

Crime Scene

Psychology Behind Bars and In Front of the Bench

The Official Organ of the Criminal Justice Section of the Canadian Psychological Association

What's Inside

Section Executive:

President

Daryl Kroner, Ph.D.,
KronerDG@csc-scc.gc.ca

Secretary/Treasurer

Karl Hanson, Ph.D.,
HansonK@sgc.gc.ca

Past President

David Nussbaum, Ph.D.,
David_Nussbaum@camh.net

Editor Crime Scene

Jeremy Mills, Ph.D.
MillsJF@csc-scc.gc.ca

Student Representative

Joseph Camilleri
camilleri_j@hotmail.com

Directors at Large

J. Stephen Wormith, Ph.D.,
wormith@duke.usask.ca

Carson Smiley, Ph.D.

SmileyWC@csc-scc.gc.ca

Doug Boer, Ph.D.

BoerDO@csc-scc.gc.ca

The Editor's View

View from the Top ~ President's Comments

A Softer Issue: Working Together

Annual Business Meeting Report

by R. Karl Hanson

The Personals Column

Reflections of an Institutionalised Psychologist

by Ron Blackburn, Ph.D.

Submission

Structured Clinical Judgment in Risk Appraisal: An idea whose time has gone. The Parable of the Lawn Mowers

by Vernon L. Quinsey, Ph.D.

Recently Defended Ph.D. Thesis

Affective Aggression in Adults.

by Gurmeet Dhaliwal, Ph.D.

Criminal Justice Section Award Winning Student Poster

Measuring Motivation of Change in Violent Offenders

by Kathleen Lewis & Stephen Wong, Ph.D.

Research Brief

Anger Norms for Students and Offenders

by M. C. Cullen, M. T. Bradley, & J. A. Stapleton

Recent Publications

Opportunity Knocks – Academic Position at Carleton University

Upcoming ICCA Conference

The Editor's View

I trust that this newsletter will find you happy and well. We had a terrific showing of our section at CPA this year and I hope this is a sign of things to come. Do not forget that the deadline for CPA submissions for 2003 is fast approaching.

Our invited guest spot goes to Dr. Ron Blackburn who offers both a personal and professional reflection on his years working in forensic psychology.

The "Crime Scene Challenge" is being considered again this year (see last January's edition). I have a thought or two on what might be of interest, however, if there is anyone who would like to have a question posed or debated please be in touch in the very near future and I will see what can be done.

Also, if you are a professor at a University and are interested in supervising a student or two we would be interested in profiling you and your work so that we can facilitate the student-supervisor link.

JM

View from the Top

Daryl Kroner, *President*

A Softer Issue: Working Together

Many different structures, positions, and focuses are needed to provide the best possible service to those who come into conflict (or contact, such as victims) with the criminal justice system. Whether it is research (empirical, theoretical, historical), administration, delivery of services, each has an intrinsic part to accomplishing the overall goals of the field. One area operating in

isolation from the rest will ensure reduced impact on others or the ability to receive feedback (i.e., what if a service delivery person seldom read a relevant research article). One of the purposes of Crime Scene is to help bridge some of these gaps.

My first day as a Psychologist is as clear as if it was yesterday. I can remember the shoes, tie, sports jacket (now long gone) that I wore. It was in Grande Cache in the mid 80s. The institution and town were isolated. I was the only Psychologist. Five hours from Edmonton. Northernly Allowance deduction on my income tax. Professional development was accomplished through the telephone. Difficult clinical situations were discussed, which resulted in some type of action (some solutions that are no longer acceptable). It wasn't only the support for a specific professional issues that was garnered, but friendships were developed and a movement toward accomplishing a common goal. With bigger projects, such as research or development of test protocols, I can't imagine accomplishing these on my own. I have yet to publish a paper as a sole author. This is not to say that single person projects should not occur, or to say that everything should be a group hug. There needs to be healthy debate of relevant issues and how we can best serve the overall criminal justice system.

This softer issue is not just mine. Clearly, the small group literature shows a relationship between corporate performance and small group cohesion. The stronger the group cohesion, the more commitment there is to corporate objectives and the more productive are individuals. This softer issue is one way that will contribute to a better level of service an under served group.

**Minutes of the Annual Business
Meeting of the
Criminal Justice Section of CPA
Vancouver, BC
June 1, 2002**

Review of the previous years minutes showed substantial progress on many of our goals: new distinctions were defined and awards given (Don Andrews, Career Award; Robert Cormier, Significant Contribution Award); two of our members were successfully nominated as Fellows of CPA (James Bonta; Steve Wong); the section drafted and presented a statement objecting to CSC policy of requiring 2 years in maximum security for all murderers; and the CPA conference included strong criminal justice content, a special symposium, and a banquet dinner. Overall, well done.

