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Although group counseling procedures have been researched extensively for institutionalized offender populations, literature concerning group counseling with non-institutionalized offenders has been less evident. In addition, much confusion exists in the literature with regard to frustration tolerance, and the acquisition and modification of aggressive behavior. For the purposes of this research, frustration tolerance as outlined by Saul Rosenzweig and the theoretical base of social learning in the acquisition of aggressive behavior, were utilized. In sum, this study was designed to investigate three treatment methods and their effects on frustration tolerance and aggression for a population of non-institutionalized offenders.

Thirty-nine clients under the supervision of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia were randomly assigned to one of three treatment groups. The treatment exposures consisted of: a) psychodrama and group counseling; b) films, audio-visual and group discussion; and c) normal probation and/or parole supervision as outlined by the Courts.

The Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study and the Berea
College Form Board were used as pre-test and as post-test measures for subjects in all three treatment groups. A Behavioral Rating Scale was developed to be used with the Berea College Form Board which consisted of 21 identifiable and/or definable physical and verbal behaviors.

Computation of two Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients resulted in .71 for the pre-test and .83 for the post-test when comparisons were made between judges ratings on the Behavioral Rating Scale of subject's aggressive behaviors.

Analysis of covariance with pre-test scores used as co-variates was used in the analysis of the data. Results of the analysis were as follows: (1) There were no significant differences in mean scores between the three treatment groups in the acquisition of appropriate behaviors as measured on the (E), (I), (M) and (GCR) dimensions of the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study. (2) There were no significant differences in mean scores between the three treatment groups in the acquisition of appropriate behaviors as measured on the Behavioral Rating Scale.

While an analysis of the quantitative data does not support the use of psychodrama and group counseling, and the use of films and/or audio-visual aids and group discussion as treatment methods to be used in the acquisition of appropriate behaviors, examination of the qualitative progress reports lend support to its continued use as treatment methods with offender populations. Meaningful relationships with probation officers and other group members were established, and in addition, "group members were
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able to look at themselves and discuss some of their problems."

Further research, however, is recommended using similar techniques so that the effectiveness of this approach can be better evaluated.
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Purpose of Study

This study is concerned with the examination of frustration tolerance and aggressive behavior as well as the effects of varying intervention methods for a population of adult offenders.

Need for the Study

Concern has been expressed at all levels of Federal, State and Local governments over the rising crime rates. In addition, public awareness of the problem has been elevated because of the feelings by many citizens that they are not even safe in their own homes. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967) reported that 43% of the people surveyed stayed off the streets at night and that 20% would like to move to a new neighborhood because of their fear of crime.

To try and cope effectively with these issues, commissions have been established, new facilities have been opened and research projects have been initiated. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Acts (1967) passed by Congress, allotted
63 million dollars to be used for planning grants, academic assistance and other projects concerned with the questions of crime and the public offender. In the area of Vocational Rehabilitation, new legislation was passed in 1965 (PL89-333) which broadened the scope of services so as to include the public offender.

The Probation Office of Washington, D.C. has expressed a need for research in several areas in order to be better able to cope with some of the problems which arise in working with men and women on their case loads. Their need for research fell into several broad categories: (a) work adjustment; (b) social and personal attitudes; (c) frustration tolerance; and (d) attitudes towards law and order.

As a priority, it was suggested that frustration tolerance was an important issue because of the difficulty many of the clients under their jurisdiction had in dealing with frustrations at work, at home and with significant others. Peterson (1971) has suggested that the reduced threshold for frustration caused many clients to lose jobs because of their inability to operate effectively with authority figures, and as a result, the loss of work apparently caused a higher rate of recidivism. In a final report for the United States Department of Labor, The Draper Report (1966), it was stated that some of the personality characteristics of the target population included low aspirational level, quickness to give up and walk away and a low frustration tolerance. The target population in this report was a prison group of adult males in an Alabama penitentiary. Similar
findings by Lasher and Synderman (1966) indicated that some of the problems encountered in employment counseling of the dis­advantaged were that this population had difficulty in toler­ating pressures and sustaining efforts.

In summary, the need for this study becomes evident because up-to-date there has been little research organized for the purpose of finding treatment variables or intervention methods which deal with the problems of frustration tolerance and aggressive behavior with special clients like parolees and/or probationers.

**Statement of the Problem**

To investigate the effects of three intervention methods: (a) psychodrama and group counseling; (b) films, audio-visual aids and group discussion; and (c) regular probation pro­cedures as specified by the Courts as "The Conditions of Pro­bation" on frustration tolerance and aggressive behavior for a population of men and women on parole and/or probation in Washington, D.C.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this research the following terms will be used.

**Frustration**: Whenever the organism meets a more or less insurmountable obstacle or obstruction in its route to satisfaction of any vital need (Rosenzweig, 1943).

**Frustration Tolerance**: The individual's capacity to withstand
frustration without failure of psychobiological adjustment, i.e., without resorting to inadequate modes of response (Rosenzweig, 1950).

Aggression: An inappropriate response to a frustrating situation which can be directed towards self or towards others (Rosenzweig, 1933).

Theory related to research variables

Frustration Tolerance

Many views exist in the literature related to the concepts of frustration tolerance. A rather brief definition by Fenton (1957) describes frustration tolerance as the ability to stand frustration without loss of self control. This definition is used to explain the purposes of group counseling which allows the individual, through frank discussion, to understand his feelings about prison life and his self control in the face of unpleasant circumstances within the prison and also upon release.

Crow (1967) has further defined frustration tolerance as the extent to which any individual is able to endure a frustration without becoming emotionally disorganized. He further feels that individual differences exist with regard to frustration tolerance, and that early experiences contribute to the varying levels of frustration tolerance.

Yates (1962) also feels that there is a great deal of confusion with regard to the concept of frustration tolerance and he concluded that much of this confusion exists because of what
he calls "terminological difficulties." He feels that it is difficult to determine whether the authors are referring to tolerance of a frustrating situation or whether they are talking about the individual's ability to withstand a particular degree of frustration.

Rosenzweig (1944) defined frustration tolerance as the individual's capacity to withstand frustration without failure of psychobiological adjustment, i.e. without resorting to inadequate modes of response. Rosenzweig (1950) further refined his definition of frustration tolerance as the capacity to sustain tension or to inhibit its premature discharge.

Another major frustration theory developed during the time Rosenzweig presented his works. The basis of this theory outlined by (Dollard, Dobb, Miller, Mowrer & Sears, 1939) consisted of two main propositions: (1) the occurrence of frustration always increased the tendency for the organism to respond aggressively; and (2) whenever an organism responded aggressively this was prima-facie evidence of the previous occurrence of frustration. Briefly stated, frustration ultimately leads to aggression; aggression always implies that frustration has occurred at some previous time (Lawson, 1965).

Frustration is the interference with a behavior sequence normally leading to a "goal response," and aggression is the behavior that is reinforced by the occurrence of injury to an organism (Dollard et al., 1939). The author attempted to analyze frustration and its consequences using s-r concepts and his works were an attempt to integrate s-r and psychoanalytical con-
It seems obvious in reviewing these few definitions of frustration tolerance that there are some similarities and some variations, however, for the purposes of this research study, the theory outlined by Rosenzweig will be utilized.

**Aggression: Acquisition and Modification**

The models employed by this research to study the acquisition and modification of aggressive behaviors for a population of adult offenders will take its theoretical foundations from (1) social learning theory, (2) group counseling, (3) psychodrama and (4) films and/or audio-visual aids.

**Social learning**

Certain aggressive behaviors are reinforced by society as being acceptable while others are regarded as being inappropriate. The purpose of this study is not to accept or reject what society regards as appropriate or inappropriate aggressive behavior, but rather, it is an attempt to explain how aggressive behaviors are acquired and modified.

Bandura (1969) has stated that the frequency with which aggressive behavior is displayed, the specific forms that it takes, the situations in which it is expressed and the targets that are selected for attack are strongly influenced by social experiences. That is, the role of the parents, friends and significant others often shape our reactions to frustrating situations and play an important role in the modification of these aggressive behaviors.
Group Counseling

Although group counseling techniques have been tried in a variety of institutionalized settings, the establishment of group counseling procedures as a means of delivering treatment services to non-institutionalized public offenders has not been extensive. A recent study (Marx, Giblette and Stockdale, 1969) has shown that relatively little has been written about group procedures with parolees and/or probationers. The study previously cited (Marx et al., 1969) further shows that many contributions to the field have been based on experiences of the leader--his role and attitudes or the group--functions, composition, process and outcomes. In the area of group counseling and frustration tolerance, little work has been recorded.

For the purposes of this study, the theoretical foundations for group counseling stem from what is commonly called "reality orientation." In many instances, why a person does what he does is not of immediate importance, but rather what he is doing is given greater consideration. For example, if one must work, it is of greater concern that he continues working rather than subjectively have a liking for the work.

Psychodrama

Psychodrama as a treatment technique for use with populations of parolees and/or probationers is fairly new, in that it has only been in use for approximately six years in the Washington, D.C. Court system (Franck, 1969). In describing the values of using psychodrama Franck also states that individual counseling has failed in many instances because the majority of people
assigned by the courts to the probation office find it difficult to communicate verbally. Because many clients have been classified as "action oriented," psychodrama with its many variations appears to be a useful technique in helping the communication of ideas and feelings.

Psychodrama has also been used quite effectively with juveniles through the Montgomery County (Maryland) Juvenile Court. Twice or three times a week the parents and children were involved in a family psychodrama session (Miller, 1960).

Psychodrama aims at a direct expression of the subject's emotional level as he is encouraged to act out various life situations (Moreno, 1946). The author further states that the theaterlike atmosphere of psychodrama enables the individual to face his problems with less emotional tension than in real life. In essence, the subject is free to express his fears and desires in a setting which simulates real life, but at the same time, does not possess all of the threats which he will find outside of the treatment room.

Audio-visual Aids and Films

Although many group counseling programs conduct their sessions mainly with talk, the value of films and/or audio visual aids can be a valuable asset in promoting activity in the groups for behavioral change. Films have been used for a variety of reasons. For the individual leaving prison, films may be used to help the person understand some of the prejudice he will encounter once on the "streets." Upon release, films can be used as an aid in the readjustment to society by
presenting topics which directly relate to some of the problems he may have been experiencing prior to incarceration.

Bandura (1969) suggests that the natural environment observer-learners are provided many observational experiences, but many are of inappropriate and undesirable behaviors. Through the use of filmed presentations such as 8mm film or a video tape, the observer can be presented with a highly controlled planned observational experience.

In therapy the use of films may be seen as a means of helping subjects "loosen-up" and become aware of their feelings through identification with the central characters or identification with the situations. Prados (1951) sees films as a way of enabling patients to become aware of emotions without fear of guilt since the group situations give feelings of safety and reassurance.

Summary

The plan for this study is as follows: A review of the relevant literature will be presented in Chapter II. Methodology will be presented in Chapter III which will include the experimental procedures, treatment conditions and descriptions of the instruments used. Chapter IV will describe the statistical analysis of the data and Chapter V will be the summary and conclusions.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter is a review of the literature relevant to the topics of frustration tolerance and aggression. Also included in this literature review are summaries and critiques of research articles as they relate to the areas of group counseling, psychodrama and audio-visual aids as counseling techniques with special populations.

