel you can work with him to keep up the production schedule?

Interviewer: What are the characteristics you feel you have which will help you in your work?

Interviewer: Where did you last work and how long did you work there?

Interviewer: Why did you leave your last job?

Interviewer: Do you have a reference I can check with from your last job?

Interviewer: Thank you very much. We'll be in contact with you.
Why do we go for an interview? If you said something like, "It's just something you've got to do to get a job," it's not particularly surprising that you weren't the one picked out of the three trainees. It seems that every job requires a man to do a hundred chores more than just what he was told he would when he first started. One of those chores which few people realize as part of their job is selling themselves to an employer. That is, you've got to convince the man that you are what he needs. Few people look at this step as important to the job because they aren't collecting any money. Actually, this step might be one of the most valuable ones around because if you do these 15-20 minutes up right, you might be setting yourself up for some cash money that you'll be able to collect on later.

Now we all know how we see job interviews, but how does the man doing the interviewing look at it. This is Mr. Norbert Dompke, owner and president of Root Photographers, the largest and most modern portrait studio in the United States. Mr. Dompke interviews every employee for his company. He knows exactly what he is looking for when he interviews someone. Let's see how he sees things from his side.

"First of all, I assume that a man is coming to an interview to show me what he plans to do if he gets the job I've got to offer. He
also comes to see what working conditions and how much money he can expect to get from me. Obviously, for my part, the interview is to see how much and what kind of work I can expect to get out of him. He knows why I'm talking with him; I know why he is talking to me. But somehow, I get the feeling that a lot of people don't know why they come for an interview. If a man comes to talk to me about working and he's dressed in these so-called superfly clothes, he's telling me he's interested in being "pretty." The man sometimes says, "This is just the way I like to dress." That's the man's business. I don't care what the man is like on the street. He came to talk to me about a job, and by bringing his street talk into our conversation about work, he is telling me he is interested in being "pretty" on the job. A man who is interested in being "pretty" isn't going to care to get dirty when that time comes. If there is a dirty job that needs to be done, this man isn't going to be ready to do it. I need someone who is flexible, and superfly clothes don't show me someone who is this kind of person. The same thing goes for long fingernails. If a man came to convince me he wants to work, he had better cut those nails before he comes. I need to see what he considers a respectable length. I'm assuming that what I see is what I'll get. So I don't want anyone to come to me telling me what he will do IF he gets the job.

All I've got is 10-15 minutes to find out all that I can about a person. I may not be exactly right, but I know pretty much what a man is going to be like after that short time. Here are some things I look
for: messy hair, dirty fingernails, and sloppy clothes. I figure that if the man doesn't even care about himself, he certainly isn't going to care about getting a job done for me. From time to time, I criticize something about a person during an interview just to see how he is going to handle it. In this business, jobs have to be done exactly right. If a job isn't being done correctly, I'm definitely going to be telling him about it. If he can't handle criticism, then he's not the man I need.

I might also describe my business to the person who comes for a job. While I talk, I look to see how good he is at listening. If he can't pay attention to me when he came to show me that he will be a good employee, then I assume he won't pay attention later on the job with a lot of distractions.

Some of these things might be unfair. There are probably a lot of good people that I've turned down. However, I'm not going to gamble any more than I have to. If I was only interested in the man's qualifications, then there would be no need for an interview. I would just go through all the applications until I found a man who met the requirements. The purpose of that interview is to increase my odds. Each employee costs me a lot of money. Let's suppose I pay a man a salary of $6,000. That's all he sees. But I've got to pay $351 in social security, insurance, and training.

If a man quits, I've got to pay unemployment compensation. So a man that I pay $6,000 salary, costs me around $8,000. That means that I've got to make $8,000 more profit from pictures to break even on paying his
salary. If this man is sick every other week, or if he has a grandmother or uncle who dies each month, the man costs me more than I agreed to pay...and he's got to go.

I've got machines here that are the most modern in the business, but they must be taken care of exactly according to directions. If someone forgets to check the temperature in a particular chemical solution (really a very simple job) thousands of dollars worth of pictures could be ruined and all those customers lost permanently. You see, I don't need someone who usually does something right. I need someone that pays attention to details and does a job right every time. In that interview, the man has got to convince me he is going to try his best to do the jobs I give him the best he can every time. If this man isn't serious about his job, he can forget about working here. These little mistakes people make because they're sloppy cost me money, and I'm not willing to pay out money for something I don't get. I realize when a man comes to me asking for a job, he wants as much money as he can get. I also understand that if a man is offered more money for less work somewhere else, he will go to work for them. But somehow, there are people who think it's wrong for me to be in this business to make money too. I've definitely got to see in that interview that the man is going to help me earn some money or I'm not going to make a job for him."

Some people would say the man was hard. As one would expect, he's going to make the requirements which seem important to him. We shouldn't be too critical of the employer because we do the same thing in reverse.
We say,

"I won't work if I don't get at least $3.00/hour."

"I'm not working that graveyard shift."

"Now, I can't be getting my hands dirty."

Actually, we already know how to show an employer that we are interested in a job. Look at the way this PACE trainee tried to convince his learning manager he was interested in a job. This man was the most successful of the three trainees who tried.

Did you notice how he was sitting?

Was he courteous?

Well groomed?

Alert?

How did he walk?

What was said to make the learning manager think he was responsible?

Now check out a little different contest we had. This time the trainee who showed the least interest was rewarded.

ROLE PLAY OF MAN SHOWING HOW NOT TO INTERVIEW FOR JOB

Did the sitting positions change?

Was the man as courteous the next time?

How was he groomed?

How alert was he this time?

Did he change the way he walked?

Obviously, this time the trainee didn't promise to do anything for
interviewer.

As you can see, it isn't too hard to tell what's on a man's mind by his actions. Of course, these are extremes, but the interviewer uses the same actions to measure by. A man who isn't trying to do everything wrong just won't do as many things wrong in a short period of time. Most of us know how to show interest, care for ourselves, and just be interesting people. For some crazy reason though, some of us think the employer is supposed to read into our minds and completely ignore what we tell him by our actions. Tell your instructor you are ready to take the interview again, and this time think about what you are telling your interviewer with each action you make.
LESSON EXPLAINING WHAT INTERVIEWER IS LOOKING FOR

OPTION II

You can get a lot of feelings from people. The way you feel about them and the way you react to them depends a lot on HOW they come to you. There is a saying that "Words are cheap". Another phrase heard a lot around PACE is "What you say don't mean nothin'!" The meaning of what we say can be changed entirely by the way we say it. Take for example, "What's in the road ahead?" That could have a very different meaning just by changing the way we make the same sounds. "What's in the road? A head?"