Business arising at the meeting included the following:

- 1) The section currently has 227 members (171 full; 56 students). The bills are not yet in for the banquet, but it is expected to cost about \$1000 for the room and discounts for students/early registration. Given annual revenue of \$915.25, this expense cannot be sustained on a yearly basis. For next year Brian Grant promised to explore venues in Hamilton, with the possibility of participants paying a greater proportion of the costs. Everybody agreed that the banquet costs seem reasonable given that chips and drinks at previous conventions cost \$400 to \$500.
- 2) Kroner/Mills successfully produced 3 great issues of Crime Scene. They encouraged all members to submit material, new publications, comments, and, most importantly, informal information about the comings and goings of members. The distribution has switched to 100% email. Mailed copies are available upon request, but for the last issue, no mail copies were requested.
- 3) Steve Wormith repeated his previous years comments about the relationship between NAACJ and CPA. "The National Associations Active in Criminal Justice (email: naacjott@web.net) invites the participation of section members to its annual meetings. The NAACJ membership is centered around voluntary sector organisations (e.g., John Howard Society, Elizabeth Fry) providing services to offenders. The annual meetings provide an opportunity for consultation between various levels of government and NAACJ members. In the past, Steve Wormith has attended, but typically there is a space funded for a second participant, which often goes unfilled. ANYBODY WANT TO TRAVEL? Those interested in potentially participating should submit your names to Steve Wormith (wormith@duke.usask.ca)."
- 4) Steve also provided an update on the collaboration with the American Association for Correctional Psychology. Membership comes with a subscription to Criminal Justice and Behavior, which is regarded as one of the leading journals in the area.
- 5) David Simourd is the book review editor of CJB and invites suggestions for books and reviewers.
- 6) David Nussbaum reported that CPA is attempting to merge with the other psychological associations in Canada to become a more effective lobby organization. The details have yet to be worked out. Expect a modest fee increase.
- 7) Steve Wormith reported that the letter to the Solicitor General of Canada objecting to the "2 years in maximum policy" met with a lukewarm response. Bob Cormier reminded members that policy development is a complex process, and that it is naïve to expect a small, professional organization to change established policies. A discussion ensued about the appropriate role of the section in lobbying for policy change and development. There was a consensus that the section should play some role, but the

limitation of its resources were also acknowledged.

- 8) This year's winner of the Student Prize for Best Poster was awarded to Kathleen Lewis for "Measuring motivation to change in violent offenders". Congratulations!
- 9) David Nussbaum was thanked for his strong leadership of the section. Tanye Ruge and Jennifer van de Ven did an outstanding job as student reps.

The new student representative is Joseph Camilleri, who has been an active member of CPA. Joe has recently completed his B.A. from McMaster and starts his M.A. in at the University of Saskatchewan this fall. His interests are in risk assessment, psychopathy and evolutionary psychology. The new member-at-large positions were filled by Steve Wormith (our past past president) and Carson Smiley (an ex-executive member) and Doug Boer. Both

Carson and Doug have been influential in the development of corrections within the Pacific Region of CSC. Welcome all.

The new executive is as follows:

President: Daryl Kroner

Past-President: David Nussbaum

Secretary-Treasurer: Karl Hanson

Newsletter Editor: Jeremy Mills

Student Representative: Joseph Camilleri

Directors at large: Steve Wormith, Doug Boer, Carson Smiley

Prepared by R. Karl Hanson

The Personals Column

Reflections of an Institutionalised Psychologist

Ron Blackburn, Ph.D.

It's quite flattering for a British 'forensic' psychologist to be invited to contribute to *Crime Scene*. Over the last couple of decades, ideas about work with offenders have flowed mainly from Canada to Britain, and like most of my colleagues working in and around the criminal justice system here, I'm in thrall to the prolific research output of Canadian psychologists. I'm also an inveterate Canadophile in other respects. I'm a Friend of Batoche and I try to impress Canadians by announcing that I've travelled the Dempster Highway to Inuvik. Sadly, this invariably produces an incredulous 'Why?'

I've spent most of my career working in institutions for mentally disordered offenders as a practitioner and researcher, but I can't claim to have been driven by altruistic dedication to human service. I went to university on a history scholarship to read archaeology, but switched to psychology naively believing that it would broaden my career options. The options turned out to be a PhD in experimental psychology or a training post in clinical psychology. I chose the latter for practical reasons (debt!). My first boss had a psychodynamic background, although he was also a pioneer behaviour therapist. He suggested that my interests in archaeology and psychology had in common a desire to return to the womb. I eventually forgave him for this, and we became great friends.

Career paths seem to be typically a result of chance encounters with people and ideas. When I started my clinical training in 1962, the dominant figure in British applied psychology was Hans Eysenck. His theories on personality, neurosis, and socialisation had a major impact on developments in clinical and

criminological psychology, and influenced my own thinking in two ways. First, they emphasised a need for research and practice to be theory-driven, a tradition from which we've strayed in recent years. Second, they demonstrated how an understanding of individual differences might bring some order to the myriad of human problems we encounter in mental health and criminal justice. However, a major shortcoming of Eysenck's theorising was to bypass the distinctive concerns of psychology with the 'psyche' in favour of a biological level of analysis. The theorists I later found literally more 'thoughtful' were Richard Lazarus, whose ideas on emotion were the basis for cognitive therapy, Albert Bandura, whose social cognitive theory remains the most comprehensive account of how thought affects behaviour, and Timothy Leary, whose interpersonal theory of personality harmonises well with more recent developments in social cognition.