Frustration Tolerance

Much confusion exists in the literature concerning the concepts of frustration tolerance, frustration, and reactions to frustration (Fry, 1949). In the study of frustration tolerance many of the difficulties have been centered around the areas of terminology. Yates (1962) has pointed out that it is usually not clear as to whether the authors are referring to tolerance of a frustration situation (in which case frustration tolerance could be used synonymously with frustration state); or whether they are referring to the individual's ability to withstand a particular degree (in which case frustration state and frustration tolerance could be regarded as independent dimensions).
The introduction of the concept of frustration tolerance was first introduced by Rosenzweig (1944) who defined it "as the individual's capacity to withstand frustration without failure of psychobiological adjustment." It seems clear that Rosenzweig intended to refer to the state of the individual and not to the frustrating situation.

The nature of frustration tolerance according to Rosenzweig is better understood if three sets of determinants are distinguished: a) constitutional factors, neurological or endocrinological; b) experiential, which includes aspects of informal and formal education; and c) contemporaneous conditions such as fatigue, illness, and injury which may lower the level of frustration tolerance.

The experiential determinants of frustration tolerance are apparent in the education of the child. Rosenzweig (1944, 1945, 1950) has pointed out that the child who has not been taught to accept privation or deprivation will be "spoiled" and as a result will not develop a capacity to withstand frustration in subsequent experiences. However, if the individual has been excessively frustrated, anxiety, conscious or unconscious, may be aroused and may impede the growth of frustration tolerance. It is Rosenzweig's contention that the proper aim of education lies between these extremes of overindulgence and traumatic frustration. The child is encouraged to inhibit his impulse toward immediate gratification and to substitute in the interest of more ultimate satisfaction a delay of tension discharge.
Pertinent psychologically is the psychoanalytical distinction between the pleasure and the reality principle of Freud, the pleasure principle involving immediate gratification of all impulses and the reality principle demanding certain restrictions of gratification. The essential ingredient is the capacity of the individual to delay gratification. This same capacity is implied in the concept of frustration tolerance (Hunt, 1944). The advantage of frustration tolerance as a concept (in comparison with the pleasure and reality principles) however, lies primarily in its readier quantification as a continuous variable (Rosenzweig, 1950; Hunt, 1944).

Rosenzweig's work has been centered around two main lines: a) preference for success and failure experience as a function of age; and b) the classification of reactions to frustration, describing reactions as extrapunitive, intropunitive and impunitive (Lawson, 1965). The research concerned with preference for success or failure formed the basis for Rosenzweig's contention that frustration tolerance increases with age.

Operationally defined, frustration tolerance is the extent to which the organism prefers to return to tasks at which he has been unsuccessful rather than successful (Yates, 1962). Using 37 children (22 boys and 15 girls) at the Peabody Home For Crippled Children as subjects, (Rosenzweig, 1933) was able to show that the choice of failure rather than success for repetition was a function
of mental age level. The tests consisted of two jigsaw puzzles which were presented to the subjects. In each instance the subjects were allowed to complete one successfully and were frustrated on the other puzzle by not being allowed to successfully complete the project. Thus when children were allowed to fail on one jigsaw puzzle and succeed on another, and were then asked which one they preferred to repeat, there was a difference of nearly four years of mental age between those who preferred to repeat the unsuccessful and those who preferred to repeat the successful puzzle.

Because of the small number of subjects in Rosenzweig's first study (37) and because all of the subjects were physically handicapped, a new study was designed by Rosenzweig (1945) which included two-hundred new subjects, one-hundred of which were normal. Testing procedures were similar to the first study in that two puzzles were used, with subjects being able to complete one and then being frustrated by not being able to complete the other. In the present study as in the previous study it was found that those subjects under seven years characteristically preferred success while those about 11 years of age preferred failure for repetition. The results obtained with the groups of problem and feeble-minded children in this study suggest a possible retardation from the standpoint of isolating the closely related variable of chronological and mental age as factors in repetition-choice. It was
Rosenzweig's contention that the shift from success to failure in repetition-choice in the course of development seems to represent an increase in sensitivity to certain competitive aspects of socialization. Pleasure in past achievement becomes subordinated to social failure where present. Concurrently the capacity to sustain the tension associated with failure and to delay gratification appears to develop. The shift in repetition-choice thus reflects, however, modestly, the growth of frustration tolerance.

In an attempt to answer some unresolved questions in the Rosenzweig studies, Crandall and Rabson (1960) designed a study to evaluate sex differences as well as age differences, and also assess independent measures of selected personality variables likely to be associated with children's repetition choice.

The sample consisted of 59 children ranging in age from three to nine years, from middle class families in southwestern Ohio. The children were divided into two groups, the younger group comprised of 30 children ages 3, 4, and 5, and the older group comprised of 29 children ages 6, 7, and 8.

Two puzzles were used in the experiment and each subject was allowed to succeed on one puzzle and fail on the other. In each instance the child was asked if he wanted to have extra time to work on one of the puzzles again and his response, his repetition for choice, was recorded for subsequent data analyses. In addition to the
repetition choice experiment, behaviors were recorded by observers on each child with six variables being selected.

In the repetition choices experiment, the nursery school children were compared with those of the early grade school children. The obtained chi square was 2.66 \( p < .10 \), indicating a non significant trend for the older children to prefer repeating the previously-failed puzzle rather than the successfully completed one. When sex differences were compared, a chi square of 6.69 \( p < .10 \), was obtained with the result that boys preferred to return to previously-failed puzzles more frequently than girls. Interactions of age and sex using the Fishers exact test with results showing no significant differences between repetition of choices of the nursery school age boys and girls. In the early grade school group, boys chose to repeat previously failed puzzles more often than girls \( (.p < .10) \). A Mann-Whitney U Test was also run between repetition choices and the Standard-Binet I.Q. of the total group and no significant relationships were found. Intelligence was not a factor in the childrens repetition-choice.

The second line of Rosenzweig's research has been concerned with reactions to frustration. Although much of Rosenzweig's work has been criticized because of the lack of data where independent variables have been manipulated, there are a great number of studies in which his instrumentation has been used mainly as a measure of personality, and the research with it has been primarily of the
correlational sort. That is, the standing on the Picture-Frustration Study is related to other personality tests or social class (Lawson, 1965).

In a study reported by Mercer and Kyriaazis (1962) a comparison of a group of physically assaultive prisoners and a group of matched normals on the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study yielded no significant differences. The sample consisted of 32 male prisoners in the maximum security section of Saint Elizabeths Hospital, with offenses including aggravated assault, homicide and rape. The normal comparison group consisted of 35 male subjects drawn on a volunteer basis from hospital employees and other employed males in the Washington, D.C. area. Groups were roughly similar in age, I.Q., and educational level.

The groups studied differed markedly in community adjustment leading the authors to conclude that it was difficult to correlate overt behaviors with reported attitudes.

The results are not isolated in that similar findings for such populations have been reported by (Fry, 1949; Kaswan, Wasman and Freedman, 1960; Vane, 1954; and Norman and Kleinfeld, 1960).

Rosenzweig (1963) feels, however, that the difficulty in interpreting these results may lie in the fact that a technique like the Picture-Frustration Study may operate at any one of several undefined levels - opinion, overt or implicit, and it is Rosenzweig's further contention that
these levels must be taken into account in research in delinquency and criminology. Assaultive prisoners may well be versed in the denial of their hostile tendencies, and if so, would at the opinion level obtain normal results.

Aggression

The social learning paradigm attempts to explain the acquisition of behavior, deviant and non-deviant in terms of antecedent social stimulus events such as the characteristics of the models to which we are exposed, the reinforcement contingencies and the methods of training which have been used to develop and modify social behavior (Bandura and Walters, 1963).

Many different behaviors are learned through the observation of the behaviors of models and include vocational skills, appropriate sex roles, aggressive behavior and many verbal and non-verbal responses. The models may include many types of persons, parents, peers, adults, and symbolic and film mediated models such as those seen on television and other film mediated models as seen in the motion pictures.

The importance of family environment in the causation of crime, delinquency and aggressive behaviors is no longer questioned (Gulecks, 1950; Bandura and Walters, 1959). Many factors have been considered in past research, among them, the parental attitudes toward their children, their methods of discipline and their attitudes toward society.
McCord and McCord (1958) designed a study concerned with the relationship between role models and crime, focusing on three interacting variables in the familial environment of the boys. Studied were the role model of the parents, the attitudes of the parents toward the child and the method of discipline used by the parents.

The subjects used for this five year program were children of parents studied previously by Dr. Richard Clark Cabot in the Cambridge-Somersville Youth Study. The mean age for this present group of males was twenty-seven with most of these subjects coming from relatively lower-class urban areas. Information for this study was gathered in several ways: a) records kept by observers which contained direct evidence from the every-day behavior of the parents; and b) reports from the Boston Social Service Index and the Massachusetts Board of Probation which reported all contacts between parents and community agencies. Additional information was gathered concerning the attitudes of each parent toward the subject by repeated visits of the observers to the families involved in the study.

In studying parental role, parents were divided into three major categories: a) non-deviant; b) alcoholic or promiscuous; and c) as being convicted by the courts and sentenced to prison. Parental attitudes toward children were divided into either warm, passive or rejecting. Five categories were used to determine the degree and amount
of discipline: a) punitive consistently; b) love oriented consistently; c) punitive erratically; d) love oriented consistently; and e) lax. Two raters were used and were in agreement approximately 88 percent of the time. In the sample of 253 subjects, the authors found that 45 boys had been raised by criminal fathers and of these boys 56 percent had themselves been convicted of crime. Of the 69 boys who had alcoholic or promiscuous fathers, 43 percent had themselves been convicted of crime. As a next step the authors tried to determine whether paternal rejection aggravated or hindered the boy's tendency to imitate the father. An analysis of the data suggested that paternal rejection and a deviant paternal model tended to lead to criminality. Next investigated were the effects of discipline, with the data indicating that of the boys raised by criminal fathers, a significantly lower proportion whose discipline had been consistent became criminals.

In another investigation (McCord, McCord and Zola, 1959) the disciplinary, affectional and child rearing practices of parents of delinquent aggressive children and non-delinquent non-aggressive children were studied. The findings were quite consistent with the modeling interpretation in the development of aggressive delinquent behavior. Parents of non-delinquent children were generally more consistent in the disciplinary techniques, more affectional, less often antagonistic and combative between themselves. Fathers of non-delinquent non-aggressive boys
were described as more often passive. It was suggested that the passive father is a model for a boy which is inconsistent with the standards of delinquent aggressive peer group.

Modeling influences continue to regulate aggressive responsiveness to some extent even after the behavior has been acquired and the behavior of the models continually exerts selective control over the types of responses exhibited by others in any given situation (Bandura, 1969). In the study of juvenile gangs it can be stated that peer group relationships and approval are often a very powerful incentive for the youth and it is these groups which may often be contrary to society's norms, values, and attitudes. In the delinquent group, aggressive behavior is to be emulated and often the leader is chosen because of an ability to demonstrate more aggressiveness than the others in the group. Yablonsky (1962) has also pointed out that one of the violent gang leader's vital functions for gang membership is to serve as a symbol of idealized violence. When cast in his violent role he is the shining example for core gang followers. The leader in their view has "heart" and will pull the trigger, swing a bat, or wield a knife without any expression, or, most important, regret. As a prototype of the violent gang, the leader is thus an ideal model.