Just as the way we hear sounds can change our understanding, so can our actions. Take a minor bluff situation on the tier when a new man doesn't want to give up his cigarettes to an older and bigger man who is demanding all his cigarettes. Just to make it interesting, pay attention mostly to the men's actions. As you look at the two trainees arguing, notice how one man makes sure the other man realizes that he is not going to be a chump. The taller man clearly states this to the man in words, but he backs it up with body language. He makes sure that the man believes that every part of him---his mouth, his fists, his whole body---is ready to take those cigarettes....today and whenever he wants them. Where is the man with the cigarettes looking? Do you think he could be just as effective if he didn't look at the man in the
eye? Does the way he is standing tell you he cares about what he is saying? Is he more convincing by adding some hand motions?

INSERT ROLE PLAY

Often an employer will ask you a few fact questions when he starts the interview. But for the most part he is finished collecting facts before you come to an interview—the facts he wants to know should have been included on the application form. You can assume that if a man asks you in for an interview, he must have been fairly well satisfied with the facts about you. Now he is asking you in to take a look at you. He wants to know how you feel about working, but obviously he can't get inside your brain. The only thing left for him to do is see what your actions show him.

You use the same technique to check out a car. The salesman tells you the facts first:

"It's a one-owner beauty. The tires are new and the car's only two years old. The engine has 347 cubic inches and it has a brand new paint job. The previous owner was a little old lady that only put on 13,000 miles."

That's all fine, but can I believe his words? How do I feel about car salesmen? How well does it ride? Do I have enough power to pass on a hill? Is that new paint job in a color that I like?

Are you satisfied with the ride? Do you like the amount of power it gives? Is the color one you would pick? These are things that can only be satisfied by you.

There are some fairly obvious actions you can take to come across
well with the one who will employ you. First, make your actions tell
the man what you really are. What are these body language signs? Do
you sit, walk or stand as if you are alert, business-like, and are in-
terested in what the man is saying? Do you look him in the eye as if
you considered what he was saying is important? Do these actions show
that you have confidence in your ability and are comfortable in talking
to strangers? What are you telling the man with your eyes? Those eyes
tell a lot more about people than we'd like to think.

There are normally a lot of different things going through our
minds at any one time. Usually our eyes follow the thought that is
strongest in our brains at that moment. Though we may know what an
interviewer is saying, it's a dead giveaway that he isn't the most
important thought in our minds when our eyes are floating off in all
directions.

The interviewer is an expert in looking at or observing people.
He does it all day long. He associates probable future work-related
actions with present interview actions. Thus, you need to be in full
control of your actions during an interview. Learning a few rules will
not make you an expert in this field, but it can get you started look-
ing for the right things. Continued effort and practice will be neces-
sary to make it a part of you. The same technique is used in baseball.
Knowing the rules is cool. Even practicing a couple of times might make
you able to hit the ball if it comes directly over the plate slowly. But
just because you are ready for the slow pitches over home plate, it doesn't
mean you're prepared for the fast ball, curve or slider. It takes a lot
of practice and control of every muscle to ready for those big league pitches. Likewise, it takes skill to control your physical appearance and body movements all at the same time.

You need to become an expert in two important skills.

1. Problem solving skills.
2. Communication skills.

Consider your interviewer as a problem to be solved. He is looking for traits to show how well you will work for him. Read his intentions carefully and give him the answer you want him to have by giving him your attention---both physically and mentally. You probably already have problem solving skills, but if you're like the rest of us, you are not conscious of them and you don't always use them at the right time. On the street, you have to figure out where people are coming from real fast because few of us take time to really know others. You can probably pick out a phoney a mile away, and if you happened to be into the drug trade, you certainly had a lot of experience checking people out fast. You probably put people through your own test before you would do business with them. We can often use what we are good at in one situation to solve new problems. If you can consciously see an interviewer as a problem you've got to solve, you've got a head start on the next guy. You know the interviewer is going to be looking for traits which will show him you will work well for him. For the next couple of minutes, see if you can predict how an interviewer would describe each of these men. The descriptions are ours and may not be exactly right. No doubt, some of our descriptions will differ from yours. That's all right.
Compare the opinions given here with the opinions you feel the interviewer would have had and then decide which is more likely.

INSERT TRAINEE INTERVIEWED
1. Talks too much.

INSERT TRAINEE INTERVIEWED
2. Knows everything. "Perhaps my man could have cleaned it up this way."

INSERT TRAINEE INTERVIEWED
3. Gives unimportant information or talks too much.

INSERT TRAINEE INTERVIEWED
4. Sprawled in chair---uninterested and doesn't respect interviewer

INSERT TRAINEE INTERVIEWED
5. Criticizes previous employers----again, the man could have said the same thing better if he had said, "I suppose I'll be next on his list to criticize when he leaves this job."

INSERT TRAINEE INTERVIEWED

To be able to understand things the way the interviewer does is a real step in understanding people. To understand him, it is NOT necessary that you agree with his opinion.

This brings us to the next skill...COMMUNICATION.

Notice, it was never said that you have to agree with anyone... but you do have to understand him. To communicate does NOT mean just talk. To talk means to fill up some time with words. But to communicate means you must answer, and to answer you must answer both the
listeners' FACTS and FEELINGS. If you've never checked into the person you are talking to deep enough to know what his feelings are, then how can you answer them? In an interview, the man may ask you how the weather was on your way to the interview. He probably doesn't care about the weather forecast at all. If he did, he would probably turn on the radio and get a weather forecast. So, in this simple question, the facts are really unimportant. However, the feelings you cause the man to have are really important. Are you friendly? Easy to talk to? Interesting? These are important traits to an employer because he has found out that friendly, interesting people usually do a better job. He is not really interested in finding out if you are the exception; he wants to know if you can fit into his organization the way most people do. If you feel you are an exception to his understanding of a good worker, it is your job to show him how you fit in. If you have special qualities which would help the interviewer know you will make a good worker, it is your business to tell him. The product you are selling is you. Show the man how you can be an efficient, cooperative, worker for his firm.
ROLE PLAY SITUATION

FOR

OPTION II

Jim was in the west cell house at the House of Correction. He had a girlfriend who used to send him money, but she broke it off. Jim found out that he was to be transferred to the County Jail, so he bought five cartons of cigarettes to cover him until his money would be transferred from the House. When Jim arrived on the PACE tier, he found a lot of the men had not received commissary for several weeks. A couple of the trainees saw him unpacking his cigarettes, and they spread the news. Naturally, a lot of guys came to him and asked him for a cigarette and a pack was gone in no time. Jim decided that he was not going to give out any more cigarettes. The next person that came asking for cigarettes was Bill---but he was demanding a whole pack. Bill was about twice as big as Jim and much more jail-wise. Bill expected big time on another case before he was released. Jim had only two months to go. Bill continued to insist on getting a whole pack.
LESSON FOR STAGE TWO

Your boss was given instructions to choose one man of the three that he felt would do the most work for him. There were some reasons he chose you over the other two men. First of all, think to yourself what traits you feel you showed him. You may either write these down or just keep them in your head. In either case, don't discuss these with anyone. Keep them to yourself. Turn the machine off, and when you have decided what you think these traits are, start the machine again.