My first job after completing clinical training was at Broadmoor Hospital, one of England's three maximum security hospitals, and I subsequently worked at the other hospitals as well. When I joined the system, the status of psychologists was somewhere vaguely between that of the junior medics and the chaplain, and their role was mainly psychometric assessment ('tell us what the entrails say'). Treatment interventions in the form of behaviour therapy were still relatively new in the health system generally, and it wasn't until the early seventies when the numbers of psychologists began to increase that we started to apply behavioural and cognitive-behavioural methods to social skills, anger and aggression, and sexual problems.

Inevitably, my interests in applying psychology to crime were shaped by the focal concerns of the forensic psychiatric system with serious violence and sexual offending, individual psychopathology, and the assessment of 'dangerousness'. I became particularly interested in personality disorder because of the presence of a sizeable group of patients detained under the legal category of 'psychopathic disorder' (a legal fiction with little connection to current concepts of psychopathy). Then, as now, psychiatrists looked to psychologists to provide some understanding of, and hopefully treatment strategies for this group. It was apparent that whatever the utility of psychological models of aggression at a general level, they were not sufficient to explain why some people convicted of violent offences were actually quite timid or conforming, while others were clearly habitual bullies. Ned Megargee's theory of overcontrol promised to reduce this heterogeneity. At the same time, there were other relevant theories around, such as Eysenck's theory on personality and socialisation and Marvin Zuckerman's ideas about sensation seeking. Bob Hare's research on psychopathy was also providing a focus on one significant aspect of individual differences among offenders.

I tried to bring these together in a model of impulsivity versus control. For some time, I relied on the MMPI, though abandoned it in favour of my own short form when it became apparent that it measures little apart from Neuroticism and Extraversion. However, one line of work led me to a fourfold personality typology that identified two types of overcontrolled offender and two types of psychopath, primary and secondary. The latter distinction has gone out of fashion, but it comes up repeatedly in different measurement domains. Some of our recent work clearly confirms that high scorers on the PCL-R are not a homogeneous group, and this has implications for risk assessment and management that remain to be explored.

I started this work in my PhD in 1967. A year later, Mischel's devastating critique of personality and assessment appeared, and many of my more behaviouristically inclined colleagues heaved a sigh of relief and held ritual MMPI-burning ceremonies. Perhaps because of a constitutional rigidity, I've retained my convictions about the importance of individual differences among offenders. I think there's still a widespread misunderstanding of the notion of personality dispositions. Behaviourists, including those with cognitive leanings, argue that the focus for understanding deviant behaviour has to be the response or response class as it occurs in a specific environmental context. I've no problem with this except that the

only reason we attempt to understand 'responses' is that they are likely to be repeated and hence reflect dispositions or tendencies to behave in a particular way. Like the brittleness of glass, dispositions of the person are properties that people carry around with them, and there is now ample evidence that specific response dispositions are linked to more general dispositions that differentiate between people, including offenders.

Personality has recently become more respectable among psychologists working in criminal justice. Work on psychopathy has been influential in this respect, but the current preoccupation with risk assessment also reflects an awareness, if not always fully explicated, of the considerable continuity and stability in people's lives stemming from personal characteristics. I think risk assessment has more to do with identifying the dispositions of the person that make certain kinds of behaviour more probable than with predicting or forecasting future behaviour. 'Static' risk factors are simply the historical conditions that promote a disposition to violate society's rules or under which it is expressed. 'Dynamic' risk factors do the same job, but may do it slightly better because they identify more specific and malleable dispositions.

Another influence on a revived interest in personality is the increased emphasis on personality disorders, although I find it frustrating that this has come from psychiatry and not from developments in the psychology of personality. In England, personality disorders are becoming more central to criminal justice with the impending introduction of the legal category of 'dangerous as a result of severe personality disorder', one criterion being a high PCL-R score. This is creating a lot of unease because it will be possible to subject people to indefinite detention in a civil context when they have not actually been convicted of a crime. However, it is just possible that one positive consequence will be increased resources directed at treatment of 'dangerous' offenders.

As I approach retirement, my thoughts about the future directions of psychology in the criminal justice system are more a biased wish-list than a prediction. I see a need for more theory-driven research on the role of person variables in crime, for at least three reasons. First, we need to go beyond surface traits such as psychopathy or antisocial personality disorder to the personal agendas, schemas, and beliefs underlying them. Second, we need to know more about the variables that moderate or mediate both re-offending and intervention. Don Andrews' principles of effective intervention have pointed us in the right direction, but these are as much a guide to research targets as to service requirements. Criminogenic 'needs', for example, have to be determined empirically, not assumed. Third, we need to move from 'prediction' to explanation. Risk factors are not causes, and causal theories that identify motivational variables may provide a firmer foundation for management and intervention.