Social class and ethnic differences in the amount of overt aggression appear at least in part a function of the extent to which members of a particular social group
tolerate and show approval of aggressive actions. Lower class parents tend to encourage and reward aggression to a greater extent than middle class parents. This interpretation is indirectly supported in the study by Bandura and Walters (1959) of child training practices of parents of aggressive and non-aggressive boys, who found that parents of the aggressive boys were more inclined to encourage actively and to condone more aggressive behavior than the parents of the non-aggressive boys.

The encouragement of violence, the way in which aggression has taken on status conferring values and the influential rate of social reinforcement was seen in a study by Yablonsky (1962) who stated that:

A prime function of the modern gang is to provide a channel to act out hostility and aggression to satisfy the continuing and momentary emotional needs of its members.

The author further stated that:

No special ability is required to commit violence—not even a plan. And the guilt connected with executing the act of violence is minimized by the gang code of approval—especially if the violence fulfills the gang's idealized standards of a swift sudden, and senseless outbreak.

One of the assumptions about vicarious or imitative learning is that this mode of response acquisition is based essentially on a process of covert instrumental conditioning in which the observer acquires responses imitatively by performing covertly the behavior exhibited by a model. It is further assumed that the occurrence of vicarious learning
phenomena is contingent on the administration to the performing model reinforcing stimuli which the observer presumably experiences as vicarious reinforcements (Hill, 1960; Mowrer, 1960). To test the possible influence of vicarious reinforcement on imitative learning Bandura, Ross and Ross (1962) conducted an experiment in which imitation of aggression was studied as a function of rewarding and punishing consequences to the model.

Nursery school children, (40 boys and 40 girls) with a mean age of 51 months were randomly assigned to one of the following groups: a) aggressive model rewarded; b) aggressive model punished; c) a control group shown highly expressive but non-aggressive models; and d) a second control group with no exposure to the models. It was hypothesized that children who observe a model amass highly desired reinforcers through aggressive behaviors will display more imitative and non-imitative aggression than children who see the model punished for exhibiting aggressive responses.

Children in the aggressive model rewarded were shown a film depicting two children fighting over some toys. The child in the film who had displayed the greatest amount of aggression was eventually rewarded with ice cream, soda and cookies. Children in the aggressive model non-rewarded were shown the same film except that when the film was finished an announcer explained that the "winner" was severely punished. Children in the non-aggressive model
control observed two males engage in vigorous but non-aggressive play. Children in the second control group had no prior exposure to the models. Upon completion of the films each child spent 20 minutes in a room with various toys and was observed by judges through one-way mirrors. Raters simply recorded frequencies of behavior. Inter-rater reliabilities were high, the product-moment coefficients being in the .90's. Results of the Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance revealed that imitation is significantly influenced by response-consequences to the model. Further comparison of pairs of scores by the Mann-Whitney U Test showed that children who observed the models amass rewards through aggression displayed significantly more imitative aggressive behavior than did children in the three other groups.

Group Counseling

Traditional probation and parole supervision and treatment has been based upon the notion that the most therapeutic process is the one-to-one relationship between the supervising officer and the client. Now after many years alternative methods are beginning to be utilized, the most significant of which is the group process.

As group counseling relates to the Probation Office in Washington, D.C., Vogt (1961) states that because of the heavy case loads and other duties assigned to probation officers, there was a realization that supervision consisted
primarily of grappling with crisis situations, report gathering and really nothing else. It was felt that supervision was practically void of genuine rapport and lacking of real mutual commitment to the supervision process. Because of these problems, serious questions arose as to the usefulness of the profession. To help resolve some of these problems, group counseling was initiated in the Probation Office using probationers and parolees selected from the case loads with weekly meetings of ninety minutes duration.

Mandell and Parsonage (1965) describe a study conducted by the Minnesota Department of Corrections using male adult parolees, comparing the adjustment of those supervised in biweekly group meetings with the adjustment of those supervised individually.

Hypotheses were developed to test the qualitative and the quantitative effectiveness of the group method of supervision, these included the following: a) the group method of supervision reduces recividism and also permits more intensive and extensive parole supervision, b) permitting controlled associations among parolees has positive effects, c) subjecting the parole agent's activities to the collective scrutiny of his clients reduces the social distance between the agent and the parolee, and d) the opportunity for self-expression and participation in determining his own goals increases the parolee's self-esteem.
Forty-one parolees released from the Minnesota State Prison between December 1963 and May 1965 comprised the study sample and were selected according to the following criteria: a) no severe emotional problems and no experience with group therapy in prison, b) eighteen months or more of the sentence remaining upon release and no involvement in a halfway house program.

Persons selected to participate were assigned to one of three groups. An experimental group, under the direction and supervision of a Division of Adult Corrections Field Agent who had no experience in group therapy. Control group A, supervised by the experimental group's field agent but given only the usual one-to-one method of parole supervision. Control group B, under the supervision of several Division of Adult Corrections Field Agents to whom group members were assigned according to current administrative procedures. Subjects were matched according to race, marital status, education completed, intelligence estimate, highest occupational class on admission to institution, frequency of privilege loss and lockups during incarceration, offense classification number of previous felony convictions and number of previous paroles granted. The three groups were tested for homogeneity on each of the matching criteria. A chi-square test of significance yielded no statistically significant differences between groups at the .05 level of confidence.

Ninety minute meetings were held every two weeks for
18 months and were held at a community center in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. Each subject was rated on the Mandel Social Adjustment Rating Scale at six month intervals. In addition, verbal communication was recorded on tapes and tally sheets of discussions which included topics of adjustment to the community, work, family and goals. With regard to the hypotheses; on overall adjustment to parole, the experimental group was significantly more successful than either control group. Group parole supervision was found to be more effective and economical, showed no adverse effects when parolees were permitted to associate under controlled conditions, reduced social distance between parolees and parole officer, and increased the self-esteem of parolees by allowing them intensive participation in determining their own goals while under supervision.

Crites (1965) discusses a study in which the Sacramento County Probation Department initiated a group counseling program which provided continuing training for probation officers working with groups throughout the existence of each group. At the same time, these officers were members of their own adult groups.

Prior to these efforts, the probation office had tried to use group counseling as a means of treatment for their clients, but had failed because there appeared to be a lack of formalized training in group counseling, and those few officers who had some training were left unsupervised in handling their groups. With this new effort changes were
made to help the probation officers understand the dynamics of counseling with clients. Training classes were held two hours a day for ten consecutive days and the content included group counseling theory, criteria for selection and problems to be anticipated in the first few meetings.

Selection of clients for groups was made by matching groups according to age, levels of intelligence, emotional maturity, and number of friends in the groups. Excluded from the groups were boys who were not in contact with reality, cultural deviants, chronic monopolists and psychopaths. Once selected for the group, with the consent of the parents, attendance was then made mandatory as part of the parole process. Groups were made up of seven to nine boys meeting regularly each week for one-hour periods of nine months.

During the treatment program with clients, the probation officers attended individual consultation sessions each week bringing to these sessions any problems experienced by them during the previous group counseling meetings. In addition, the officers were also attending their own group counseling sessions with all other officers having groups. Included in these groups were supervisors (each with the group of men not under his supervision), probation officers (who would later have their own groups). Group counseling for these men were held on a once-a-week basis for one hour.

Of the twelve groups initiated, eleven were still operating in May just before the summer vacation. In evaluating the effectiveness of the program, the author felt
that success was based on the following: a) the probation officers involved in the program requested that the administration allow them to continue on the fall; b) many of the boys in the original groups asked to be considered for new groups; and c) behavior patterns appeared to be more stable at school and at home and as a result, the recidivism rate dropped sharply (an overall average of one per group).

In many instances the selection process is extremely important in deciding who shall become a group member and who shall not. Unless careful selection of criteria are used, the majority of the clients assigned to group therapy will terminate treatment discouraged and without benefit. In terms of people on probation or parole, termination of treatment could mean further incarceration and/or another criminal act. Douglas, Fike and Wierzbinski (1965) designed a study to test the effect of group counseling in changing the attitudes and behavior patterns of selected juvenile probationers living in their own homes or in foster homes in the community. It was hypothesized that group counseling could effectively change the attitudes and behavior patterns of certain juvenile probationers by helping them gain an understanding of their personal and family problems. It was also hypothesized that sharing of experiences with peers would help the clients see that others have similar problems, and that this discovery, in itself, would be therapeutic.

Four groups were selected and were composed of six
probationers, two leaders, and an observer-recorder. The boys had been on probation for periods varying from two months to nearly two years and were selected for participation in the experiment on the basis of similarities in age, intelligence, school grades, and ability or potential ability to respond to group counseling. Ages ranged from 15 to 16 years old, in the eighth, ninth and tenth grades with types of offenses, varying.

Not selected for this group program were any boys who were thought of to have character disorders or acting-out tendencies. Participation by the probationers, once they chose to become members of the group, was made mandatory as a condition of probation.

The groups met for just over eight calendar months in 28 ninety-minute weekly meetings with the average attendance of the six-member groups at 4.3 members per session.

In an attempt to discover whether changes in attitude that had been effected by group counseling could be measured by an objective test, each probationer was given the Gordon Personal Inventory and the Gordon Personal Profile at the beginning of, and at the end of the experiment.

The Gordon Tests are rather brief, forced-choice procedures which rate adjustment in eight areas, those of ascendancy, responsibility, emotional stability, sociability, cautiousness, original thinking, personal relations and vigor. Gain scores were used and the groups as a whole showed gains in all traits except in original thinking. However,
since this category measured nonconformity, this finding may not be an undesirable one in light of the goals set up by the therapist.

The results showed that the long-term goal of the experiment was met, that is, that each member develop to the extent that he would no longer engage in delinquent acts. In approximately two and one-half years since the experiment terminated, only one of the members had been involved in any delinquent acts, and this was of such a minor nature that it was closed with a warning at a preliminary hearing. In the area of family relationships, no instrumentation was developed, although some of the clients who were experiencing difficulties in these areas showed improvement.

Judging from this investigation, it appeared that group counseling was an effective means of meeting the needs of carefully selected delinquents, and at the same time helping the counselor cope with a large caseload.

Youth often have a strong need to enter the world of work, but often have misconceptions concerning the qualifications required to obtain certain jobs; their vocational aspirations are often unrealistic because of poor insight into their own capacities. Weiner (1965) reports an experimental project whose basic purposes were: a) to increase the group's staying power in school; b) in support of the first, to help them develop sound vocational and educational goals; c) to help the boys realize the importance of a high school education for the achievement of
their vocational objectives and as a result, improve their 
scholastic work, and d) to help them obtain better self 
images.

Seven subjects who were native born, of lower socio-economic 
group family backgrounds, had histories of conflicts with principals 
and other school personnel, were selected from the probation 
officers' caseload. Other characteristics of the group in­
cluded offenses ranging from malicious mischief to armed 
robbery, age range from 13-17 and grade school level seven 
through tenth. Participation was voluntary. The ninety 
minute discussion sessions which were held weekly for a 
period of six months centered around some basic areas. These 
included relationships between high school education and 
careers, and relationships with others in an attempt to 
increase their understanding of their own behavior. In 
addition, aptitude and vocational interest inventories were 
administered and placement specialists from the Texas 
Employment Commission came to some of the meetings. The 
Differential Aptitude Test was used, not so much as a means 
of evaluation, but rather, as a lead to discussion of various 
skills needed to maintain one's self in the world of work.