Ask your boss to tell you at least three things you said or did to make him think you were the best man for the job. Do not say anything to him while he is telling you. Turn the machine off again until he is finished telling, then start the machine another time.

Did he say what you expected? Were your reasons the same as your boss's? If your opinion and your boss's agree, you may have indication that others see you the same way you see yourself. If you do not agree, there is no reason to be alarmed. (However, it would be a nice ability if you, instead of other people, could be in control of how people see you.)

It makes no difference at this point if you agree or disagree with your boss. It is important to know why the boss made the comments he did or what you did that caused him to have the feeling he did.
Here are some traits which are commonly looked for when inter­viewing for a job. Though your boss may have put his reasons in differ­ent words, it is likely that he looked for some of these same traits. In each of the twelve items, ask yourself the question:

(1) Did I show my boss I could think positively?
(2) Did I show my boss I could appear well groomed for the job?
   Obviously, well dressed for a big time on Friday night doesn't mean the same thing as well groomed for a day at the beach. The meaning of well groomed changes with the occasion. Long fingernails and superfly may be good for chasing women, but the man is not interested in paying you money to chase women. He's interested in paying you in return for work.
(3) Did I show my boss I could be pleasant and natural, but still business-like? The boss is not wanting to be a friend. He left his friendship at home. Now he's at work and he's in the business of making money. Which one of these men would appear pleasant and still business-like?
(4) Did I show my boss I could sell him on my qualifications instead of how badly I needed a job? Which time did the man do a better job of selling his qualifications?
(5) Did I show my boss I could look at him while he interviewed me?
(6) Did I show my boss I could answer all of his questions even if some sounded too personal?
(7) Did I show my boss I could use words a square would understand?

(8) Did I show my boss I could answer questions directly and truthfully? Check out this man speaking with a Norwegian accent. All his words were correct but did he make you feel comfortable? The closer he speaks to what you are used to, the more comfortable you would probably be.

(9) Did I show my boss I could sit up and stand up straight?

(10) Did I show my boss I could speak clearly?

(11) Did I show my boss I could smile, or at least look pleasant?

(12) Did I show my boss I could act alert, attentive, interested and ready to work?

Sometimes, the way we do things causes the person to just "have a feeling" about us. He doesn't always realize that he is looking for some things, but something just gives him that feeling. Perhaps this list provides a few of the "some things" that give us feelings about people.

Do not fail to check back over your successful interviews when you get out on the street. You will, no doubt, see ways it could be made even better. You probably will not have the same job all your life, so you might as well have your game up as tight as possible. What questions could you have answered better? For the first part of this program, you will be called a "worker." To be accepted in any job, you can do a number of things which will make events go much
smoother. It is most important to accept the role or expectation of you. As you change to any new job, your role will change. We already do this regularly with officer-inmate, father-son, husband-wife, or even older brother-younger brother relationships. If an inmate goes past his limits and begins taking on an officer's role, you can be sure he will be told in no uncertain terms to get back into the role expected of him. Likewise, many problems start in the home when a husband doesn't bring home the bread or a wife does not clean the house. Or the real heavy drama starts when each thinks it's part of the other person's role.

Her: "Charlie, take out the garbage."
Him: "No, that's your job."
Her: "No, it's not. You never take it out."
Him: "Of course I don't. I'm not supposed to."

And so it goes. You see that how well we play our roles is important and knowing what our roles are can be equally important. Unfortunately, as workers, we do not write the script for the roles we play. The foreman or boss decides what situation he wants us to take. But what we can do is play the part so that it helps us the most. And this brings us to the next step that is often left out of a job role. It is called skillful management. This is your ability to skillfully control a situation. You must know what you want someone to do and get their cooperative effort in accomplishing the task. As you know, a lot of supervisors get paid to manage or manipulate, but they really
just tell people what to do. They ego-trip. It's a lot more fun to just tell people, but it doesn't always get the job done.

The easiest way to come to people that takes the least thinking is to demand someone to do what you want. This technique is used by a lot of people in authority. But if workers try to use it, either to their bosses or fellow workers, people usually get mad. More importantly, the people we tell off usually don't do what we want. They just get mad.

Her: "Take that trash out, you lazy bum!"

That kind of talk doesn't help you very much when you are a worker. It is not in your role. If a boss, foreman or even a fellow worker hears you talking like that, any of them may begin giving you a hard time. They are mad and will try to get back at you and, at the same time, you are mad because they probably did not do what you wanted. Usually, the only satisfaction gained for you from this kind of talk is a two-second ego-trip and a chance to look for a new job.

It seems that through the years, women have used these manipulative skills best, so let's check in with an expert who is still trying to get her husband to take out the trash...

Her: "Hey honey, when you get the chance, would you mind taking the trash out?"

She cleaned it up some, but a woman's got one more approach that is always a clincher for getting it her way...here's how she really goes in for the kill!

Her: "Awh, come on honey. Pleeze. Just take the trash out. It won't take very long."
Him: "Awh, OK. Just for you."

Her: "And hurry up! We don't have all day!"

Yes, it may be the most fun just to yell at people and watch them do what we say, but it does not always work.

We can choose our actions toward people, but we have to live with the way they come back at us. If we are really interested in results and not just having a good time ego-tripping, we can choose the way which will most likely get the results we want. A strong woman is one who uses management skills that work for her. A good worker is one who manages his "worker" role skillfully. In a sense, the worker skills are the toughest to use because bosses tend to think it's not in the worker's "role" to get mad and yell at someone. He's probably right about that; he hired you to do a job, not yell. He's probably wrong to think it should be in his own role. He also gets mixed up and confuses which is more important---ego-tripping or getting a job done.

The name of the game for you as a worker is to manage people off your back. To get people on your side, there is one rule that almost always works: show them you are on their side. This technique works quite well. An obvious example of using this technique is how some men handle the gangs.