Ron Blackburn is Emeritus Professor of Clinical and Forensic Psychological Studies at the University of Liverpool. e-mail: ronb@liv.ac.uk

Recent publications:

Blackburn, R. (2000). Treatment or incapacitation? Implications of research on personality disorders for the management of dangerous offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 5, 1-21.

Blackburn, R. (2002). Ethical issues in motivating offenders to change. In M. McMurrin (Ed.) *Motivating Offenders to Change*. Chichester: Wiley.

Logan, C., Blackburn, R., Donnelly, J., & Renwick, S. J. (In press). Personality disorder, criminality and perceived risk and treatability in detained mentally disordered offenders in Scotland and England. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*.

Structured Clinical Judgment in Risk Appraisal: An idea whose time has gone The Parable of the Lawn Mowers*

Vernon L. Quinsey, Ph.D.

Queen's University at Kingston, ON

So I go to Canadian Tire and pick up a lawn mower for a couple of hundred bucks. Its operation is simple enough that, following the application of a little authoritarian persuasion, I can sit on my deck sipping mint juleps and increasing the likelihood of my developing a malignant melanoma while supervising my kids cutting the lawn.

One day a guy comes to my door with a very fancy looking lawn mower. Now this lawn mower comes with a tweed or pinstripe dust cover and has a unique feature—the machine that drives the blades is mounted on springs! This feature means that the operator must apply exactly the right amount of downward pressure to cut all the grass at the same height. Difficult? You bet. But the operator has trained for eight years (actually mostly in the ethics and philosophy of lawn management) and is now a board certified and registered grass height consultant who can commit the controlled act of mowing as long as he uses tasteful fonts in his advertising. In addition, the operator has mowed court house and prison lawns all over North America and knows what he's doing.

So I ask him—"how high will you cut my grass?" He says, "How high would you like it? Very high, moderately high, or low?" "Well," I say "How high is moderately high?" "Well, you know," he replies, "...moderate." "How many inches is moderate?" I say, betraying my age. He smiles secretively. "That all depends on how hard I'm pushing."

"So how consistent will 'moderate' be across my lawn? Right now I cut it all at exactly two inches." "We've looked into this in great detail." he says. "Our spring loaded model in the hands of a board certified operator is almost as consistent as the completely mechanical ones. And you know what?" he confides, "The newer models have shorter and stiffer springs that make them just as good as the mechanical models in some studies."

As prestigious and dynamic as this guy is, I can't afford to pay him to cut my lawn—he's just too expensive. However, for only ten times the cost of my old lawn mower, he'll run a training workshop for me in the use of the spring-ed machine in the privacy of my own backyard. I think there's a living to be made here and I'm thinking about it. As to capital investment, all I have to do is add four springs to my old lawn mower.

* A French version of the parable, entitled "Il faut que je meau de lawne avec les petites spirales de fer ou les bandes de latex" is permanently unavailable from the author.

Recently Defended Ph.D. Thesis

Affective Aggression in Adult Male Prisoners: The Role of Prior Exposure to Violence, Psychopathy, Hostile Attribution Bias and Anger

Gurmeet Kaur Dhaliwal
Carleton University
June, 2002

Abstract

Hostile attribution bias, a cognitive distortion, is a belief that the intentions of a person's behavior are harmful or hostile. The current research project investigated the relationships between prior exposure to violence, psychopathy, hostile attribution bias, state anger and affective aggression among 70 adult male offenders incarcerated in a medium-security federal penitentiary in Canada. Some link between psychopathy and prior exposure to violence was found. This research confirmed previous studies of differing populations that offenders were more likely to rate hostile intent in Hostile Scenarios than Ambiguous Scenarios, and more in Ambiguous Scenarios than Benign Scenarios. A significant relationship between psychopathy and hostile attribution bias was found only in Ambiguous Scenarios. Further, offenders with a hostile attribution bias reported feeling angry, and were more likely to resort to more aggressive behaviors. By testing a proposed model of affective aggression, additional information was gained. First, prior exposure to violence had a direct effect on aggression, but was not a direct predictor of hostile attribution bias. Second, psychopathy had both a direct relationship to aggression, and an indirect relationship to aggression for Ambiguous Scenarios, with hostile attribution bias and anger acting as mediating factors. Third, hostile attribution bias was indirectly related to aggression with state anger as the mediating factor. Fourth, anger was a direct predictor of affective aggression.