Evaluation of the group came from a series of questions 
administered orally to the group members, examples of which 
were: a) Why are you here?  b) What did you expect to get 
from these meetings?  c) Were you prepared for these meetings? 
d) What have you obtained from these meetings?  e) Were 
these meetings helpful? and f) What would you like to get
from future meetings?

Although a more concrete evaluation would have required a control group with characteristics that matched those in the experimental group, and a much better means of evaluation, the results indicated that the program enabled the boys to understand the value of remaining in high school, and that the group members developed a greater confidence in their ability to meet the problems of school and academic achievement. Vocational goals were more clearly defined and although some of the goals of the group were still a little hazy, the group experience had been successful.

An important factor in the rehabilitation of the public offender is a stable vocational and employment rate. When conditions exist where the offender is able to gain employment in line with his capacities and his income needs, he is less likely to recidivate. Rest and Ryan (1970) report a study made by the Chicago Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Project in which the objectives were to assist the offender in the location of work commensurate with his abilities and income needs, and to assist the Vocational Rehabilitation agency in gaining experience in working with "hard-to-reach" clients by helping them determine the nature of interests, abilities and opportunities for further vocational or educational training.

Probation Officers selected people for this program who were designated as "hard-core" unemployed. Anyone who was within an employable age range (roughly 16-60) was
considered with the exception of the narcotic addict with an active habit. The ten men chosen for this project represented a wide range of ages (18-42), offenses and vocational handicaps. Educational level ranged from school dropout to two years of college. No attempts were made to assign participants to either group on the basis of any of these variables.

The treatment program of four weeks duration was held Monday through Friday for three hours each morning. To insure attendance a "contract" was negotiated with each man receiving $5.25 daily for full participation in addition to carfare to and from the project. Group counseling was held on Monday, Wednesday and Friday discussing problems encountered trying to find work, and the handicap of having a prison record. Also included in these discussions were skills needed to gain and maintain employment.

On Tuesday and Thursday the men took field trips to local business and industries with the idea that these were not just "show and Tell" adventures, but rather a means of entry to employment offices with the hope of making contacts with potential employers. Added to these sessions were contacts with vocational rehabilitation counselors for the purposes of trying to implement some of the ideas discussed in the groups and on the field trips. Psychovocational testing took place during the afternoons and the men were paid at the rate of $1.75 for overtime as incentives. At the end of the four week program vocational plans were made with the
men according to their expressed goals which appeared more realistic as a result of the program.

Results of the program were found to be positive in that although some of the men lost their jobs, they, however, found new ones and worked regularly. Another advantage of the program was the interest and concern for each other which was expressed in different ways in future meetings. Although some of the men lapsed back into their original habits the project was termed a success which was largely attributed to two factors--services were immediate and tangible.

Many times counseling is done with one party in a family and then, when the counseling sessions are completed, no real change is noted in the clients behavior. In an effort to remedy this situation, some agencies have initiated counseling with the parents in one group and the juvenile in the other.

Geertsma (1960) discusses an effort in which parents and juveniles participated in separate but concurrent group counseling sessions. The basic purpose of the study was to help families deal more effectively with their individual and familial problems, and to provide useful training experiences for probation officers. Members of the juvenile group were selected from the case loads of two probation officers who also acted as co-therapists in the groups. Nine clients were matched according to age, intelligence, personality integration,
willingness to participate in groups and heterogeneity in such areas as traits of leadership, ability, scholastic ability and cooperation. It was felt that if groups were heterogeneous in certain areas, members could gain more from each other. Parents were contacted during the initial interview with the probation department. Although there was a potential of 18 parents, only nine decided to participate in the groups.

Sessions were seventy-five minutes long on a bi-weekly or weekly basis and lasted for a period of twelve to eighteen months. Groups were open and members only terminated upon completion of their probationary period. Treatments for the juvenile group consisted of discussions concerning attitudes towards teachers, girls, parents, authority figures, while discussions for the parental group centered around discipline and value systems.

Although no results are offered, the author feels that this approach has real promise for helping delinquents, pre-delinquents and their parents.

In another study, Steininger and Leppell (1970) reported two efforts, one in 1966 and the other in 1967 using parent and offender group therapy sessions. In the 1966 study, thirteen subjects were selected from the probation officer's caseloads and were matched according to age levels. Group A consisted of boys 13-14 years of age, all of whom were enrolled in school. Group B, consisted of boys 15-17 years of age, only three of which still attended school. In both
groups each of the boys had multiple offense charges against them. The parents (mothers) of these boys were divided into two corresponding groups.

Sessions were held weekly for a period of one hour with each group, with one therapist seeing both groups of boys and another therapist working with the two parent groups. Attendance for all groups ranged from zero to 97 percent, both groups having fairly much the same attendance records. All of the original thirteen cases selected did not remain in the groups. Reasons listed ranged from lack of attendance by parents to return of the subjects to the reformatory.

In the 1967 study 16 subjects were selected from the probation officers caseload and were matched according to age levels, (15-16), only one or two offenses, parents in attendance of other sessions, and subjects not considered "hard-core" or psychotic. Parents were also divided into two therapy groups. Attendance records indicate better attendance by both parent and juvenile groups in the 1967 project than the 1966 study. In the period of time during the therapy sessions, only two boys were brought back to court on additional charges. A follow-up study one year after completion of the 1967 study showed that only two of the eight boys who completed the series had to be incarcerated again.

The authors felt that the 1967 study was more successful because of the better attendance and recidivism rates which was due in part to a better selection process and the involvement of fathers in these groups. It was therefore con-
cluded that group therapy is more fruitful with adolescent probationers if they have a minimum of charges against them, if they have passed their 15th birthday, and if they have both parents involved in the therapy sessions.

**Psychodrama**

Because present methods of counseling have not been satisfactory, newer techniques such as group counseling and psychodrama have been turned to in order to try and work more effectively with the offender population.

Franck (1969) describes an attempt by the Probation Office in Washington, D. C. to initiate psychodrama as a new treatment method with the offender who is described as quiet, withdrawn, non-verbal and who has led an action oriented life. Conventional therapy methods have fallen short of meeting the needs of these clients because in many instances, the offender does not communicate through words, but rather he communicates through actions. And, when the offender does respond verbally it is usually what the counselor would like to hear and not what the client feels. Psychodrama, then allows the client to deal with the here and now in action-oriented ways and as a result, the counselor is better able to see how the client functions.

Much has been written about psychodrama as a therapeutic technique, however, much of the literature has been limited to institutionalized juvenile offenders and mental patients in hospital settings.
Shellow (1958) describes the use of psychodramatic techniques with institutionalized boys ranging in age from 15-17. Described is an incident in which the "Doc." was put on trial by the group for a breach of confidence. The gang leader selected the jury, the judge, the public defender and the "prostitution." The therapist was charged with the crime of "expiring against the group."

The therapist allowed the trial to take place because the group was acting as a whole enabling the isolated group members to take part and act as a unit. The trial provided an opportunity for the dramatic expression of their feelings of bitterness toward authority figures which was safe for the boys. A result of the sessions allowed for the covert identification of some of the boys with the therapist to come to the surface. The subsequent members forced the one-time gang hero to take a subordinate role in the group which made it possible for new elements of strength to emerge among previously subordinate members.

In another study, Eliasoph (1958) reports on the development of a group therapy program at a residential treatment facility for delinquent boys ranging in age from 12-17. A program of group therapy was in existence for approximately one year and one-half at the time of the beginning of this study, and in addition, individual counseling and psychodrama were also used. Initially the content of the sessions were focused around early events in life, however, the emphasis shifted to concerns which were more immediate—those of inter-
group reactions such as rivalry between boys and hostility directed toward the therapist. All therapists agreed, however, that the boys discussed materials in groups which did not ordinarily come up in the individual sessions i.e., sexual anxieties, direct feelings towards the therapist, interpersonal relationships between boys and between boys and staff.

In evaluating the program it was felt that the therapist learned more about some of the boys in one or two sessions than in months of face-to-face interview work. This was not meant to be a criticism of the therapist, but rather, a belief that new forms of communication (action) as opposed to communication (verbal) was needed with this type of individual. It was further stated that psychodrama had proven especially beneficial to younger boys, because they were not as able to communicate on a verbal level in therapeutic atmospheres as were the older boys.

Corsini (1958) states that many psychologists feel that the psychopath cannot benefit from psychotherapy, however, many psychologists would feel that a person who was helped through psychotherapy and was thought of to be a psychopath, was indeed, "mis-labeled."

Reported are the effects of one psychodramatic session of a teen-age boy in a correctional institution. A group was started, all of the members volunteering for therapy, including the object of the study. Eleven members were encouraged to discuss their past and their desires from which the therapist would set up psychodramatic situations to be enacted by the
boys. Of the 11 boys, four were Black and the others white, with the age ranging from 12-16. Around the fourth week one of the members of the group escaped from the institution, stole an automobile and drove it at high speeds. The police followed and shot at the car blowing one tire out. Although the car crashed, the subject came out unhurt and returned to the group after several days. Psychodrama was used as a therapeutic technique and scenes were set up to help the subject see some of the consequences of his previous behavior.

A follow-up was made several months later by group members and houseparents in which it was stated that the subject was a changed boy. Reports now used terms like "more quiet, responsible, and ability to get along." It was therefore concluded that the one single psychodramatic incident was responsible for the change in behavior. The author feels that in working with institutionalized people, ordinary communication tools (language) are frequently useless and new forms of communication have to be formulated. In the treatment of such cases, actional procedures such as psychodrama appear to be effective.

Psychodramatic techniques with mentally defective delinquents at the Oregon Home for Delinquents are reported in a study by Pankratz and Buchan (1956). Clients selected for this group ranged in age from 15-28 and were told that they would have a group meeting in which they would act out things they wanted to talk about. None of the psychodramatic techniques were explained to them, but rather, they were introduced as a
natural method for expressing the problems at hand. Techniques utilized during the sessions included identifying double and contrary double, behind the back technique, modeling, role selection, role reversals and soliloquy. Through the illustration of psychodramatic intervention techniques with an arsonist, the authors concluded that they had demonstrated that psychodrama was useful in working with subjects who had been classified as defective delinquents.

With special problems i.e., alcoholism and drug addiction, psychodrama has been used effectively. Eliasoph (1955) discusses group therapy and psychodramatic techniques with four adolescent boys ranging in age from 19-21 who were at the Riverside Hospital in New York City, an institution devoted to treatment of adolescent drug addicts. In addition to using drugs, each boy had an additional problem of showing severe pathological disturbances. Concurrently with the group sessions, each boy was being seen individually for private counseling sessions.

Their major difficulties in relating to others were shown to have been derived from a poor extremely dependent infantile relationship with their parents, and especially with their mothers. Much guilt was expressed about hurting the mother by using drugs. While some of the subjects felt that the therapist really did not care about them personally, they did decide that it helped to talk about themselves with other users. Psychodrama was used in the group sessions whenever the therapist felt it was beneficial, and after each psychodramatic
episode, a discussion by the group and a critique was given. According to the author, group therapy provides insight into interpersonal operations of the clients and offers potentialities as a means of reaching this difficult group of patients.

