1-1-2019

Examining The Internal & External Factors That Motivate Inmates' Participation Among Various Prison Programs

Kornicha Shaneice Johnson

EXAMINING THE INTERNAL & EXTERNAL FACTORS THAT MOTIVATE INMATES'
PARTICIPATION AMONG VARIOUS PRISON PROGRAMS

A Thesis
presented in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Criminal Justice
in the Department of Legal Studies
The University of Mississippi

by

KORNICHA SHANEICE JOHNSON

December 2019

ABSTRACT

Prison programming has been linked to reducing recidivism and reincarceration, yet only a small percentage of prison programs are completed by inmates (Duwe, 2018). The demand in preparing inmates for reentry is crucial and ongoing. Studies have tried to understand the failure of prison program completion; however, research has not been aimed at specifically locating the internal and external factors that encourages this voluntary participation. This study examines internal and external motivation in order to find what factors influence inmates' decision to pursue prison programs. This study contributes to link these factors to the programming types of religious, educational, treatment, and vocational. There are three major findings: 1) among all of the factors examined, program readiness was associated with the interest to all the programs types examined, 2) inmates were more willing to participate in programs that do not heavily impact or alter their behaviors, 3) bible study was the only program linked to procedural justice.

DEDICATION

For
Tonia, Terell, Terrell, & Tyler Campbell
and
Walter Bruce Jr.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to recognize and thank my parents, Tonia & Terell Campbell and Larry Johnson, for instilling the ambition to accomplish my goals, providing emotional support and guidance, showing unconditional love, and motivating me through every obstacle. Thank you to my brothers for believing in me as their role model even when I did not believe in myself. I would also like to thank my extended family (Mary Zollicoffer, Larry Zollicoffer, Martha Bruce, and Walthena Bruce) for the encouraging words and motivation throughout this process. Special thanks to my close friends for claiming greatness and supporting me in my times of absence and frustration. I love you each of you dearly.

To my committee members, thank you for your time and assistance. To Dr. Kimberly Kaiser, thank you for your academic guidance, teaching, and words of wisdom. Thank you for also challenging me in development throughout this extensive process.

Lastly, without my Christian faith I am nothing. My faith in Jesus Christ has allowed me to persevere through all the odds. I am overwhelmingly blessed for the endless contributions in completing this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

Introduction

There are more than 650,000 inmates who are released back into society each year (U.S. Department of Justice, 2019). Two-thirds of those inmates commit new or similar crimes resulting in rearrests and reincarceration (Durose, Cooper, & Snyder, 2014). Prison programs were created to reduce recidivism rates (Phelps, 2011) by facilitating the growth and change of inmates while enhancing productivity skills. These programs address the deprivation of education, faith, work skills, support, ethics, and confidence, which impact successful transitions back into the community (Phelps, 2011).

Prison programs offer positive behavior reinforcement for inmates as they aid in deterring inmates from committing crimes. For example, Gordon and Weldon (2003) found a reduction of 6.71% in recidivism rates among inmates who completed a prison program. It can be suggested from literature that prison programs contribute to inmates by helping inmates create a tangible plan, helping them construct goals, equipping them to reach those goals, and showing them how to commit to positive behavioral and change are active components of prison programming. Karoly (1993) found that creating goals provided a motivational foundation to change and study by Day and associates (2009) revealed that treatment program participants were able to change their motivations, attitudes, efficacy, and beliefs on negative behaviors.

Statement of Problem

As research has demonstrated that prison programs can have a positive effect on reducing recidivism, it is important for researchers to identify how to improve inmate participation in these programs. Motivation plays an integral role of not only changing offenders' behaviors but influencing them to participate in prison programs. McMurran and Theodosi (2007) found the lack of inmate motivation or readiness for change contributed to the unsuccessful completion of prison programs. High rates of incompletion have been shown to reduce the effectiveness of prison programs. As such, it is vital that research identifies the motivational factors behind inmate participation in prison programming (McMurran & Ward, 2010).