For more information contact Dr. Dhaliwal directly at DhaliwalGUK@csc-scc.gc.ca

Criminal Justice Section Award Winning Student Poster

Measuring Motivation to Change in Violent Offenders

Kathleen Lewis, University of Saskatchewan, & Stephen Wong, Regional Psychiatric Centre¹
Poster presented at the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association
Vancouver, BC, May 2002

Abstract

Motivation to change is an important precondition for treatment success in forensic settings. The University of Rhode Island Change Assessment scale (URICA; McConaughy, Prochaska, & Velicer, 1983) is a standardised measure of motivation developed from the Transtheoretical Model of Change (Prochaska & Norcross, 1994). The URICA is a 32-item self-report measure designed to measure the

¹We would like to thank the participants for their time and effort in completing the assessment batteries. In addition, we would like to thank RPC staff, particularly Chantal Di Placido, for their support and suggestions during this study. For further information please contact the first author at kathy.lewis@usask.ca

stages of change (precontemplation, contemplation, action, and maintenance). However, rather than using the URICA to place participants into stages, cluster analysis of URICA scores may produce motivation profiles that have greater interpretative and clinical utility (e.g., Hemphill & Howell, 2000). The three goals of the current study are to generate descriptive data for the URICA with a forensic sample, to develop URICA profiles using cluster analyses, and to review participants' membership in the profiles at pre- and post-treatment. Participants are 236 incarcerated male federal offenders who have participated in an Aggressive Behavioural Control program. The URICA was administered to participants as part of a standard pre- and post-treatment assessment battery. Results will be discussed in terms of the URICA profiles' utility in describing participants' therapeutic progress.

Method

Participants

Participants are 236 federally incarcerated male offenders. Each participant was convicted of at least one violent offence and participated in the Aggressive Behavioural Control (ABC) treatment program at the Regional Psychiatric Centre (RPC).

Materials

The URICA (McConaughy et al., 1983) consists of 32 items designed to measure four stages of change: precontemplation, contemplation, action, and maintenance. There are eight items per factor, and each item is scored using a five-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Each item is written so that it is relevant to changing a problem behaviour.

Procedure

The URICA was administered to participants as part of the standard RPC pre- and post-treatment assessment battery. Some participants completed only pre- or post-treatment assessment batteries. Two hundred and twenty-five participants completed a pre-treatment URICA and 129 participants completed a post-treatment URICA. There are matching pre- and post-treatment URICAs for 108 participants.

Analyses

The first analyses involve generating descriptive statistics for the URICA factors (both pre- and post-treatment) including means, standard deviations, and internal consistencies. Independent t-tests were used to compare these descriptive statistics with those from Hemphill and Howell (2000; 225 young offenders) and McConaughy, DiClemente, Prochaska, and Velicer (1989; 323 adult therapy clients) to investigate the URICA's cross-sample consistency. For the second analyses, hierarchical agglomerative cluster analyses (Ward method) were conducted to generate pre- and post-treatment cluster profiles. The third analysis explored the distribution of participants' URICA profiles at pre- and post-treatment.

Results

Psychometric Properties of the URICA

Pre-treatment:

Factor	N	Mean	St. Dev	Alpha
Prec	221	1.89	0.56	0.78
Cont	225	4.34	0.41	0.76
Action	224	4.22	0.40	0.75
Main	221	3.28	0.56	0.68

Post-treatment:

Factor	N	Mean	St. Dev	Alpha
Prec	129	1.75	0.56	0.82
Cont	127	4.41	0.41	0.79
Action	128	4.44	0.38	0.70
Maint	128	3.28	0.61	0.69

Based on t-test results, the current study's pre-treatment Action factor was significantly higher than Hemphill and Howell's (2000), $t(453)=5.11$, $p=.005$, and McConaughy et al.'s (1989), $t(551)=5.13$, $p=.005$. The current study's pre-treatment Maintenance factor was significantly lower than Hemphill and Howell's (2000), $t(453)=-3.89$, $p=.005$, and McConaughy et al.'s (1989), $t(551)=-5.61$, $p=.005$.

Internal consistencies for pre- and post-treatment URICA factors ranged from moderate to high.

	Pre-Treatment			Post-Treatment		
	Precontemplation	Contemplation	Action	Precontemplation	Contemplation	Action
Contemplation	-.54*	--		-.37*		
Action	-.47*	.68*		-.39*	.70*	
Maintenance	-.06	.29*	.22*	-.07	.41*	.28*

Note: p = .001 (1-tailed)

There were no significant differences between the current study’s pattern and strength of intercorrelations and those found in the comparison studies.

URICA Cluster Profiles

Ten cluster profiles were generated:

	Pre (%)	Post (%)
• <i>Precontemplative</i> – no desire to change	8	--
• <i>Discouraged</i> – no attempt to maintain previous changes	19	14
• <i>Reluctant</i> – may think about change but there is no commitment to change	3	18
• <i>Immotive</i> – engaged in maintaining the status quo (i.e., no change)	15	6
• <i>Ambivalent</i> – ambivalent about change and endorsing conflicting statements	11	7
• <i>Unprepared Action</i> – changes made without fully acknowledging the problem	6	--
• <i>Contemplative</i> – want to change but have not begun to plan for action	18	15
• <i>Pre-participation</i> – somewhat involved in planning how to change	--	14
• <i>Decision-making</i> – thinking about problems and starting to take small actions	10	19
• <i>Participation</i> – actively engaged in change and maintaining previous changes	10	7

Pre-treatment to Post-treatment: Profile Movement

POST-TREATMENT	PRE-TREATMENT								
	Precon-templation	Dis-couraged	Reluctant	Immotive	Ambivalent	Unprepared Action	Contem-plative	Decision Making	Participa-tion
Discouraged		7		1		4	3	1	
Reluctant	3	4		6	3		2		
Immotive	2		3		1		1		
Ambivalent		3			2			1	2
Contemplative	1	2	1	3	2	1	3	1	2
Pre-participation		4		2	1	1	3	2	1
Decision Making	1	3		2	2	2	4	3	4
Participation							3		5

Note: Light gray boxes indicate progression through profiles. Dark gray boxes indicate regression through profiles. White boxes indicate no change.