Films and Audio-visual aids

Films have been used successfully in therapy with adults as a means of "loosening up" and so facilitating access to repressed material (Rabin and Haworth, 1960; and Rome, 1945). Since the group situation gives the client a feeling of safety, Prados (1951) sees the use of films as a way of enabling the patient to become aware of his own emotions without fear or guilt, and in addition, films also afford the clients the opportunity to identify with the central character.

Audio tapes have been used as a treatment technique for institutionalized and non-institutionalized offenders. Taylor (1963) suggests that many offenders leaving the prison setting present special adjustment problems for the parole officers. Fears relative to working situations, family relations and fears of returning to the institution all require new counseling techniques by parole officers in order to insure successful parole adjustment. Continuity of treatment outside of prison for men whose problems are only partially resolved at the time of discharge is discussed by Taylor (1963) in a study using ten released offenders 27-37 years of age.
Audio tapes were exchanged by two groups, an incarcerated group and a released offender group in meetings which were held on a once-a-week basis for two hour sessions. After four months the group disbanded because of the lack of interest and because counter-attractations interfered with the group. Individual counseling sessions were held, however, in lieu of the group experiences.

The author concluded that there appeared to be a value in the group experience based on the fact that only one of the ten recidivists who elected to join the group committed further crimes, and he was a man 45 years old. In the study, it was further concluded that the dissolution of a group can be a positive sign because the successful ex-prisoner has to merge his interests, himself and value systems with the rest of society.

The use of anonymous tape recordings in group psychotherapy with sex offenders is presented in a study by Anderson (1969). The idea of tape exchanges was developed to provide a sex education experience for sex offenders and at the same time circumvent the intense authority problems experienced by this group.

The primary group consisted of five sex offenders treated on an in-patient basis at the Sex Crimes Facility at the Wisconsin State Prison. Before, during and after the tape exchange experiences, the group received bi-weekly group psychotherapy as provided by the Wisconsin Sex Crimes Law. The student group was recruited through announcements to students
taking an introduction to psychology course. Five women and one male formed this group with ages ranging from 18-33. Included in this group were people with obvious sexual problems. The student group was begun as a discussion group and was given the topic of premarital sex to discuss in their first meeting.

Problems and replies were exchanged regularly with eight student tapes and seven sex group replies forming the basis of the discussions. Anonymity was stressed throughout the whole group experience. No formal evaluation of this approach was planned because of the small numbers involved, however, the author felt that there was considerable progress toward emotional acceptance of materials presented because of the anonymity. The effect on actual behaviors and attitudes in most cases were not evaluated. There were also some areas in which either or both groups had not yet achieved a clear understanding even on an intellectual level. Several personal and situational elements appeared to be of some aid to both groups, and in some instances strong emotional attachments occurred between both groups although they remained unknown to each other.

In the group psychotherapy context, audiovisual feedback allows each member to view himself through his own eyes just as others view him. Perhaps even of greater significance, the individual now can have direct access to viewing his own behavior as it actually was. In essence, video tape playback offers the advantages of immediate feedback, access to
material normally forgotten and continuity between sessions.

In a study attempting to clinically evaluate the impact of videotape playback on two psychotherapy groups from a mental hygiene clinic of the University of Minnesota Health Services (Danet, 1969) considered three questions: a) the nature of the groups as they resembled and differed from other similar groups in the clinic; b) the question regarding the influences of the equipment on the groups functioning; and c) a study was made of eight group members' reactions to playback experiences.

Two groups, one experimental and one control were used, the control group containing four men and three women, and the experimental group containing four women and three men. The experimental group received ten minutes of playback from the previous week at the beginning of each session (from the second through tenth meeting). The control group in contrast did not receive any playback but was video recorded with the knowledge that they would be able to view one of their tapes. Evaluation was made on the basis of a record of attendance and observation of the groups by the therapists. Questions were asked of members regarding prior acquaintances with one another before joining the group and regarding extra group socialization during the course of the therapy. In addition, focused interviews with therapists and students were recorded.

The results indicated that attendance was better than average when compared to other groups at the clinic. The therapists were struck with the emotionality and explosiveness
of the experimental group as compared to other groups in the clinic. Questionnaires revealed that both groups contained people with no prior acquaintance and that extra social contact during the therapy sessions occurred more in the experimental group. With regard to the influence on the group on filming during the sessions, most of the group indicated that they were not affected although two men, one from each group did express concern and stated that they did not feel comfortable. Another means for assessing the influence of the group recording procedures came from the control group. In this group a "deprivation phenomenon" was noted. As treatment proceeded, their curiosity was aroused and a great deal of anticipation was generated, resulting in a decrease in hostility, making denial impossible and in essence a bi-modal effect in the experimental group. On the one hand there seemed to be a very marked impact on the reduction of a member's defenses, and on the other hand some individuals in the group reacted not with a reduction of defenses, but with a reinforcing of their old images to a greater extent.

Video taping as a technique of counseling with juveniles has been used successfully on many occasions. Pascal, Gottrell and Baugh (1967) report on the use of video taped sessions with a group of juvenile delinquents ranging in age from 12-18 and referred from the Juvenile Court. Group meetings were not mandatory, however, each member was urged by the Court to attend the once-a-week sessions which were
held after school for a period of 24 weeks. Parents also attended separately on a once-a-month basis.

Each group meeting began in a television studio on the psychiatric ward of the University Hospital and were of one-half hour duration. After completion of the session at the studio, the group moved to a private office which contained a television screen. A stop-start switch was located in the center of the table and the therapist or any group member could play back any of the sessions. The authors felt that using video tape methods with the start-stop device enabled the group sessions to become more of an educational process.

**Summary**

The review of the literature contains five major areas: a) frustration tolerance; b) aggression; c) group counseling; d) psychodrama; and e) films and audio-visual aids.

The theoretical position of Saul Rosenzweig in his attempt to explain frustration tolerance based on preference for success or failure as a function of age, and the classification of reactions to frustration were explored. Rosenzweig's concept that frustration tolerance increased with age was supported (Rosenzweig, 1933; 1945; and Crandall and Rabson, 1960). In all instances, age appeared to be a factor in the repetition of choice for successful or unsuccessful tasks.

The second line of Rosenzweig's work dealt with reactions to frustration. Although much research has been done in this area, results have been difficult to correlate
with overt behavior (Fry, 1949; Kaswan, Wasman and Freedman, 1960; and Vane, 1954). Rosenzweig, however, feels that this difficulty may lie in the fact that a technique like the Picture-Frustration Study may operate at any one of several undefined levels--opinion, overt or implicit.

Aggression was discussed using the social learning paradigm which attempts to explain the acquisition of behavior through antecedent social stimulus events such as the characteristics of the models to which we are exposed, the reinforcement contingencies and the methods of training which have been used to develop and modify social behavior. Evidence was presented supporting the importance of family environment in the causation of crime, delinquency and aggression, in addition, the importance of attitudes of parents toward children and their methods of discipline (McCord and McCord, 1958; and McCord, McCord and Zola, 1959).

Research relative to reinforcement contingencies showed that gang membership and the reinforcement by gang members and gang leaders were often powerful incentives in the acquisition of aggressive behavior (Yablonsky, 1962). In addition, the literature also supported the idea that ethnic and social class differences figured importantly in the reinforcement of aggressive behaviors.

Research pertaining to group counseling, psychodrama and films and audio-visual aids as treatment variables appear to have several commonalities: a) most of the research has been done with institutionalized clients; b) results are often re-
ported without the use of some quantification; c) independent variables have not been manipulated; and d) the lack of experimental designs using experimental and control groups has been evident.

Recent literature on group counseling programs for juvenile, adult offenders and concurrent groups of juveniles and parents have been reported. In some of the group studies, group leaders had limited experiences in the area of group counseling (Crites, 1965). In other articles special training programs were initiated to help train leaders. Two studies explored the issues of vocational training and counseling (Weiner, 1965; and Rest and Ryan, 1970). Concurrent group counseling experiences i.e., juveniles and parents were presented (Geertsma, 1960; and Steininger and Lepel, 1966, 1967). Results indicated varying degrees of success due to selection processes involved.

Psychodrama as a counseling technique with special problem cases was reported successful in several studies (Shellow, 1958; Eliasoph, 1958; Corsini, 1958 and Pankratz and Buchan, 1956). The studies presented, however, reported using small groups over a relatively short period of time.

Again, the problems of small groups, short-term treatments and poor experimental design existed in the studies where films and audio-visual aids were used as treatment methods (Taylor, 1963; Anderson, 1969; and Danet, 1969).

Although many of the studies focusing on group counseling, psychodrama and films and audio-visual aids reported success,
these results appear to be questionable in light of the lack of quantifiable data to support these conclusions.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

Introduction

This research investigated the varied effects of treatment intervention methods in dealing with frustration tolerance and aggression for a population of adult offenders.

Three treatment conditions were developed which allowed for the comparison of their effects in modifying the behaviors of frustration tolerance and aggression with the target groups.

In order to determine the effects of treatment conditions, a research hypothesis was developed and is stated as follows:

1) The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will acquire more appropriate behaviors than the group of Ss exposed to treatments Two or Three.

Thirty-nine Ss were randomly assigned to each of the three treatment groups. Each of the Ss were assigned a number from 0-38 and then placed into treatment groups using a table of random numbers (Edwards, 1967). All Ss were pre and post-tested on two criterion measures during the course of the research. (Attrition resulted in a final N of 31.)

Subjects

Clients under the supervision of the United States District
Court for the District of Columbia served as subjects for this study. Included in this group were men and women, Negro and white, ranging in age from 18-40 who were assigned to the Probation Office from June 24, 1971 through August 27, 1971. Of the 70 who were identified, 39 were used for the purposes of this research and placed into one of three treatment groups.

Experimental Procedures

The experimental phase of this study took place in space provided by the Probation Office in Washington, D.C. The steps listed below represent the order in which this research was implemented.

1. Development of treatment conditions which included the preparation of role-playing sequences, group counseling provisions, and selection of films and audio-visual aids.
2. Selection and assignment of subjects to treatment groups.
3. Pre-experiment administration of the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study (RP-FS).
5. Training of raters for the Berea College Form Board and the Behavioral Rating Scale (BRS).
6. Pre-experiment administration of the (BCFB).
7. Scoring of the (BRS).
8. Initiate the experimental phase of the experiment, i.e., exposure of subjects to treatment conditions.
10. Scoring of the (RP-FS).
11. Administration of the (BCFB) as a post-experiment measure.
12. Scoring of the (BRS).
13. Evaluation of data.

Treatment Conditions

Treatment for Group One, consisted of ten (10) weekly sessions of ninety (90) minutes duration with a parole officer acting as group therapist. In addition to the 16 week training program in the Psychodrama Department at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, D.C., the parole officer participated in other group therapy sessions as a therapist. As previously stated, therapy sessions were held in space provided by the Probation Department. Offices used as training rooms by the probation staff were used for the group meetings. Evening hours were also utilized because of the working schedules of many of the Ss. Role-playing was used as a technique with roles centered around relevant situations which have proven frustrating to many of the Ss in the group. Topics included in the role-playing situations were centered around work adjustment, family relationships, law and order, working effectively with social agencies and problems with authority figures. There was active participation by group members in the role-playing situations, and then, the group counseling attempted to discuss the importance of the roles played.