"When I'm in Soul territory, I'm a Soul. When I'm in Vice Lord territory, I'm a Vice Lord. When I'm in Latin King territory, I'm a Latin King."

When a man believes you're on his side, he will probably leave
you alone. Make your position unquestionably clear. The man walking through the Vice Lord's territory didn't say "I'm a big man. They should know where I am coming from." Instead, he told in very clear language, "Hey, I am with you!" And you should get that same message clearly to the boss. Just like the gangs, the boss can mess you around too. There are several ways that we can get this message across. The method is really simple. Ask yourself, "What would that man have to do to convince me he is for real?" Then treat him the same way. Consider these things that we all like: (1) We like to be listened to; (2) We like for others to stay in their roles; (3) We like for others to put up with our human mistakes. In your own way, apply these techniques to your boss and he will respond like anyone else. Be consistent. A real turn-off comes when a man thinks he can trust you and you let him down when times get tough. If a man thought you were a goof-off from the start, he would not need to change his opinion of you. But if he believes you are one kind of person and show you are not, it tends to irritate him and he tends to strike back at you.
Almost every organization or society has an order or hierarchy... a system where one man is above another. In business, government and even in social organizations there is a rush for people to get power. "I want to be Boss," "I want to run it," "I'm in charge," "All bills need my signature", are expressions of people seeking power. These may be natural human traits but there may also be an instinct that tells us to stay away from responsibility. While it may seem crazy at first glance, nevertheless, our society has created an artificial order in which power has been assigned to positions instead of the people who deserve it or could handle it best. This is the way the political, social and many family relationships are set up. This simplifies the situation because you know who is in control and how he is likely to act.

Although it is nice to say that all people are equal in power, this is not the case. There are some people who won't do things on their own and need to be told. There is no reason that a child should have rights equal to those of his parents, even when he reaches 30 years old. If a son decides to stay in his parents' home for thirty years, he shouldn't think that he deserves equal rights with the father and mother just because he knows as much as they do. To make himself equal in authority with his mom and dad, he should do something to establish his own self worth, like owning a home and accepting all the
responsibilities that go with it. You can sometimes come pretty close to measuring your real authority by figuring out how much responsibility you'll have to accept if things go wrong. Every bit of blame you can shift to someone else, you can subtract from your real authority. The real power or authority you can claim should follow pretty close to the amount of weight you can handle. Your real authority is just about equal to the responsibility you are willing to accept for your actions.

Most people would agree that the only fair system would be to give people the amount of authority which they can handle. In spite of knowing that a lot of people reach positions they don't deserve, we continue assigning authority to positions instead of people. That is, we take on the role or expectation people have for a position. If a position becomes available, the interviewer is going to see how well you fit into his role. The position is rarely changed to fit the worker's personality. You might be able to fit into many roles. However, when you are hired, one of the big measures of your success is how well did you fill the role of a particular position. There are only a few people in society that would believe this system is 100% right or fair. There is one partial exception to the strict rules society has for assigning authority to positions...a husband and wife relationship. Usually, there is an attempt by a man and wife to be fair as they work out what they expect of each other. Here the rules are not automatically set by society but are usually worked out by the man and woman themselves. After these roles are established by the husband and wife, they
attempt to live by them. Let's suppose that in your house it has been agreed that you will be in charge of the money. The chores and responsibilities might fall like this:

The man---all big cost items must meet your approval.

The woman---1. The woman can buy normal items, but she should clear extra items through you. 2. The woman is responsible for teaching the child how to spend money wisely.

The child---1. The child is required to answer to both the mom and dad, but more often the mother. 2. Normally, the child can answer that "Mommy gave me the money" if the father sees money being spent on things he does not approve. If the father is not satisfied, he will go to the mother, not the child. 3. The child will take most of his problems to his mother. If the child starts taking problems directly to his dad, the mother will become uneasy. Notice there is a pretty strict chain of command or path you are expected to follow if you are on the bottom, like the child, going up. However, if you are on top like the father, you can make your demands to anyone below you. There are a couple of important conclusions which you should be able to draw from these rules, even if they are not exactly the same as the ones to which you and your lady might agree.

1. Once the rules are set, there isn't much room for change. Look at the child's role again. If he doesn't go through the mother most of the time, she's going to get upset even if it is agreed that the man is the final authority.
2. If you are in charge of making things go right, then you are automatically in charge when things go wrong. A bill collector who comes looking for his money will come to you—not your wife or children—because you are the one assuming this role.

Suppose you have 50 wives instead of one. Instead of trying to get along with one wife, you had to establish your role with each one of the 50! Can you think of a worse nightmare? If this were the case, you probably wouldn't have time to work out the roles with each one and certainly you wouldn't be able to work out all the small problems that would come up with each one on a day-to-day basis. What you would probably do instead is gather all fifty in a room and say "I run it" and then assign chores to each one of the fifty women. You would probably do as this trainee did and replace that "understanding" which was so important when there were just two of you with jobs, chores and rules.

If you opened up the system and began assigning power to people instead of positions in an attempt to "be fair," you would also leave yourself wide open to those people greedy for power and unwilling to accept responsibility. It is hard enough for one man and one wife to establish their roles and authority, but it would be next to impossible for a large factory to allow each person the time or even to be able to establish his authority with every other person. Most people find it easier to go along with the imperfect but acceptable system of delegating authority to positions instead of people. A sure system of chaos
would result if you had to get to know each person at your job before you would do what they wanted or they would do what you asked. Who would be the authority that would control someone if he started taking more authority than others believed he should? What would keep the barn boss system of whoever is strongest from running a factory? As you can see, you would have a monster of a time just establishing yourself on a job. In most cases, we prefer to accept positions and roles when we apply for jobs instead of coming to an understanding with each employee. Of course, the always present problem is "What do you do with a guy that doesn't want to come to an understanding?" How do you deal with a guy that has zero understanding? In a company that has men in three positions---boss, foreman, and worker---you know what you're asking for when you apply for the job. By going to a job and getting one of these titles or positions, you know almost immediately what is expected of you. You know fairly well what you can and cannot do. This helps you because you don't have to take a long time to work out limits and restrictions on your actions.