According to the above matrix, 49% of offenders progressed through profiles during treatment, 19% stayed at the same profile, and 32% regressed during treatment.

DiscussionThe psychometric results indicate that the URICA can be used successfully with violent adult male offenders. The internal consistencies of the factor scores, and the pattern and strength of the interfactor correlations, were similar to those from the comparison studies. The mean scores for the Precontemplation and Contemplation factors did not differ significantly from the comparison studies. The mean scores for the Action and Maintenance factors were significantly higher and lower, respectively, than those from the comparison studies. Violent offenders may have identified themselves as more prepared for change since participation in the ABC program is important when offenders are under consideration for later release. The unexpected results involving the Maintenance factor (e.g., lower factor scores) may indicate that the adult offenders identified themselves as less likely to maintain change over time.

Every cluster profile generated in the current study has been identified in previous research. The distribution of cluster profiles suggests that some of the most high-risk violent offenders either want to change or have begun making small lifestyle changes prior to starting treatment. This may indicate that their previous institutions were successful at helping them to identify the need for change. Furthermore, cluster analyses of URICA scores was effective in identifying participant movement during treatment. Results from the profile matrix indicate that by the end of treatment, two thirds of offenders who began treatment in precontemplative-like profiles made improvements. This suggests that the ABC program is effective in helping the least motivated violent offenders to progress. This progress may be attributed to the program's practice of first offering precontemplative-oriented services to engage offenders in treatment before providing contemplative, preparation, action, and finally maintenance-oriented services.

However, one third of offenders who began treatment in more advanced profiles regressed substantially. It is possible that these motivated offenders felt that the initial focus on precontemplative-oriented services was not useful for them and they may have felt that their time was not well used. If these offenders can be reliably identified before treatment, they may benefit from attending an accelerated version of the ABC program that is focused on action and maintenance-oriented skills.

Research Brief

Anger norms for students and offenders

M. C. Cullen, M. T. Bradley and J. A. Stapleton
Department Of Psychology
University of New Brunswick,
Saint John, N.B.

Cullen and Bradley (2001) believed that offenders are likely to react with anger when faced with selected situations. Their aim was to help offenders anticipate and recognize anger provoking situations and then employ anger reduction techniques. Hunter (1993) tested earlier strategies of Cullen (1992) and found that incarcerated adults who learned to identify anger and use non-aggressive behaviours were less likely to have angry outbursts. Cullen and Bradley (2001) continued the use of anger/aggression-provoking situations with scenarios adapted from experiences of offenders. Implicit in their thinking was that offender reactions in one, some or all spheres of cognitive, emotional and behavioural realms would be extreme. The purpose of this study was to begin to find how extreme offenders reactions are by gathering norms for comparison.

Male University students were used as the normative group.

Method

Thirty-nine first year male university students were given six situations from the manual (Cullen & Bradley) to read. The situations were selected to be appropriate and fit potential events that could happen to either offenders or non-offenders. The students reacted to 6 examples as if they were the central character. They indicated their level of anger on a scale from 1 (not at all angry) to 7 (enraged). They wrote down two thoughts, two feelings and two likely behaviours resulting from their experience of each situation in the following format.

If you were _____ indicate how angry you would be by circling a number on the following scale

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at Moderately Enraged
all angry angry

a) What would you think? (1st two thoughts)

b) How would you feel? (Remember to put the strongest feeling first and then any other feelings)

c) Most likely, what would you do and what would you like to do?

that they would verbally or physically aggress or would “like to aggress” were derived for each scenario. The number of participants indicating aggression given either “anger” feelings or “no anger” feelings are reported with their appropriate scenarios.

Results

Norms reflecting anger levels, the number of times participants indicated feeling anger and the number of times they indicated

Sample Scenario (S1)

Fred and his Date

Fred and his first time date go with another couple (friends he has known for years) to a local night club on the weekend. As Fred is sipping his glass of draft, he notices his new date making eye contact and smiling with another fellow who is sitting with a group of guys at a table at the far end of the night club. A few moments later, she tells Fred that she must go to the bathroom. When she returns from the washroom, she takes the long way around the inside of the night club and leans over the table, smiling, and carries on a rather long conversation with the guy that she had made eye contact with, as well as the other fellows at that table. Fred's friend, Tom (who is sitting with him at the table) leans over and asks Fred..."What the hell is going on over there? You're looking pretty bad here, my friend. She's making you look pretty pathetic here!" A few moments after that remark, she returns to the table. She seems in a very happy mood.