Treatment for Group Two, consisted of ten (10) weekly sessions using audio-visual aids and/or films and group dis-
cussions. The group leader was a parole officer who had completed a 16 week training program in the Psychodrama Department at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington, D.C., and in addition, participated in other group therapy sessions as a therapist. Offices used as training rooms by the probation staff were used for the group meetings with evening hours being utilized because of the working schedules of many of the Ss.

Films chosen by the group leader included the following topics: a) parole and/or probation adjustment; b) narcotic addiction; c) mental health and behavior; d) community and social responsibility; e) marriage and family relations; and f) racial and civil behavior.

Treatment for Group Three, consisted of ten (10) weekly visits by the Ss to the probation officer's office. General inquiry was made by the probation officer with respect to work, family relationships and other problem areas which may have arisen during the course of probation and/or parole.

**Criterion Measures**

For purposes of this study two measures were used: The Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study (RP-FS) and the Berea College Form Board (BCFB).

**The Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study**

The (RP-FS) was administered to all three groups as a pre-test and as a post-test measure. The rationale for using this instrument is that the subject will project himself into the stimulus situation and possibly identify with the central
Both the Children's Form and the Adult's Form consist of 24 cartoon-like pictures representing everyday frustrating situations involving two persons. The individual on the left of the item is shown saying something which either frustrates or helps to describe the frustration of the other character. The other individual in the picture has a blank caption box over his head which the subject is instructed to fill in with the first thoughts which occur to him that the character in the picture might say. Facial features are left vague to ease the structuring by the subject (Rosenzweig, 1944: Rabin and Haworth, 1960).

**Scoring**

The responses given by the subjects are scored along two main dimensions: Direction of Aggression and Type of Aggression. Direction of Aggression is divisible into extrapunitive or (E), when subject turns aggression outward. Intropunitive or (I), when subject turns aggression inward. Impunitive or (M), where all expressions of aggression are avoided or evaded.

Type of aggression is divisible into obstacle-dominance or (O-D), when the response indicates only a perseverance at or insistence upon the presence of the obstacle, ego-defense or (E-D), when the response refers to the blame-worthiness or inviolacy of the ego, and need-persistence or (N-D), when the response involves in some fashion the satisfaction of the frustrated need.

From the combination of the three categories in each of
the two chief dimensions, nine scoring factors result, each of which represents a combination of Type and Direction of Aggression (Rosenzweig, 1944).

**Norms**

The revised Form for Adults is standardized on 236 males and 224 females in the age group 20-29 (Rosenzweig, 1949). Although this group included a relatively small number of skilled and unskilled laborers, the vast majority were middle class with a fairly high educational level.

**Reliability**

The manual does not include mention of reliability although the manual for the Children's Form asserts that the Adult Form has a retest reliability from .60 - .80. Retest r's of .50 - .75 were found in a study by Bernard (1949), the retests made a period of four months after the original test.

**Validity**

Validity is not mentioned in the manual although numerous studies have examined the validity of this instrument (Rosenzweig, 1963; Rosenzweig, 1958; Lesser, 1959; Lindzey, 1950). Studies of validity measuring the (RP-FS) with other instruments have shown results varying from slightly negative to slightly positive (Graine, 1957; Freidman, 1958).

**The Berea College Form Board**

The Berea College Form Board (BCFB) was administered to all three groups as a pre-experiment and as a post-experiment measure. The rationale for using this instrument was that the subject found himself reacting to the stimulus situation in a
manner which demonstrated frustrated behavior.

The (BCFB) consists of one (1) rectangular board 11" x 4" with three (3) pegs standing up in a straight line along the center of the board approximately 4" apart. Also included are seven (7) squares in ascending order with the largest size at the bottom or the base of the board, and each square having a hole in the center. In order to complete the project, it is necessary to replace the seven squares from the center of the peg to either of the other two pegs in the same position or order as were originally found on the center peg.

The instructions given the Ss were as follows:

1. Replace this stack of squares from the center peg to either the left or the right peg in the same order as you now see them.

2. You cannot place a larger square over a smaller square.

3. You cannot remove more than one square at a time from any peg.

4. You have ten (10) minutes to complete this project, at which time upon successful completion, you are to receive $5.00, five dollars.

5. For each minute after the original ten (10) minutes you will lose $.50, fifty cents, until you have lost all of the original $5.00, five dollars.

6. There will be two people in the testing situation with you. One to keep time, and the other to help you with any questions you may have with the project.
Description of the Behavioral Rating Scale

A Behavioral Rating Scale (BRS) was devised to be used with the (BCFB). The scale consisted of a listing of 21 identifiable and/or definable physical and verbal behaviors exhibited by subjects during the course of testing. These behaviors were selected by judges enrolled in the graduate counseling program at the University of Maryland in the observation of 26 people who had worked on the (BCFB) prior to the pilot study and the pre-experimental and the post-experimental administration of the instrument.

Raters chosen to observe Ss and record behaviors on the (BRS) during the pre and post-experimental administration of the (BCFB) were selected by probation officers from clients on their case loads, and each of the raters selected had some college coursework. Training sessions lasted for three hours during which time the nature of the behaviors were explained along with the recording procedures.

Standardization

The (BCFB) and the (BRS) were standardized on a prison population at the Maryland Correctional Training Center in Hagerstown, Maryland. Seventy-five (75) males, Black and white, ranging in age from 15-32 were used for the purpose of standardization. Each of these Ss were members of a self-help therapy program at the prison and were given this test as part of their involvement in the therapy program. Offenses for these Ss ranged from the use of drugs to assault with a deadly weapon, and sentences ranging from six months to life imprisonment.
Reliability

Interjudge ratings were used in the pilot study and the pre-experiment and the post-experiment administration of the instrument.

In the pilot-study, inmates who had previous college courses in psychology, or inmates who had completed high school and had participated in therapy programs for a period of at least six months were used as raters.

In order to determine the degree of relationship between raters, a Pearson product-moment correlation was computed with a correlation of .79 being reported. It was concluded that the (BRS) was reliable enough to proceed with its use. Additional data on the reliability of the scale is presented in the analysis of data in Chapter IV.

Validity

Face validity was established by the research committee consisting of faculty members in the Counseling and Personnel Services Department, College of Education, University of Maryland.

Statistical Analysis

Data collected during the experimental phase of this research is presented and discussed in Chapter IV. The following statistical procedures were used in the analysis of data.

1) A Pearson product-moment correlation was computed to test for interjudge reliability of the ratings by the two judges on the (BRS).

2) Analysis of covariance (Dayton, 1970) was used to
test for significant differences resulting from treatment exposures.

3) Scheffe's Test for multiple comparisons.

Summary

This research investigated the effects of three treatment approaches to the intervention of frustration and aggression for a population of adult offenders. Ss were randomly assigned to one of three contrived treatments. Ten sessions were scheduled for treatments One and Two following a pre-testing with criterion measures; post-testing was completed following the treatment sessions. Treatment Three was both pre and post-tested, but was not exposed to any direct treatment. Data collected from the criterion measures was then analyzed and is presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of three treatments on frustration tolerance and aggressive behavior for a population of adult offenders. It was hypothesized that the results would indicate that Ss who received psychodrama plus group counseling as a treatment would score significantly higher on the criterion measures. It was decided that in order for the research hypotheses to be rejected, the .05 level of significance had to be reached.*

Analysis of Data

Before the analysis of covariance was applied, the homogeneity of regression assumption was tested. The analysis for the various groups are presented in Tables I-V.

TABLE I
HOMOGENEITY OF REGRESSION TEST ON THE (E) DIMENSION
FOR SUBJECTS IN ALL THREE TREATMENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0522</td>
<td>1.0261</td>
<td>.1265</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>202.7295</td>
<td>8.1092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F.95 in tables indicates confidence level.
### TABLE II

**HOMOGENEITY OF REGRESSION TEST ON THE (I) DIMENSION**

FOR SUBJECTS IN ALL THREE TREATMENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.7047</td>
<td>5.3524</td>
<td>2.2321</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59.9486</td>
<td>2.3979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III

**HOMOGENEITY OF REGRESSION TEST ON THE (M) DIMENSION**

FOR SUBJECTS IN ALL THREE TREATMENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7412</td>
<td>1.8706</td>
<td>.4114</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>113.6613</td>
<td>4.5465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IV

**HOMOGENEITY OF REGRESSION TEST ON THE (GCR) DIMENSION**

FOR SUBJECTS IN ALL THREE TREATMENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.4415</td>
<td>12.2208</td>
<td>4.5239*</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67.5351</td>
<td>2.7014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant beyond the .05 level.
TABLE V
HOMOGENEITY OF REGRESSION TEST ON THE (BRS)
FOR SUBJECTS IN ALL THREE TREATMENT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5703</td>
<td>1.2852</td>
<td>1.6406</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.5841</td>
<td>.7834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of Tables I, II, III and V indicate that the F values were non-significant. Thus the homogeneity of regression assumption was upheld in each of these cases and it was, therefore, concluded that the within-group regression coefficients differed only by sampling error.

Table IV, however, indicated that the F value of 4.5239 was significant. It was concluded that the difference was recorded in the variance of treatment group Three, those Ss receiving no direct treatment other than the normal follow-up procedures as outlined as the "conditions of probation and/or parole." A further analysis of data indicated that the raw means for all three treatment groups varied .6.

Five null and alternative hypotheses and their findings were presented which were developed from research hypotheses outlined in Chapter III.
Hypothesis One

The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will develop more appropriate behaviors than the groups of Ss exposed to treatments Two or Three as measured on the (E) dimension of the (RP-FS).

The appropriate null hypothesis is:

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the three treatment groups as measured on the (E) dimension of the (RP-FS).

Findings

The data in Table VI indicate that the F value of 1.0773 was not significant at the .05 level of confidence, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE SCORES ON THE (E) DIMENSION FOR SUBJECTS IN ALL THREE TREATMENT GROUPS WHEN PRE-TEST SCORES ARE USED AS COVARIATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.3411</td>
<td>8.1706</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>204.7818</td>
<td>7.5845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>221.1229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Two

The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will develop more appropriate behaviors than the groups of Ss exposed to treatments Two or Three as measured on the (I) dimension of the (RP-FS).
The appropriate null hypothesis is:

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the three treatment groups as measured on the (I) dimension of the (RP-FS).

Findings

The data in Table VII indicate that the F value of 3.3256 was not significant at the .05 level of confidence, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

TABLE VII
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE SCORES ON THE (I) DIMENSION
FOR SUBJECTS IN ALL THREE TREATMENT GROUPS
WHEN PRE-TEST SCORES ARE USED AS COVARIATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.4046</td>
<td>8.7023</td>
<td>3.3256</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70.6534</td>
<td>2.6168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88.0579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis Three

The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will develop more appropriate behaviors than the groups of Ss exposed to treatments Two or Three as measured on the (M) dimension of the (RP-FS).

The appropriate null hypothesis is:

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the three treatment groups as measured on the (M) dimension of the (RP-FS).