Consider a husband and wife relationship again. It takes a long time to agree on what each expects of the other. Many times there is no mutual agreement because one expects certain actions which the other never intends to do. In a large organization there isn't enough time to work out these relationships. If these expectations can be established at the start, then you can move on to another job if you do not consider them fair. The company likes it too because it allows them to remain stable while employees come and go.
Here is an example of the standard expectations one would anticipate for the three roles of boss, foreman, and worker:

**Boss:** The boss makes decisions on what needs to be done; tells foreman what jobs he needs to have done.

**Foreman:** The foreman gets orders from the boss and makes sure they are carried out.

**Worker:** The worker does the work necessary to get the job done.

As a worker, you are not expected to satisfy the boss directly. You are supposed to satisfy the foreman and it's the foreman's job to understand the directions of the boss and explain them to the worker. If you have satisfied your foreman on a particular job, but your boss comes along and tells you that you have not done it right, you should not be blamed. This is the reason you were not criticized in the job you just finished and observed on the video tape. You did the job according to your instructions from your foreman. Obviously, in real life the foreman would probably try to shift the weight on you, but this is because of your foreman's weakness and not because the organization is set up that way. When these kinds of problems happen, you should reach into your bag of social skills and shift the weight back on to your foreman without getting him mad. A pretty neat trick if you can do it! Here's how one successful bus driver is able to avoid a lot of conflict.

One word about the boss before we go on. He will judge a worker
by the work performed. Usually, items only come to his attention when problems come up. Normally, he only looks at and comments on lack of performance. He is mainly a problem solver.

Here are some questions you can ask yourself concerning the scene you just recorded on the video tape:

1. Did any of my actions go outside of my role as a worker?
2. If so, what could I have done which would have accomplished as much but would have been in the worker's role?
3. If I had asked the foreman more questions, could I have avoided some of the problems?
4. When the chemical started burning, did my reactions come from what I knew I should do or my feelings?
5. What things didn't go the way I expected? Did I try to correct the situation or did I wait for someone else to take over?

When you think you have answered these questions adequately for yourself, ask your foreman for directions to do the next job.

As a worker, your direct concern is to satisfy your foreman, and hopefully he knows what is going on in your boss's head. By satisfying him, you should also be satisfying the boss. In the job you just finished and observed on the video tape, you never really had a chance to satisfy your boss, since you didn't even satisfy your foreman. If your foreman has said the job wasn't good enough, the boss is almost sure to go along, especially if the foreman has already told you to do it over.
As a worker, your direct concern is to satisfy your foreman, and hopefully he knows what is going on in your boss's head. By satisfying him, you should also be satisfying the boss. In the job you just finished and observed on the video tape, you never really had a chance to satisfy your boss, since you didn't even satisfy your foreman. If your foreman has said the job wasn't good enough, the boss is almost sure to go along, especially if the foreman has already told you to do it over.
STAGE ELEVEN A

WORKER TO FOREMAN

Up to this point, most of the work of this program has fallen on you. You have been doing all the work and your boss and foreman seem to have taken turns jumping on you for what they didn't like. To add to your frustration, you may have noticed that if you did exceptionally well on the last job, your boss received a pack of cigarettes.

Things are starting to look up. Since you have reached this far and worked your way through all the obstacles thrown at you so far, you are now being promoted to a foreman.

Just as in every situation when you start a new job, the first chore is to determine what the expected roles are. In this case, your role will change immediately and pretty drastically. First of all, the people bringing you problems will be different. You will be hearing complaints from the boss and your worker. Though you have some control over your worker, you need to understand that the worker is the final person that will or will not get the job done. If you make unreasonable demands on him, the work won't get done and certainly your boss won't be satisfied. If you can't get the worker to get the work out then you've got to go back to the worker's role or get fired. Though you don't have to answer to your worker, you do have to keep him satisfied enough to get the work out for you.

Being a foreman, you will be the first person to see jobs which
your worker thinks are completed. One of your jobs is to determine if the job was completed correctly and according to the directions. If it isn't, then you need to have the worker do it over...it's even better if you can do it before the boss finds out.

While you are performing the role of foreman, you won't be getting into trouble for the same things anymore. You will now be getting in trouble for what your worker doesn't do. Another problem is that you'll have to understand your boss's standards pretty well. Your boss is expecting you to give the OK at the same time he would give it. So if you start being too friendly, easy or nice to your worker---and if his work doesn't measure up to what it should---you will catch the trouble. You will also be getting extra trouble if you misunderstand what the boss has told you he wants done, and you tell the worker to do the wrong thing.

Your primary role is to make sure your boss's requests are carried out. As a worker, you could sometimes go blindly through your job just doing the work. Now you'll have to see problems as they come up; you can't wait for someone to point them out to you. Chances are the worker is already passing the buck to you, so he won't have to do them. You've got to devise methods for getting past the problems of your worker and still get the job done. Better still, if you can, figure out problems ahead of time, then you are that much farther ahead.

In this program, your boss has only one foreman and one worker. But normally, your boss would have at least four foremen and each fore-
man would be in charge of at least four workers. The picture of power looks something like this:

Though your boss probably does have time to answer most of your questions, he probably does not have time or want to be concerned with all the petty problems of each of the workers. Your job as foreman is to get the job done for the boss, so if you bring every petty problem to him, then again, he has no need for you.

After each of the two jobs which the worker will have to do, you will have to evaluate the worker's performance. You will also have to relay information and directions which your supervisor gives you. Lastly, you will be the first person the worker will look to if he has any problems.

One word of caution: You only have one worker under you. So don't be surprised into thinking it will always be this simple. In real life you will probably have several workers to be in charge of. Meaning, you'll have to multiply the number of headaches you have by at least four.
Your boss has decided to quit and take a better job in Afghanistan, so the management decided you're next in line for his job. In real life you may have been chosen because you are the best for the job. That is, you may have shown while you were a foreman that you could be depended upon to get the work finished. They might judge you for your ability to get along with your boss. You may have had seniority over the other foremen being considered for the promotion. In our case you were the only foreman to be advanced, so the only man for the job. Maybe we could safely say you are the best man for the job! Though we were joking about how we determined you are the best man for the job, we are serious about your not knowing what the management will be looking for when promotion time starts. You may know what one boss is looking for, but he may not be around when an opening occurs. There are a number of different and relatively fair ways of choosing someone for a promotion, but you never really know which one the management will decide to use when it is time for you to be promoted. Even if they tell you the way they consider people for promotions, it may or may not be true when openings occur. As conditions change, so do the reasons for choosing people for promotions. To be on the safe side, it's best to have yourself covered despite the use of different criteria. Regardless
of the reasons, you are already being given the second promotion since you started this program. You now run it. You're the boss!