Endorsement of Anger and Aggression Across Scenarios

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6
Average Anger Level	3.7	3.4	5.5	3.6	4.8	6.2
% Indicating Aggressive Response	33%	69%	74%	18%	61%	97%

In summary, across all six scenarios, when participants made their 139 reports of angry feelings they indicated aggression 117 times or 84% of the time. On the 95 occasions that they indicated feelings other than anger they reported aggression in 21 instances or 22% of the time.

Discussion

The present results provide normative information about anger levels evoked by the scenarios used by Cullen and Bradley (2001). The intended use of this information will be to provide comparison with norms for the offender population. We have some indications of anger levels from the offender population but information coming from offenders following

the manual may not be comparable. These offenders are trained example by example with anger recognition and management and they may be more sophisticated in their reactions because of training. We anticipate soliciting reactions from untrained offender populations using the same questionnaire format as we have used on students.

Normative data is important. Are violent offenders more extreme in their emotional, cognitive and behavioural reactions? If offenders are more extreme, programs can focus on their “abnormally violent propensities” in attempts to “normalize” them. If offenders are not more extreme in their anger reactions, then programs could include sections illustrating

self-defeating aspects of violent behaviour for all members of the culture.

The questionnaire yielded information about angry feelings and the potential of aggression from participants. If a participant reports anger then most likely he is considering aggression anywhere from 41 to 100% of occasions with an overall average of 84%. Given that aggression is at the least uncomfortable for the recipient, knowledge that someone is angry could be a warning that aggression is highly probable.

Feelings other than anger are less likely to result in aggressive behaviours. The predictions ranged from 0 to 100% with an overall average of 22%. Awareness of the feelings of an individual in these situations does not guarantee protection from aggression, but the probability is much reduced. If these findings hold for the offender population, a parole board dealing with an offender who expresses anger may wish to use extreme caution in that case since indications of anger almost guarantee the consideration of aggression. Indications of other feelings do not, on the converse, guarantee non-aggression but the risk probability could be estimated from other information.

Of course, caveats pertain since this study uses paper and pencil forms. We did not measure actual behaviour and answers were given anonymously. Thus anticipated behaviours were unrestrained by immediate social conditions and social desirability.

References

Cullen, M. (1992). *Cage your rage*. Upper Marlboro, Maryland: American Correctional Association.

Cullen, M. and Bradley, M. (2001). *Inside out: Continuing to cage your rage*. Lanham, Maryland: American Correctional Association.

Hunter, D. (1993). Anger management in the prison: an evaluation. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 5, (1), 3-5.

For more information please contact the authors.

Recent Publications

Hanson, R. K. (in press). Recidivism and age: Follow-up data on 4,673 sexual offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*.

Hanson, R. K., Gordon, A., Harris, A. J. R., Marques, J. K., Murphy, W., Quinsey, V. L., & Seto, M. C. (2002). First report of the Collaborative Outcome Data Project on the effectiveness of psychological treatment for sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 14(2), 169-194.

Beech, A., Friendship, C., Erikson, M., & Hanson, R. K. (2002). The relationship between static and dynamic risk factors and reconviction in a sample of U.K. child abusers. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 14 (2), 155-167.

Mills, J. F., & Kroner, D. G. (in press). Anger as a Predictor of Institutional Misconduct and Recidivism in a Sample of Violent Offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*.

This study investigated the relationship of self-report anger measures that measured anger within the context of interpersonal conflict or the outward expression of anger with criminal history, institutional misconduct, and recidivism. An incarcerated sample of 102 violent male offenders participated in the study. Self-reported anger was not associated with prior convictions and incarcerations. Selective scales were associated with minor institutional misconduct but these relationships did not remain once impression management was accounted for. There was no relationship between anger and post-release performance. Implications regarding the prediction of

institutional misconduct and recidivism are discussed.

Glover, A. J.J., Nicholson, D., Hemmati, T., Bernfeld, G., & Quinsey, V. (2002). A comparison of predictors of general and violent recidivism among high-risk federal offenders. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 29, 235-249.

The accuracy of 10 risk measures in predicting general and violent recidivism among 106 federally sentenced male offenders was compared. During an average period of opportunity to reoffend of 713 days (*SD* 601.38), 28 offenders recidivated non-violently and 34 recidivated violently. Common language effect sizes in discriminating violent recidivists from other offenders were .73 for the General Statistical Information on Recidivism-Revised and .72 for the Violence Risk Appraisal Guide. Effect sizes in the .60s were obtained for DSM-IV Conduct Disorder scored as a scale, the Violent Statistical Information on Recidivism-Revised, the Psychological Referral Screening Form, the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised total score and Factor 2, and the Childhood and Adolescent Taxon Scale. Effect sizes in the .50s were obtained with the DSM-IV Antisocial Personality Disorder scored as a scale and the Psychopathy Checklist Factor 1.