There is limited research on the reasons for non-completions. Specifically, previous research has not expanded deeply into identifying the effects of internal and external sources of motivation that relate to inmates' willingness to participate in prison programs. Additionally, most research on offender motivation to change has focused on engagement in drug treatment and has not examined other types of programs. The current study will address these gaps in previous research. As Ward, Day, Howells, & Birgden, (2004) noted, research in treatment readiness thus far has not been as fundamental as it should. Once identified, correctional facilities can construct a higher priority to adopting a strategy for increasing participation and retention. Thus, implementing effective post release outcomes

Purpose of the Study

The goal of this study was to identify the internal and external factors that motivate inmates to participate in three types of prison programs: education, religious, and vocational/treatment skills. Additionally, an evaluation of whether these motivating factors differ

between these types of programs was conducted. Specifically, this study was guided by the

following research questions:

1. What internal and external factors motivate inmates to participate

    in prison programs?

2. Do the internal and external motivating factors vary or differ

    between prison program type (educational, religious, vocational

    life skills/treatment)?

II.   A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides a literature review on the importance of prison program participation, the importance of program diversity, and the benefits of the three types of diverse prison programs, educational, religious, and vocational/treatment. Some of the benefits of the prison programs that will be examined include job opportunities, character/behavioral changes, rehabilitation, and lower recidivism rates. With the knowledge of these points, an additional assessment for the need of consistent and completed inmates program participation can be examined.

The Importance of Prison Program Participation

Educational, religious, treatment, and life skills programs are effective tools in promoting positive change within inmates. The goal of prison programming is to promote an improvement in behavior of offenders, both within correctional facilities and post release. There have been numerous benefits to inmate participation such as reduced reincarceration, decreased prison infractions, and improved probabilities of job opportunities as well as self-control.

Prison programs are diverse and designed to concentrate on reducing chronic dynamic factors within an inmate that contribute to criminal behavior. The types of prison programs address a variety of offenders' addictions, negative behaviors, chronic internal issues, and prosocial goals. For instance, educational programs allow offenders the opportunity to advance in their goals of learning and gaining skills. Gendreau (1996) found that diversity of prison

programs successful in assisting in offenders' transition into society post release. Inmates who complete educational or vocational skill programs are able to transition easily into jobs that a lack of education would normally make intangible to obtain. Furthermore, Gendreau, French, and Gionet (2004) found that the diversity of prison programming, and its ability to capitalize on offenders' criminogenic needs, has been linked to decreased recidivism.

Research has suggested that decreased recidivism may be linked to inmates' participation in educational programs (Vacca, 2004). In a study done by Visian, Burke, and Vivian (2001), 22 percent of inmates were less likely to recidivate within five years of release if they had completed at least one college course in prison. Another study found that almost 45 percent of inmates who did not complete an educational program had significantly higher levels of reoffending (Clark, 1991). Similarly, in their analysis of the Virginia Department of Corrections, Hull, Forrester, and colleagues (2000), found that, of 907 inmates who completed educational programming, only 183 (20%) recidivated.

While recidivism is a post-release expectation, successful behavior inside the correctional facilities is typically an indication towards that expectation. Inmates who successfully complete educational programs are more controllable within the prison environment (Newman, Lewis, & Beverstock, 1993). For example, educational programs have been shown to reduce criminal behavior and disciplinary infractions within prisons (Adams, Bennett, Flanagan, Marquart, Cuvelier, Fritsch, & Burton, 1994). Inmates who do not engage in educational programming or lack educational background tend to act more violently within prison (Berg & DeLisi, 2006). This body of research suggests that educational programs may provide a valuable determent for negative influences within and outside of correctional facilities.

Another program designed to address the criminogenic needs of offenders are religious programs. Studies show that religious programs have an impact on recidivism (Schroeder, Broadus, & Bradley, 2018; Wallace, Moak, & Moore, 2005). Religious programs may have the ability to modify criminal intentions through the promotion of discipline and prosocial behavior (Evans, Cullen, Dunaway, & Burton, 1995). For example, Camp, Daggett, Kwon, and Klein-Saffran (2008) found that inmates who participated in religious programs were less likely to have serious infractions involving misconduct. Similarly, Kerley, Mathews, and Blanchard (2005) found that Mississippi inmates who believed in a higher power were approximately 70 percent less likely to engage in arguments and Kerley, Copes, Tewksbury, and Dabney's (2011) study of religiosity and self-control found that participation in religious services was the only factor to significantly reduce the incidence of prison deviance.