Just as before, when you got promoted the first time, the new position of boss is going to require some changes in you. Usually, as a boss, you will no longer deal with workers on a day-to-day basis. Your normal contact will be your foremen...in our exercise you only have one, but in real life there would probably be several. You will no longer be concerned with running the production each day, but instead, you will be concerned that your foreman notices all the details that need to be taken care of and that he takes action on them. As you will not actually be doing the work itself, you will be giving a lot of instructions on how you want your jobs done. Be sure to choose your words carefully and be able to explain yourself well. It is your job to get your foreman to understand what you need to have done. If he does what you tell him to do, then you can't blame him if you didn't explain yourself carefully enough. Another thing has changed in your role: you will now be dealing almost entirely in the negative. By this we mean that you are now being paid to correct problems and make things work that have gone wrong. You're the last man in the line for people to see and they will hand you all the problems they couldn't work out. They, along with the big bosses of the company, will look to you to fix up the problem. You will have to make a decision on what action must be taken to make things go right... and you'll have to carry the weight if things don't. There is no one left to blame. In a real job situation, you will be dealing almost
You'll also have to be dealing with many different kinds of people, which is probably the downfall of most bosses. You won't be able to choose who you want to deal with because your job will require that you deal with every area that has difficulties. If you have a foreman for whom you have a particular dislike, you will have to look past that and deal with whatever problems come up in his area. If you have a worker that can't get along with his foreman, you will have to do some counseling and somehow get them to cooperate. If the worker just plain doesn't intend to work, you'll have to fire him. You should be getting the idea by now that the buck stops with you. Normally, people won't pass the buck on to you unless it is a problem that they can't or won't deal with. So the biggies and the nasties fall on you. Now you're going to be the beast...the person everyone sees as negative. In a sense, you'll have to be a beast because your role is to be a problem solver. If everything goes right, there really is no need for a boss. If you want to keep your job as a boss, you had better hope that companies continue to have problems!

For the purposes of this lesson, your work here as a boss will be an unusually slack job. It will be much easier than a normal boss job. Instead of making all the decisions yourself, you'll get off easy. Most of your brainwork will be done for you so as to insure that a worker is getting all the experiences he needs. You will still be required to evaluate the worker's performance, get your foreman in line
if he is letting his worker off too easy, and choose the worker who will do the most work for you. As a matter of fact, if all goes well and you can get your foreman to get his worker to do a better than average job, you will be rewarded. That is to say, a manufacturing company makes its money on how much it can produce. If that company is able to produce more and make more money because people do more work when you're in charge, then you can expect to get some kind of bonus.

For the purposes of this experiment, the tape recorder will be your instructor. The rules for using the tape recorder are simple. You may listen to the tape of your instructions at anytime with the earphones and by yourself. Do not let anyone else hear these instructions directly. It will be your job to interpret these instructions and then explain them to the person in such a way as to make sure the jobs are done correctly.

DIRECTIONS FOR STAGE 1

Your instructions are very simple here. The man on the monitor will ask the questions for an interview. You sit beside the monitor and listen to the answers given to you by three different people who will ask for a job as a furniture stripper's helper. You pick the best man of the three. That is, judging from the man's answers and reactions to the questions asked, who do you think is going to do the most work for you? If you ask this man to do a funky job, do you think he would do it? What does he say that makes you think he won't give
you a lot of needless conversation? Also, don't get fooled by a guy who talks a good game. You're interested in making your job as boss as easy on you as possible, which means choosing the man who is going to take criticism best and do the most work with the least supervision. Be sure you know why you make the decisions you do.

DIRECTIONS FOR STAGE 2

The man is reporting for work as a furniture stripper's helper. Be sure your foreman knows that he is to give the instructions. Here are the things your foreman should explain to the new worker:

1. Paint and varnish remover is messy and can ruin the tile on the floor if any gets on it. So DON'T!

2. The stripper needs to be applied thickly and left for two or three minutes before scraping it off. Use a putty knife and paper towels to scrape off the old varnish.

3. Caution! If he gets any paint and varnish remover on his skin, it will burn. It won't do any harm, but it surely won't feel good.

4. He is to get all the paint and varnish off the area marked on the chair, even the junk down in the cracks.

5. The worker will only have 6 minutes to get all the paint off his portion of the chair and his work will be evaluated by both the foreman and you at the end of 6 minutes.

When the worker has started doing the stripping job, come back to your tape recorder and listen to your instructions for the next
stage so you'll know what to do.

DIRECTIONS FOR STAGE 4

Did you remember to give the foreman all five rules? If you're not sure, let's check yourself out.

1. Paint and varnish remover is messy and can ruin the tile on the floor if any gets on it. So DON'T!

2. The stripper needs to be applied thickly and left for two or three minutes before scraping it off. Use a putty knife and paper towels to scrape off the old varnish.

3. Caution! If he gets any paint and varnish remover on his skin, it will burn. It won't do any harm, but it surely won't feel good.

4. He is to get all the paint and varnish off the area marked on the chair, even the junk down in the cracks.

5. The worker will only have 6 minutes to get all the paint off his portion of the chair and his work will be evaluated by both the foreman and you at the end of 6 minutes. If you left any of these out, it's too late to tell him now. Also, if you left even one of the rules off, you can't expect the worker to do all five properly. Remember that both your foreman and worker are getting paid to carry out your requests. However, they are not getting paid to do what you "meant to say." Did you make sure the foreman understood all five? Did you ask him to repeat the important items to you? Just because he was told doesn't mean that he was able to tell the next guy.
When the foreman has finished evaluating the worker's job on the chair, you will need to give the final evaluation. This evaluation could be called a "disparaging appraisal" since people in authority often use this approach to help establish their own authority and the worker's servitude. You are to look over the job that the worker has done on the chair. Regardless how good a job was done, find something which was not done correctly. Don't make up something, but overemphasize that part of the work was not done correctly. The purpose here is to have the worker and foreman (if he approved the job) feel their performance was inadequate. Lay it on thick, but don't look phoney. If you can't find something wrong with the worker's good job, then complain about his mess or how long it took the man to do the job. Above all, don't tell the worker, foreman or anyone else that you were looking to find something wrong. This is something for each one to figure out for sure when he gets to be boss. Before criticizing the work, ask your foreman if he had accepted or rejected the work, and if he felt the man had done an adequate job of completing the work according to the directions. If the work is acceptable to the foreman, then only yell at the foreman for accepting work that he shouldn't have. If the work was rejected by the foreman, then complain to both the worker and foreman since neither caused the work to be completed to your satisfaction.

DIRECTIONS FOR STAGE 6

Give these directions to your foreman who will in turn give them
to the worker. Show the foreman the dirty tile floor, soap and rag, and tell him to instruct the worker to get it perfectly clean in the next five minutes. It is particularly important that all the crud which has collected between the tiles be cleaned out.