Findings

The data in Table VIII indicate that the F value of .0497
was not significant at the .05 level of confidence, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

**TABLE VIII**

**ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE SCORES ON THE (M) DIMENSION**

**FOR SUBJECTS IN ALL THREE TREATMENT GROUPS**

**WHEN PRE-TEST SCORES ARE USED AS COVARIATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4325</td>
<td>.2163</td>
<td>.0497</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>117.4025</td>
<td>4.3482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>117.8350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis Four**

The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will develop more appropriate behaviors than the groups of Ss exposed to treatments Two or Three as measured on the (GCR) dimension of the (RP-FS).

The appropriate null hypothesis is:

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the three treatment groups as measured on the (GCR) dimension of the (RP-FS).

**Findings**

The data in Table IX indicate that the F value of .6589 was not significant at the .05 level of confidence, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.
TABLE IX
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE SCORES ON THE (GCR) DIMENSION
FOR SUBJECTS IN ALL THREE TREATMENT GROUPS
WHEN PRE-TEST SCORES ARE USED AS COVARIATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4891</td>
<td>2.2446</td>
<td>.6589</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>91.9766</td>
<td>3.4065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96.4658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis Five**

The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will develop more appropriate behaviors than the groups of Ss exposed to treatments Two or Three as measured on the (BRS).

The appropriate null hypothesis is:

There is no significant difference in mean scores between the three treatment groups as measured on the (BRS).

**Findings**

The data in Table X indicate that the F value of 1.0398 was not significant at the .05 level of confidence, therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.
### TABLE X

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE SCORES ON THE (BRS) 
FOR SUBJECTS IN ALL THREE TREATMENT GROUPS 
WHEN PRE-TEST SCORES ARE USED AS COVARIATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7064</td>
<td>.8532</td>
<td>1.0398</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.1545</td>
<td>.8205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.8608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scorer reliability**

Reliabilities were obtained by the comparison of two sets of scores (ratings by two different judges) by computing two Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (Appendix E).

It was assumed that the resulting r's of .71 and .83 were adequate indicators of reliability for this research because these are typical of reliability indices found for these types of instruments.

**Summary**

This chapter presented data as it related to five research hypotheses developed from one broad research hypothesis. The .05 level of statistical significance was used in the testing of each hypothesis.
Pearson product-moment correlations on interjudge reliability of raters' performances suggest that the (BRS) was an adequate measure for the purposes of this research.

Analysis of the data indicate that the homogeneity of regression assumption was upheld on the (E), (I), and (M) dimensions of the (RP-FS) and on the (BRS). The homogeneity of regression assumption was not upheld on the (GCR) dimension of the (RP-FS), the F value of 4.5239 indicating a significant difference.

When pre-test scores were used as covariates, no significant differences in mean scores were reported between groups of Ss exposed to the three treatments as measured on the (E), (I), (M), and (GCR) dimensions of the (RP-FS) and on the (BRS). As a result, null hypotheses One, Two, Three, Four and Five were retained.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Statement of the problem

Although group counseling procedures have been researched quite extensively for institutionalized populations, literature concerning group counseling for non-institutionalized offenders has been less evident. In addition, much confusion exists in the literature with regard to frustration tolerance and aggressive behavior. In sum, this study was designed to investigate three treatment methods and their effects on frustration tolerance and aggression for a population of non-institutionalized offenders.

Subjects

Clients under the supervision of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia served as subjects for this study. Included in this group were men and women, Negro and white, ranging in age from 18-40 who were assigned to the Probations Office from June 24, 1971 through August 27, 1971. Of the 70 who were identified, 39 were randomly selected for the purposes of this research and then were randomly assigned to each of the three treatment groups.

70
Procedures

Subjects (Ss) were pre-tested and post-tested on the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study (RP-FS).

A Behavioral Rating Scale (BRS) was constructed to be used with the Berea College Form Board (BCFB). The scale consists of behaviors which are exhibited (verbal and physical) by Ss in the pre-test and the post-test administration of the (BCFB).

Ss were randomly assigned to one of three treatment groups which can be summarized as follows:

Ss in Treatment One were exposed to psychodrama and group counseling. (Psychodrama-modified, Appendix G.)

Ss in Treatment Two were exposed to audio-visual aids and/or films and group discussions.

Ss in Treatment Three were exposed to normal probation procedures as outlined by the Courts as the "conditions of probation and/or parole.

Direct treatment methods for groups One and Two consisted of ten (10) weekly sessions of ninety minute duration.

Research Hypotheses

The major research hypotheses which were tested were:

(1) The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will develop more appropriate behaviors than the groups of Ss exposed to treatments Two or Three as measured on the (E) dimension of the (RP-FS).

(2) The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will develop more appropriate behaviors than the groups of Ss exposed to
treatments Two or Three as measured on the (I) dimension of the (RP-FS).

(3) The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will develop more appropriate behaviors than the groups of Ss exposed to treatments Two or Three as measured on the (M) dimension of the (RP-FS).

(4) The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will develop more appropriate behaviors than the groups of Ss exposed to treatments Two or Three as measured on the (GCR) dimension of the (RP-FS).

(5) The group of Ss exposed to treatment One will develop more appropriate behaviors than the groups of Ss exposed to treatments Two or Three as measured on the (BRS).

Results

Computation of two Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients resulted in .71 for the pre-test and .83 for the post-test when comparisons were made between judges ratings on the Behavior Rating Scale of Ss aggressive behaviors.

Homogeneity of Regression tests for the three treatment groups resulted in acceptance of the assumption that the within-group regression coefficients differed only by sampling error on the (E), (I), and (M) dimensions of the (RP-FS), and on the (BRS). A significant difference did exist between treatment groups on the (GCR) dimension of the (RP-FS).

Analysis of covariance using pre-test scores as co-variates provided the basis for evaluation of each of the sta-
tistical hypotheses.

**Hypothesis One** The null hypothesis was retained. There were no significant differences in mean scores between the three treatment groups in the acquisition of appropriate behaviors as measured on the (E) dimension of the (RP-FS).

**Hypothesis Two** The null hypothesis was retained. There were no significant differences in mean scores between the three treatment groups in the acquisition of appropriate behaviors as measured on the (I) dimension of the (RP-FS).

**Hypothesis Three** The null hypothesis was retained. There were no significant differences in mean scores between the three treatment groups in the acquisition of appropriate behaviors as measured on the (M) dimension of the (RP-FS).

**Hypothesis Four** The null hypothesis was retained. There were no significant differences in mean scores between the three treatment groups in the acquisition of appropriate behaviors as measured on the (GCR) dimension of the (RP-FS).

**Hypothesis Five** The null hypothesis was retained. There were no significant differences in mean scores between the three treatment groups in the acquisition of appropriate behaviors as measured on the (BRS).

**Summary**

The research did not define statistical significance between groups of subjects who were exposed to the three treatment methods as measured on the (E), (I), (M), and (GCR) dimensions of the (RP-FS). This finding has been sup-
ported in prior research (Fry, 1949; and Vane, 1954).

Although the null hypothesis was retained on the (I) dimension of the (RP-FS), the F value of 3.32 approached the .05 level of confidence. An examination of the adjusted means revealed the following: Group One, 6.9251; Group Two, 8.6311 and Group Three, 8.4489.

The Scheffe Test was used to determine significant differences on the adjusted mean scores between treatment groups. Results indicated that there were no significant differences between groups at the .05 level of confidence. Groups One, Two and Three recorded F values of 3.36, 3.15 and .26 respectively. However, when the level of confidence was changed to .10, the mean scores for Group One became significant. This change to the .10 level of confidence is recommended by Scheffe (1957) because the Scheffe Test is described as conservative and not as sensitive to changes.

Discussion

The research did not define statistical significance between groups of subjects who were exposed to the three treatment methods as measured on the (BRS). Although the null hypothesis was retained, an examination of the data did reveal a trend. Differences in raw scores which reflected reductions of aggressive behaviors were recorded by subjects on the post-test administration of the instrument. These differences, however, may be attributed to the fact that more subjects completed the tasks on the second administration of the instrument.
and that other subjects gave up because they felt that they could not complete the task the second time if they had not completed it on the pre-test.

A further question which appears to be of importance is that of motivation and involvement with the tasks. Contrived situations designed to elicit aggressive responses from subjects often do not appear to be real and therefore, the question of involvement and motivation in the completion of projects becomes difficult to evaluate by observers.

A review of the instruments used to measure the behavior relating to frustration tolerance and aggression indicate a weakness which is inherent with projective techniques. Another consideration which appears to be important at this point is that of the basic concepts of traits or predisposition. Bersoff and Greiger (1971) question the predominant feeling within the behavioral sciences, the position that personality is composed of needs and traits that predispose the individual to respond in certain ways. The concept of frustration toleration has been questioned because it has not been clearly defined in the literature (Yates, 1967).

The use of psychodrama and group counseling as a treatment approach with an offender population was not supported in this research. This finding is inconsistent with research findings which suggest that the use of psychodrama is in fact a significant means of changing behaviors and attitudes (Vogt, 1961; Eliasoph, 1958; and Corsini, 1958).

Several assumptions may be made with regard to the results
of this study: a) The short-term group, 10 weeks, may not have provided enough time to initiate new material or discuss more fully the topics presented by the group members or the therapist. Research has shown that approximately 15 weekly sessions may provide the desired results with respect to time factors; b) The therapist may have been considered an authority figure by the group members because he represented the probation office. An assumption could be made concerning the content of the material presented during the treatment phase of the study; and c) Both groups had large percentages of Black subjects, and in both instances the therapists were white. Later studies may consider racial factors in their design by varying therapists with regard to race.

Limitations of the Study

The use of group counseling techniques with non-institutionalized offenders is only recently emerging in an area which is receiving serious attention of people working in Rehabilitation Counseling, Probation and/or Parole. As a consequence, there are many unanswerable questions with regard to the most efficient methods of treatment. As the project developed some limitations became apparent. These limitations are listed below:

1) The use of one therapist for each treatment group makes it difficult to attribute changes in the behaviors of clients to either treatment procedures or to the therapist.

2) Practical limitations of using subjects in a probation or parole setting present difficulties with respect to the availability of subjects for treatment procedures. Often, many of
the subjects are required to work at odd hours which present difficulties in arranging group meetings.

3) An additional limitation concerns the probation office. Questions to be answered during the designing of the project related to the qualifications of probation officers to conduct research and/or therapy, and the availability of the probation officers to provide these services.

4) A final question which arose during the course of the project dealt with the contrived situation which was used to measure aggressive behaviors. Many of the subjects viewed the project as a "test" and questions arose during the course of treatment regarding the results of the "test" and what effects it had on the length of the probationary period.

5) Examination of process reports (Appendix G) raises questions regarding differential treatment modalities.

6) The probation officer as an authority figure presents concerns regarding material discussed during the treatment process.

7) Lack of external standardization of test instruments should be noted when interpreting data.

Recommendations

In light of the preceding discussion the experimenter would suggest the following changes be made in future designs.

1) Design a study which would allow the therapist to participate in both treatment groups. Although this would require the therapist to become familiar with two treatment modalities, the purpose would be to control for the therapist variables.
2) Rather than contrive a situation to examine aggressive behavior, natural observations would appear to be more effective. That is, observe and record behaviors for example, on the job, or in some situation in which the subject does not know that he is being observed.

**Values of the Study**

Research in the area of group counseling with institutionalized offenders has demonstrated the potential for the development of similar procedures with non-institutionalized populations.