There are other correlations to recidivism that have been found through the participation of religious programs (Johnson, 2002; Johnson, & Larson, 2003; Johnson, Larson, & Pitts, 1997; Trusty & Eisenberg, 2003). Inmates who participate in religious programs, even if classified as non-religious, are less likely to be arrested post-release, according to Melvina Sumter (2000). In a study using the number of times that inmates participated in bible class, Johnson (2004) found that within 2 years, 9 percent of inmates that attended 10 or more classes were rearrested versus 18 percent of inmates whose participation was lower. Overall, this body of research suggests that engagement is religious programs are associated with reductions in recidivism and misconduct (Boddie & Funk, 2012).

Vocational life skills and treatment programs also provide benefits to inmates who participate. Each program provides different objectives in meeting the needs of offenders while affording inmates the opportunity to thrive and survive life post-release. For example, life skills

are effective tools that allow individuals to navigate through the challenges and requirements of life. These tools are not always readily available or taught to inmates, which can influence their decisions to participate in crime. Andrews & Bonta (1994) noted life skills as one of the needed skills for rehabilitation. Vocational programs aid individuals in finding jobs, understanding the job process, becoming financially literate, engaging in setting goals and decision making, and controlling situations of conflict.

Vocational programs also increase inmates' opportunity to provide financially for themselves and their families without having to commit criminal offenses. Participants chances of jobs post-release were found to be higher than non-participants (Lawrence, Mears, Dubin, & Travis, 2002). Giles (2016) called vocational training and recidivism co-dependent, meaning that the more training inmates obtained, the more it will reduce recidivism. If inmates are able to acquire skills that will make them marketable for jobs, they will decrease their engagement in crimes for financial gain. For example, Piehl (1995) conducted a study at the Wisconsin Department of Corrections and found that offenders received accreditation for trade licenses if they completed the vocational program. In Wilson's (1994) study, it was found that 78.3% of youth inmates who did not receive vocational training whereas those who did receive vocational training had a lower rate of recidivism (61.2%). Inmates were also found to have fewer misconduct violations in prison (Gerber & Fritsch, 1995).

Similarly, the literature on treatment programs suggested promising long-term effects for inmates. From a meta-analysis of 58 experimental and quasi-experimental students of the effects of cognitive-behavioral therapy on recidivism, cognitive-behavioral therapy was found to be significantly related to reductions in recidivism outcomes (Landenberger & Lipsey, 2005). The researchers suggested that treatment is an effective measure to pursue, calling the effort

"worthwhile". Most of the prison programs are voluntary participation. In order for the effects of the programs to be implemented through participation, insight on what motivates inmates is needed.

Theoretical Framework on Inmate Motivation

The benefits of prison programming are extensive and have longitudinal effects on offenders who are willing to gain skills through program completion. Inmates cannot be impacted by these effects necessary for change if they are not motivated to voluntarily participate. Researchers have tried to measure inmates' motivation as a way to understand and locate what influences inmates in their decision to engage in prison programs. It is through these attempts that motivation has become a pivotal factor in ensuring the quality of programs meet inmates' expectations for participation. In measuring motivations, researchers have identified several internal and external motivations under the theoretical models of rehabilitation, Multifactor Offender Readiness Model I & II, context of change, and treatment readiness model.