Opportunity Knocks

Forensic Psychology/Psychology and Law Position Department of Psychology Carleton University

Subject to budgetary considerations, the Department of Psychology, Carleton University wishes to make a tenure-track appointment at the level of Assistant Professor, to begin July 1, 2003. Preference will be given to candidates

with research and teaching interests in the area of Forensic Psychology/Psychology and Law. The Department of Psychology has a strong undergraduate and graduate program in experimental Forensic Psychology; we are a participating department in the interdisciplinary Criminology and Criminal Justice degree program. Further information can be obtained from our website at <http://www.carleton.ca/> or by contacting Dr. Adelle Forth at the address below, by phone at (613) 520-2600, ext. 1267, or by email at adelle_forth@carleton.ca. Applicants should send their curriculum vitae, copies of representative publications, and a summary of research objectives and teaching experience to Dr. Kimberly Matheson, Chair, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 5B6. At the same time, candidates should arrange to have three referees forward supporting letters to the same address. All qualified candidates are encouraged to apply. The applications of Canadian citizens and Permanent residents will be given priority. Carleton University is committed to equality of employment for women, aboriginal peoples, visible minorities and persons with disabilities. Persons from these groups are encouraged to apply. Applications will be reviewed beginning January 15, 2003 and this process will continue until the search has been completed.

Members on the Move

Congratulations to Dr. Gurmeet Dhaliwal who successfully defended her Ph.D. thesis in June 2002 at Carleton University.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ASSOCIATION

2002 Annual Conference and Training

Pierre Allard, Assistant Commissioner,
Community Engagement, Correctional
Services of Canada

“What’s New in the New Millennium?
What We Know After a Decade of
Research Conferences”

November 3-6, 2002
Park Plaza Hotel
Boston, MA

Research Conference:

Research Conference Chair: John Edwards,
President, John Howard Society of Ottawa and
Former Commissioner of Correctional Service
of Canada.

Research Topics and Presenters:

➤ **Evidence-Based Programming Today:**

James McGuire, Ph.D., Researcher,
University of Liverpool, Liverpool,
Great Britain

➤ **Innovations in Community**

Corrections: Mark Carey, Researcher,
Deputy Director, Minnesota Department
of Corrections

➤ **Community Partnerships & Multi-**

Systemic Strategies: Peggy McGarry,
Senior Associate, Center for Effective
Public Policy

Keynote Speakers:

Lucie McClung, Commissioner,
Correctional Services of Canada
Joan Petersilia, Ph.D., University of
California at Irvine,

Community Corrections Workshops:

This year’s conference offers more than 25
workshops in three tracks, including:

Track I: Evidence-based Programming Today

- ❖ Supervising Women in the Community: The Canadian Experience
- ❖ Strategies to Reduce Serious Offending by Juvenile Offenders - A Case Study
- ❖ What is the Latest on Sex Offender Assessments?
- ❖ Results of Effective Group Treatment for Offenders
- ❖ Treatment Approaches for High Needs Offenders
- ❖ Empirically Driven Treatment Approaches for High Needs Offenders
- ❖ Women, Parole and Community Corrections: The Fairer Sex Has Greater Odds to Beat

Track II: - Innovations in Community Corrections

- ❖ Promoting Alternatives to Incarceration
- ❖ Effective Clinical Supervision
- ❖ Proactive Community Supervision in Maryland
- ❖ Organizational Change Process
- ❖ Race and the ‘What Works’ Genre of Community Corrections
- ❖ Community Corrections Interventions for Women Offenders
- ❖ Developing a Vision for Gender-Responsive Policy and Practice in Community Corrections
- ❖ Community Corrections in Massachusetts: It’s the Law
- ❖ A System Designer’s Perspective
- ❖ Why Fix What Ain’t Broke – Reinventing an Established System
- ❖ Reinventing Probation: Lessons Learned in NYC

Track III: Community Partnerships and

Multi-systemic Strategies

- ❖ Multi-agency Community Supervision and the Maryland HotSpot Initiative
- ❖ Community Volunteers and Sex Offenders: Best Practice or Foolhardiness
- ❖ Outcome Focused Intervention Strategies for Juvenile Offenders
- ❖ A Collaborative Strategy in the Supervision/Treatment of Sex Offenders
- ❖ We Tell Our Clients to be Self Sufficient...But How Self-Sufficient are We? Considering a Social Enterprise Model in Community Corrections
- ❖ Multi-Systemic Response to Domestic Violence

Pre-Conference Intensive Session Offerings (Sunday, November 3):

- Management Development for Women and Minorities
- Cognitive Reflective Communications
- The Community Meets the What Works Agenda
- Learning from Crayons - Illuminating the way to long-term organizational stability and learning
- Issues in Siting - Community Corrections Program
- Steve Wormith, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of Saskatchewan

More Information:

For more information on the conference, contact:

John Larivee
Or ICCA Central Office
Local Conference Host
(608) 785-0200
(617) 482-252
icca@execpc.com
e-mail: jjlarivee@crjustice.org