Although this study did not define statistical significance between treatment groups, the experimenter feels that an examination of the qualitative data, i.e., probation officer's process report, lends support to the belief that the use of group counseling, group discussions, psychodrama and films are effective means for changing behavior for offender populations.

The main value of this study appears to be twofold: a) it provided a model for persons who wish to begin group counseling with clients on their caseloads; and b) the impetus that this research provided the probation office, that is, in personal communications with the therapists it now appears that group counseling is the preferred method of treatment with their clients and there has been an increase in group counseling activities within the department.
APPENDICES

You are required to report to the Probation Office of the United States District Court, 3rd & Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., on the 10th of August at 9:00 a.m.

The purpose is to evaluate you for our group orientation program, which is mandatory for all persons going through the program.

Very truly yours,

James A. Lowery
U.S. Probation Officer
436-7345
Office of the
PROBATION OFFICER
United States District Court
For the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C. 20001

George W. Howard
Chief Probation Officer

Fred Petersen
Deputy Chief Probation Officer

Dear_______:

You are requested to report to the Probation Office
U.S. District Court, 3rd & Constitution Avenue, N.W.,
Room 1430, on the ______ of August at _______.

The purpose is to evaluate you for our group orientation
program, which is mandatory for all persons coming through
this office.

Very truly yours,

James A. Lowery
U.S. Probation Officer
436-7345

JAL:rm
Office of the

PROBATION OFFICER
United States District Court
For the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C. 20001

George W. Howard  Fred Petersen
Chief Probation Officer  Deputy Chief Probation Officer

Dear __________:

You will recall that several weeks ago you came to the U.S. Probation Office and took a test in connection with the group orientation program.

At the time you took the test, you will recall, I informed you there would be another identical test for you to take later.

The purpose of this letter is to advise you that you are scheduled for the second test on ___ at __ in Room 1430, Main Probation Office (Same room as before).

This is the final test and, as before, you will have an opportunity to make some money if you complete the test within twenty minutes.

The time stated above has been set aside especially for you; therefore, it is very important you report at that time.

I will be looking forward to seeing you again and Good Luck!!

Very truly yours,

James A. Lowery
U.S. Probation Officer
426-7345

JAL:rm
GROUP ASSIGNMENT NOTICE

You have been assigned to Mr. McHugh's orientation group which will be held on Thursday evenings at 7:00 in room 1430. The first meeting will be September 9th.

You have been assigned to Mr. Hunter's orientation group which will be held on Thursday evenings at 7:00 in room 1430. The first meeting will be September 9th.
RATING SCALE FOR JUDGING
CLIENT'S BEHAVIORS

In order to record responses to frustrating situations the following criteria will be used. Scoring of responses will be recorded as single units.

VERBAL
1. Cussing.
2. Sighing.
4. Asking for more directions (3 or more).
5. Talking to either rater.

PHYSICAL
1. Moving board (reversal of board)
2. Dropping pieces
3. Unable to place squares on pegs
4. Inability to take squares off of pegs
5. Not moving squares at all
6. Throwing arms up in disgust
7. Leaving room
8. Throwing board or pieces on floor
9. Moving eyes from board
10. Moving chair
11. Moving in chair
12. Shuffling feet
13. Moving knees nervously
14. Sweating
15. Biting lips
16. Blinking of eyes

17. Other behaviors not listed
DATA FROM THE BEHAVIORAL RATING SCALE

### Pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>Judge 1</th>
<th>Judge 2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>Judge 1</th>
<th>Judge 2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>Judge 1</th>
<th>Judge 2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>Judge 1</th>
<th>Judge 2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>Judge 1</td>
<td>Judge 2</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj.</th>
<th>Judge 1</th>
<th>Judge 2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CHARACTERISTICS OF SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>Group III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X 28.4</td>
<td>X 32.6</td>
<td>X 26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X 10.5</td>
<td>X 8.8</td>
<td>X 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical, managerial</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench work</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-occupational</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>08%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past offenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X 3.8</td>
<td>X 5.5</td>
<td>X 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present offense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group I**

1. Assault with a dangerous weapon
2. Robbery
3. Carrying a dangerous weapon
4. Simple assault (2)
5. False pretenses (2)
6. Possession of drugs (3)
7. Obstruction of U.S. Mails
Group II

1. Operation of a lottery
2. Assault with a dangerous weapon
3. Simple assault
4. Possession of drugs (3)
5. Manslaughter
6. Receiving stolen property (2)
7. Robbery
8. Embezzlement of U.S. Mails
9. Carrying a dangerous weapon

Group III

1. Attempted false pretenses
2. Uttering forged check
3. Possession of drugs (3)
4. Possession of dangerous firearms
5. Petit larceny
6. Mail fraud
7. Robbery
8. Possession & sale of drugs
9. Endorsement of U.S. Treasury check
10. Assault with a dangerous weapon
11. Simple assault
"The group consisted of 12 members (one white male, two females, and the rest Black males). One member brought her husband to most of the meetings. The husband was on parole but had not participated in group meetings before.

" The contract for the group was set which established that the group would meet every Thursday evening from 7:00 P.M. to 8:30 P.M. for ten weeks in the U.S. Courthouse in room 1430. The first group meeting was held September 9, 1971 and the last group meeting was held November 11, 1971. The writer stated the group goal as follows: to work on any community or personal hangups or problems so that living in the community might be more comfortable. Role-playing was explained and it was established that it may be used on occasion.

"Generally, the group followed the pattern of being at first mistrustful of the probation officer and of each other too, at the end, becoming a cohesive group placing more trust in the probation officer and each other. The group was able to mature to the point where a goal or problem could be presented at the beginning of an evening and each member of the group would concentrate on achieving that goal or helping the central figure solve his particular problem or hang-up.

"Role-playing was introduced at one meeting and proved to be successful. Role-playing of sorts evolved in some of the other meetings without being introduced.
"The first three or four weeks of the group sessions had discussions centering on non-personal yet common problems, for example, police harassment, illegal arrests, who is a "criminal" and who is not, etc. As the sessions continued, the problems discussed became more and more personally related with group members often "confessing" a problem or telling about the trouble they had gotten into.

"One of the biggest frustrations the group members seemed to experience was the "conflict of interest" frustration. That is, the responsibility of a probationer or parolee is to stay out of any kind of trouble, at the same time, the survival of self-respect on the street demands a certain amount of "bravery" and physical prowess. One meeting revolved around this problem. The man and wife who were group members were the central figures. While her husband was in jail, the female became a prostitute mainly to support her drug habit. After her husband was released on parole, the couple would sometimes meet up with the wife's former customers. She was no longer using drugs. The problems were set before the group as to how the husband should handle the situation when a "customer" approached his wife. The problem was at first presented as a hypothetical situation to the group, but it became obvious as the discussion went on that it was real. The couple thought that the husband should assert his authority as a husband first verbally. If that did not succeed, he should proceed physically, regardless of the fact that his parole would be revoked. The wife insisted that she too would put her probation in jeopardy.
to maintain her self-respect. The whole group appeared to be bewildered by this question. The group, closely-knit by now, did not seem to be able to cope with the ambivalent feelings present. The group turned to the probation officer for help in reducing these feelings. At the end of the meeting, the problem was not solved. What had happened, however, was the group members recognized the trust they had placed in each other and in the probation officer. A "comfort-level" was reached and frustrations were put in perspective.

"Another frustration experienced by many group members was that of job discrimination. Many of the male members had long hair and some had large Afro-style cuts. The white male had long, straight hair. Many of these members said they preferred the casual-style dress rather than the "establishment" accepted jacket and tie. These men felt that blue-jeans were an acceptable form of dress for any occasion. The question is how does one know whether he is not accepted for a position of employment because of his qualifications or is he not accepted for a position because of his appearance or criminal record. The consensus of the group was that the Federal Government should be the first to employ people with criminal records. They felt that without the help to get started again they would continue getting in trouble. "We have paid our debt to society, now society must help us." Another question in this meeting was how much should one give up his personal ideals to get a job. If the Afro-hairstyle is a symbol of black identity, should a black cut his hair to get a job with
a company such as Xerox? After much discussion the group said no--except for the white male. The conclusion seemed to be that a man has to live for himself and should only change his ways to obtain a position of employment to the degree which it would not upset his personal integrity. Along with this discussion went the question of how much authority does a probation officer have over a parolee or probationer in telling them how to dress, how to wear his hair, etc. It was interesting to see that this meeting which was the last meeting of the group allowed for uninhibited questioning in matters of authority of the probation officer.

"Over all the group members were able to look at themselves and discuss problems that were hanging them up. By being shown other ways of solving problems one's frustrations are reduced. The group members were able to become more self-sufficient with the end result of having the ability to live as law-abiding productive members of the community."
"During the first several group meetings discussion centered around the purpose of the Research Group, questions surrounding the testing, how does it effect their period of probation, feelings around how well they did or did not do, what is expected of them on probation and their feelings about being on probation.

"Out of the above concerns the following ensued: Reporting once a month for probation isn't a problem. Being on probation is a hazzard--getting picked up for anything you didn't do. What is a reasonable hour to be in at night. I'm not sure the probation officer will help me if I am arrested. What does help mean? Probation is very hard, even when not at fault you have to fear being violated i.e., 'I got hit in the head and robbed by three men the other night. I told my probation officer about it.' He told me 'if I had done something at the time it happened I wouldn't get into any trouble, but if you did something later you probably would.' Some wondered what they might do if they saw the person again on the street. 'I'll let him know he better not mess with me again.'

"The film Price of a Life was shown when the group appeared free and susceptible. This film presented a case history of a probationer. It reviewed the processes through which the convicted person is investigated and placed on probation or committed to an institution. The probationer is followed through
the period of supervision required by the court. All prob-
bation techniques are presented in dramatic fashion.

"The discussion of the film focused around complete empathy
for the probationer. In spite of the probationer's repeated
offenses and compounded difficulties at no time did anyone in
the group feel the probationer was in need of a more structured
setting—other than freedom in the community. Ventilation of
feelings centered around to the insensitivity of the probation
officer to the needs of the probationer and what is like to
be on probation.

"A preoccupation with drugs as a community problem held
the central concern for free discussion and the showing of three
drug related films, Not Me, Scag, and A Day in the Death of
Donnie B, created much discussion. The films portrayed the
reasons why people use drugs; the psychological, physical and
social dangers involved. Experiences recounted by youths from
both slum and other neighborhoods were reported in the films.
A somewhat defeatist attitude prevailed the group as to how the
victim can be helped and the harm done because the use of drugs
is considered a criminal offense and not likened to alcoholism
which is treated as an illness.

"There was a complexity of problems encountered during
the ten week period and the original format of the use of films
and visual aids was not always feasible. Problems about their
new role of being on probation, what the research group was
really all about, the inability to free themselves fully to the
utilization of the films. By this I mean the anxiety of the
group necessitated dealing with their expressed concerns from week to week.

"During the final meeting the discussion centered around the final period of testing. Several expressed 'I can't do it', when the tester gave complete support and encouragement, those who felt they could not commence the test-began and finished it with a degree of satisfaction. Of the feelings expressed with regard to the testing situation, several were quite prevalent: a) limited education; b) embarrassment; c) fear of failure; d) 'test keep your mind fumbling all the time'; e) I get angry; and f) Don't want to look bad."
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