After five minutes, the foreman will give his evaluation to determine if the directions have been followed. The foreman must either accept or reject the worker's job. Tell the foreman to set the timer for five minutes when the worker has understood the directions and is ready to begin work.

DIRECTIONS FOR STAGE 8

First, find out if your foreman is satisfied with the job done by the worker. One of three possibilities can happen:

1. If the foreman rejects the work, then you automatically agree, chew out both the foreman and worker. Tell the two they must return to 6B after seeing the video tape.

2. If the foreman accepts the work but you still think the job is inadequate, you must chew out the foreman and tell them to return to stage 6A after seeing the video tape.

3. The last and happiest solution for all is if you and your foreman both like the job done. In this case, you listen to the instructions for the next step and then all of you watch the tape of the last job. Afterwards, give the foreman the instructions you heard before seeing the tape.
DIRECTIONS FOR STAGE 10

In the box that will be given to your worker, have him finish putting it together as quickly as possible. All the corners of the box should look like the corners that are already completed. You tell your foreman the directions and have him tell the worker.
Bosses get paid the same salary no matter how many extra hours they work---and they usually work plenty. However, about once a year, a boss is usually considered for a raise, promotion, or annual bonus. When your boss's name comes up for consideration, his record for the year will be reviewed. If the company is a manufacturing company, its manager will look at how many days your boss's department made its quota, how many accidents his workers had, how much confusion occurred in his area, and how much money his department made for the company.

When you became a boss, your role changed, what others expected of you changed and how you were measured changed. Your success was measured by what someone else did. That means that as your role changed from worker to foreman and then to boss, your success was increasingly measured by the work that you could get others to do.

Look at how rapidly your worker put the box together a few minutes ago. How long did it take him to complete this task? The usual amount of time is 4 minutes and 15 seconds when a person hurries. If you were able to supervise your worker well enough so he completed the job in less time than most people, you will be rewarded with a pack of cigarettes. If your man only got by with average work, either you didn't choose the right man at the interview or you failed to get your foreman
to supervise him to do above average work. A boss is not rewarded when
his men do average work—that's expected. In real life, a boss may
even be fired for below average work.

When we talked earlier about manipulating people off your back,
this was the kind of thing we were talking about. If you know what it
takes to make your boss or foreman look good and you help him get it,
then he has no need to come bugging you. You have to have enough insight
into the man himself to know what he needs in order to be satisfied.
Making an attempt really isn't good enough. Suppose you introduced a
dozen fat girls to a friend who just happens to prefer skinny women.
You might have saved yourself a lot of time and been more successful
if you would have found out your friend's preference first. One long,
lean woman might have been enough to keep him very satisfied! If you
communicate enough with the boss and foreman to know what they need or
prefer, they are a lot more likely to appreciate your efforts. When
you accept a man for the way he is, he is a lot more likely to accept
you for the way you are.

Don't forget the importance of what you have been through in this
sequence of experiences with the TV. You have been given an interview
and you have beaten out two other people—not necessarily on the first
try, but you were at least able to get the game together enough to
eventually beat them out. You have had the criteria explained by which
employers judge you. You have also had the actions explained that nor-
mally show a particular attitude. It is now your job to analyze your
actions and determine how they are viewed by others. If these actions
need to be brought in line to say the same things about you that you want them to, then you've got some big changes to make. You have learned how your body talks just like your mouth. Sometimes your body even shouts! If you expect to convince someone you mean business, your words and your body language have to be saying the same thing. No one would be so dumb to say, "I'm here to apply for a job but I don't want to work." But there are lots of people who will go to apply for a job and say with their mouths "I want to work" and say the exact opposite with their bodies.

You did two nasty jobs and you got to see how you looked to others when unexpected problems came up. People are hired to complete jobs and they will be judged on how well these jobs are finished---not how well they are started. Therefore, it is important to know how to deal with unexpected problems. It is also helpful for you to know how others size you up when things don't fall into place as you expected.

You have played three roles and in the process you have become aware of how your behavior and even the way you come to people varies in relation to the position or title you hold. You already have many of the skills it takes to manipulate and maneuver around in society; they are pretty close to the same ones you used in the street. In legitimate society you just have to put emphasis on different things. You probably never thought of these skills as "social skills" before.

"When I'm in Soul territory, I'm a Soul. When I'm in Latin King territory, I'm a Latin King." You were probably so busy saying, "Hey Jack, that man's got to accept me for the way I am," that you never
stopped to think you already know how to get along with people when you want to. You say, "I already know how to convince people I'm serious. I can correctly use my mouth, my hands, my eyes, my face, my posture, and even the way I dress. All I have to do is get them saying the same thing and I'm a lot more convincing." You also find that you can spoil your cover just as fast when you don't get all these things talking the same language. You go to job interviews telling the man "I want a job" with your mouth, and then tell the man with your long fingernails that you don't know how to work. When you tell the man two different things, is it surprising that he believes that one of them is a lie?

You should be aware by now that what you expect of society is not really that much different from what society expects of you. That is, you have roles of fairness that you expect the courts and other institutions to go by. When they step out of what you consider their role of fairness and jump into a role of railroading you or putting you in a bag because of your record, you don't like it. You'll use whatever power you can find to show the man he is wrong. You might appeal the case, sue or even use violence on someone if you think he has gone too far from the role you feel is right. Society has roles which it expects of you and society will also fight with all its power to show you when it feels you are wrong. Obviously, you are experiencing the result of some of their power right now by being incarcerated. The purpose of these two examples was not to discuss the good and evil of the "system," but rather to demonstrate the seriousness of these role expectations and the results which are all too common when we fail to meet these require-
Often we purposely misunderstand when we don't want to look at or deal with ourselves. It should be said clearly that you're not acting phoney because you make yourself look right. If you feel this information has been shared with you in order to teach you how to be a better phoney, you've missed the boat altogether. We've been about the business of bringing your feelings, talk and body actions all together into one total, for-real human being. Most people know what is fair—but they are not willing to give it out because they feel no one else is. Sure there are a lot of unfair people out there. But that childhood saying "It takes one to know one" couldn't be truer. When we show two or three different things to others because our actions and words aren't together, then we come across as the phoney. If we fail to get actions and words together, then it shouldn't be too surprising that we haven't known a fair person.