McMurran & Ward (2004) suggested that motivating inmates for programs and treatment starts with focusing on goals that shape the offenders' behavior/actions. The Good Lives Model is one of the models used to measure motivation based on inmates' goals. The Good Lives Model states that the pursuit of goals comes from receiving primary human goods. These primary human goods are what is said to make life more purposeful and meaningful. They are the basic needs of an individual's life that satisfies them internally. As a result, human actions reflect on whether these human goods are obtained or not obtained (Ward, 2002). Murphy (2001) categorized these basic needs into nine groups: (a) life (healthy living and physical satisfaction); (b) knowledge (education); (c) mastery experiences (in activities and

work); (d) self-control/freedom; (e) peace (stress free); (f) community/relationship (family and romantic); (g) spirituality; (h) happiness; and (i) creativity.

Other studies also suggest that fruitful human actions are accompanied by the attainment of these goods (Emmons, 1999; Ward, 2002). When human goods are not being met, human satisfaction lowers. The Good Life Model calls for goals to contribute to the gaps in offenders' deficiencies. The model also says that in order for inmates to be motivated to engage in change programing and behaviors, the program should encourage the offender's needs as well as offer them a choice of goal setting in regards to the needs (McMurran & Ward, 2004).

Developed in 2004, the MORM I model is, another method of measuring motivation and coins inmate readiness as a major factor of motivation. This model says that motivation from inmate readiness is an effect of sequential behavioral (Ward et al., 2004). First, inmates are supposed to be able to see their current state and behavior as an issue and they must then seek help. Then, they must have the capacity and competency to participate in programming. In order for readiness and change commitment to be activated, there has to be a responsibility and recognition of the inmates' behavioral problems.

This early model of MORM also insisted that inmate behavior may not be easily recognizable, therefore inmates neglect to change or want to change. This ambiguous understanding of their behavior can be due in part to their environment and circumstances (Ward et al., 2004). For example, depending on factors such as where they lived, how they were raised, what behaviors they saw everyday etc. may contribute to a normative nature. Additionally, inmates' willingness to participate in programming is described in the MORM Model I as dependent on how the inmate perceives the program as well as the support in pursuing the program (Cauce et al., 2002). For instance, having family/friends/peers acknowledge the

potential success of an inmate, inspires the inmate to achieve what they may have felt to be incompatible or intangible to them.

Inspired by other pioneers in the field of study, MORM II was created as a multifaceted model of the integration of internal and external factors to explain inmate motivation (Howells & Day, 2003; Serin, 1998; Ward et al., 2004). The MORM II model umbrellas multiple factors that inspires inmates' readiness for change into two distinctive categories: person and contextual factors. Under person (or internal) factors, there are (a) cognitive (pertaining personal beliefs and self-efficacy); (b) affective (pertaining to emotions;, (c) volitional (pertaining to personal goals, needs, and wants); (d) behavioral (pertaining to their skills); and (e) identity (pertaining to their personal and social life). Under contextual (or external) factors, there are (a) circumstances (dealing with offenses and voluntary/non voluntary); (b) location (whether they are in prison or within the community); (c) opportunities (availability programs and treatment); (d) resources (quality of programs and availability of qualified personnel); (e) interpersonal supports (supportive friends, professionals, family, etc.); and (f) program characteristics (type and timing) that affect readiness to change.

Evaluations of the MORM II model suggest that inmates will be willing to change and engage in changing programs if they possess these certain characteristics within this model. Additionally, if there is the availability and support from the programs, inmates are more likely to engage. (Casey, Day, Howells, & Ward, 2007; Day et al., 2009).

Different from the MORM models in measuring motivation, the Context of Change Model has been used to describe why an individual may or may not be ready for change. This model reveals that direct readiness for change is from the interactions between the individual, the starter for change, and the environment of change (Burrowes & Needs, 2009). The model also

indicates that it is the factors surrounding the inmates that impacts their internal context of expectations, self-concept, social norms, attachment style, schemata, coping styles, rigidity and goals (Engle & Arkowitz, 2006; Jones, 1997; Needs, 1995; Stein & Markus, 1996; Ward & Stewart, 2003). Other catalysts of change include factors surrounding the program itself such as the length, coordinator's expertise, and goals of the program (Andrews, 1995; Freeman & McClosky, 2003). If the program does not meet the expectations of the individual inmate in any form/capacity, it lowers the catalysts of change influence.