Hopefully, during this time we've been working together, you have become a better reader—not the school-type "reader of words"—but a reader of actions. This is usually ignored in school, which is certainly unfortunate. You see, actions have to be read right the first time. If you read a book and don't understand what the writer said, you can read it again. If someone says something that doesn't make sense, you can ask him to repeat himself. But you can't ask someone to make a certain expression on his face if you don't catch it the first time. You can't ask someone to look or to act a certain way again because you're not sure what he meant. You've got to catch it the first time! Hopefully,
you'll be getting better and better at reading these actions in others. This is the easiest part. The next step is reading these actions in yourself. It's a bit harder, but not impossible. Unless you realize the importance of reading these actions, you will not put forth the effort it takes to become a good "action reader." The last skill of controlling your actions is by far the most difficult of all: It means controlling them when things don't go your way. It means controlling all of your actions and keeping yourself conscious of how every action you make is affecting the person to whom you are talking. To be a free man means a lot more than being out of jail. It is very possible to be a slave to your own feelings. A free man is one who is free to make his own decisions to be the kind of person he wants to be. A real man is in control no matter what kind of actions come his way. That is, he's able to deal effectively with things he agrees with as well as those he doesn't.

It is hoped that you'll take the information we've been talking about and practice using it. There is no time that you'll be able to say, "Now I've got it." Instead, you'll be like the professional baseball player who gets better and better with experience. He doesn't really learn anything new, he just learns how to make fewer errors. So we're back where we started. As we stated in the introduction, we have not learned anything new; we have just learned how to look a little bit harder at some parts of us, and a great deal harder at other parts of us. The practice and experience is going to be up to you and how hard
you want to work to help yourself—we've only taught you the rules on how to be a good manager of you.
APPENDIX B

COMPLETE LISTING OF RESPONSES FROM TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE
TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Is there anything you thought you understood about the world of work before you started this series of lessons that you found you really didn't? If "yes," what was it?

   Yes 6  No 7  No Response 1

   1. "No."
   2. No answer.
   3. "I understood the program and enjoyed it very much."
   4. "No."
   5. "Everything was just like I thought."
   6. "No."
   7. "No."
   8. "No."
   9. "Yes. I thought I knew how to communicate better than I did."
   10. "I didn't understand the fact that you had to sell yourself to the interviewer."
   11. "I thought I understood the right way to carry myself in an interview, but there was a lot I learned."
   12. "Yes. In looking at myself, I find that I look different than I thought I did at the time."
   13. "Yes. I didn't understand the roles of foreman and boss; I didn't know that the boss really had to work."
   14. "No."

2. What part of the program did you enjoy most?

   General 7  Boss 4  Foreman 2  Worker 3  Advancement 0  Interview 0

   1. "There was no one particular part of the program that I enjoyed most. I enjoyed it all."
   2. "The part of being the boss."
   3. "The part I enjoyed most was starting as a worker and advancing to boss. I really enjoyed the whole program."
   4. "All of it!"
   5. "I liked everything in the program."
   6. "I enjoyed the whole program."
   7. "Being foreman and boss."
   8. "Being the boss."
   9. "Finding out my faults and dealing with them."
10. "The dramatizing of worker to foreman and then to become the boss!"
11. "Being the foreman."
12. "Actually seeing myself on the screen."
13. "The foreman's job and his responsibilities."
14. "Being the boss."

3. What part of the program made you feel the most uncomfortable?

General 2 Boss 3 Foreman 0 Worker 5 Interview 4 Other 2

1. "The part where I played the boss."
2. "The interview."
3. "The idea of having people just sitting there and watching me."
4. "When the boss came around."
5. "The part where I was being interviewed. I didn't understand the man very well."
6. "When I was being interviewed by the boss."
7. "The initial job interview."
8. "Being the worker."
9. "Being boss."
10. "When the foreman didn't accept my work and I almost lost my job."
11. "Being the worker."
12. "None."
14. "Facing the boss when he told me that the work wasn't done."

4. Do you feel that taking this class will help you later when you are released?

Yes 14 No 0

1. "There are a lot of things I learned I can benefit from by using."
2. "I will know how to approach the person interviewing me and what to expect."
3. "It will help me a lot. I now know how to dress and answer the questions and to understand directions."
4. "To get around some problems that might occur on a job."
5. "I learned to talk with the interviewer and how to get a job."
6. "I know how to present myself to the boss better than I did before. I had a chance to see myself as I really am."
7. "I think it gave me a little more confidence."
8. "Now I know what to expect when I go to get a job."
9. "I learned how to get a job and how to hold it and I became aware of myself and others."
10. "I will have a better understanding in how you are to present yourself when applying for a job."
11. "Now I feel I know the way to carry myself when I am applying for a job. Also, I know the right information to have on hand."
12. "It will help me get myself together in dealing with people."
13. "Yes, if I decide to take a job. By learning how to cope with my superiors on the job and the way I should listen to people more often and to fully understand them."
14. "Now I know how to deal with a thing that I didn't before."

5. What will you do differently than before you took this class?

Communicate Better 3 Dress Properly 3 Nothing 1 General 7

1. "If I felt my work was done well and was not accepted, I would have left."  
2. "Look the interviewer in the eye."  
3. "I was going about it all wrong by not dressing properly and not asking questions fast enough."  
4. "Try to look as if I'm working hard."  
5. "Different parts were different to me, learning how to be a worker and foreman and boss."  
6. "I will try to present myself to the boss in a more convincing way."  
7. "Nothing."  
8. "Not work so hard."  
9. "Watch my actions, learn to communicate better and look deeper at the games people play."  
10. "I will dress as though I really want the job and try to convince the boss that I really want to work."  
11. "Try to know something about the company. Dress properly. Fill out the application properly."  
12. "Wouldn't tell the truth at an interview."  
13. "Pay more attention to matters and listen more attentively."  
14. "Have more faith in doing things."

6. What would you change to improve the program?

Nothing 9 Other 5

1. "Nothing."  
2. "Nothing at all."  
3. "I would have a few more people in the program."  
4. "I can't think of anything to better this program."  
5. "If it were up to me, there would be no change because it was beautiful to me."  
6. "Nothing."  
7. "Nothing."
8. "Show more confidence."
9. "Nothing, but add more."
10. "The time we have to complete the program."
11. "I think the program was very good as it was."
12. "Get better material to work with plus more and better teachers."
13. "Nothing that I can think of at present."
14. "The four-way box more times."

7. Did you believe that most of the lessons' information was true?
   Yes  14    No  0

1. "Yes."
2. "Yes."
3. "Yes. All the information was true, I believe."
4. "Yes."
5. "Yes, I did."
6. "All was true."
7. "Yes."
8. "Yes."
9. "Yes."
10. "Yes, I did!"
11. "Yes."
12. "Yes."
13. "Yes, I did."
14. "Yes, very much."
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