In the current study, inmate motivation will be examined using the model of Treatment Readiness. The target of treatment readiness is used to identify the reasons why non-completion of prison programs occurs through the examination of inmates' motivation. Treatment readiness is the motivation of an individual for treatment, the attempt to alter unmotivated individuals, and choosing whether or not to treat those who are motivated (McMurran, 2002). This is important to understand because the mechanisms of goal setting, self-efficacy, behavioral consistency, treatment perspectives, etc. is said to maximize the influence of engagement. These all factors that can be identified during pre-examination. Howells & Day (2003) noted in their study that configuring the attributions of participation is a vital need.

Treatment readiness has also been credited as being a great retention tool for program engagement (De Leon, 1996; Knight, Hiller, Broome, & Simpson, 2000; Margolin, Avants, Rounsaville, Kosten, & Schot-tenfeld, 1997; Simpson & Joe, 1993). Consistently, Melnick, De Leon, Thomas, Kressel, & Wexler, (2001) described this model as a gateway of improving engagement through its cognitive strategies. Some of the components of treatment readiness include the development of assessing motivation and engagement for measurement of change

over time, evaluating pre-treatment for the promotion of engagement and treatment, and strategies that combat barriers of engagement (McMurran & Ward, 2010).

Simpson and Broome (1998) revealed that treatment readiness is a better indicator to participation in treatment than other models. For this reason, this model is used in this study for treatment readiness. In order to initiate participation and evaluate a precursor to successful completion of prison programming, a pre-examination of the motivations through inmates' perspectives of readiness is needed.

Inmate Motivations to Participate in Programming

As most prison programs are voluntary, inmates must be motivated to participate. Yet, there is limited findings of research available on the specific internal and external sources of motivation for participation. With this review, a better understanding of any variances of internal or external factors in motivations accordance can be observed.

Internal Sources of Motivation

The following section introduces internal sources of inmate motivation, such as, readiness for change and self-efficacy. These internal sources aid in understanding what influences inmates in their decision to participate in prison programs. Though these sources vary, the impact of the factors are key in warranting desirable completion rates of prison programs. For example, when an individual has had enough of their sufferings or come to terms with a negative habit, the concept of readiness to change is that they will seek help and complete programs (Rosen, Hiller, Webster, Staton, & Leukefeld, 2004).

Readiness for Change. Readiness for change is one of the foundations of internal sources for inmate participation. It has been defined as "an individual's beliefs, attitudes, and

intentions regarding the extent to which changes are needed and the organization's capacity to successfully undertake those changes" (Rafferty, Jimmieson, & Armenakis, 2013, pg. 113). Readiness for change has also been broken down as two levels being successfully implemented within an individual. First, the individual must first believe that change is needed, believe that positive results will occur from their role in change engagement, and possess the capacity to undergo changes. Secondly, the individual must possess current and future-oriented responses to change (Hicks & McCracken, 2011).

The internal motivations of intentions and self-efficacy initiates the process of readiness for change. Without the presence of these factors, readiness for change becomes less tangible. Ajzen (1991) as well as Herold, Fedor, and Caldwell (2007), found that the intentions of an individual influenced their behavioral level towards change and self-efficacy worked as a reinforcement to an individual's desire and capability for change (Holt, Armenakis, Field, & Harris, 2007). For example, Batchelder and Pippert (2002) found that in their study that inmates were motivated to participate in vocational programming because of internal and external factors, such as (a) needing financial contributions, (b) wanting to be marketable, and (c) having better opportunities post release. Other the other hand, Morag and Teman (2018) examined inmates' reasoning for committing to religious programming as them feeling compelled to take responsibility for their actions in which religion afforded them that opportunity.

Readiness for change also implies that if an individual is not under the capacity to forgo changes, change initiatives such as prison programs will not have intended effects (Armenakis et al., 1993; Neves, 2009). Changes in an individual will simply not occur unless it is facilitated by readiness for change. When there are low levels or nonexistence of change readiness, implementations of change have been found to have unsuccessful results (Armenakis, Harris, &

Mossholder, 1993; Jones, Jimmieson, & Griffiths, 2005). A common basis found in readiness for change is the weighing of situational characteristics. If there is more cost to behavior change rather than benefits, an individual is less likely to exemplify readiness for change (Cunningham, et al. 2002)

Findings show that readiness for change impacts any attempts and programs targeted toward it and that there are benefits to individuals who are ready for change (Desplaces, 2005). Researchers such as Desplaces (2005) and Hicks and McCrackens (2011) designated these benefits as extrinsic and intrinsic. Extrinsic incentives influence individuals with a perspective that a tangible consequence is attracted from a certain behavior. Intrinsic incentive engages individuals with a perspective that these certain behaviors are a direct effect of psychological satisfaction. Furthermore, research has shown that if these benefits such as the individual's confidence ability, respondents will not perform well in any change initiatives (Armenakis et al., 1993; Oreg et al., 2011; Vakola, Oreg, & Armenakis, 2013). It is not only important to create conditions for change but pre-examine the state of change readiness in an individual (Desplaces, 2005; Tetenbaum, 1998).

Self-Efficacy. Another internal source of motivation is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is an individual's perception of themselves as being capable of achieving any set goal (Bandura, 1977). McMurran & Ward (2004) noted that it is self-efficacy that provokes offenders' engagement in treatment, change of behavior, and confidence in good consistency. A lack of self-efficacy can lead inmates into negative behavior. Offenders with low self-efficacy lack the confidence to learn because they feel as though they do not have the ability to. In altering a person's confidence, this theory of self-efficacy suggest that personal experiences will allot for mastery performances.

In other words, in building self-efficacy, the program must be tailored towards the inmate ability to master the goal within the program. Inmates tend to face low self-efficacy when the programs are not beneficial in inmate expectations and contributing to success (Bandura, 2010). Self-efficacy has a huge trajectory in inmate decisions to pursue goals related to participating in prison programs (Doherty, Forrester, Brazil, & Matheson, 2014). For instance, inmate participation in educational programs have been studied to range from their curiosity of knowledge, curiosity of being a solution to the world's problems, and curiosity of better job opportunities (Manger, Eikeland, Diseth, Hetland, & Asbjørnsen, 2010). Education has also been perceived by some inmates as a chance to invest in their goals. (Winters, 1995). Previous experiences where inmates fail to meet their own expectations would cause them to not finish the program or not engage in another program. Internal factors such as inmates not having a desire to participate, being too embarrassed by staff, or lacking trust (Mitchell & Latchford, 2010; Morgan, Rozycki, & Wilson, 2004) has caused inmates to be dissuaded from engagement in prison programs. Self-efficacy is a component of internal factors that can be controlled with programs that are dedicated towards truly recognizing offender's potential and building goals from the offender's confidence level (Pelissier & Jones, 2006

External Sources of Motivation

This section introduces two factors, procedural justice and prison conditions, that represent potential external sources of motivation. These external factors identify sources that are beyond the control of an inmate, but may contribute to their motivation to participate in prison programs. For instance, procedural justice determines if inmates deem initiatives as legitimate enough to participate according to their experiences of fairness and treatment (Murphy, K., Bradford, B., & Jackson, J., 2016).

Procedural justice. Procedural justice measures how fairness is perceived or considered during decision-making processes. It affects offenders when their ability to play an active role in decisions that impact themselves is not considered, their voices in the process are deprived, respect/treatment towards them is minimal. Inmates may deem treatment from administration as being unfair, unethical, bias, and inconsistent. Thus, these factors may cause inmates to look at any initiatives of the administration as illegitimate (Hough, Jackson, Bradford, Myhill, & Quinton, 2010; Ötting, & Maier, 2018). In contrast, program volunteers have played a key role in inmates'/offenders' motivation to complete programming (Johnson, Larson, & Pitts, 1997). For example, research has revealed that parolees were able and motivated to complete their terms of parole successfully through the interceding of prison program volunteers instead of parole administrators.

Procedural justice is used in the current study as it has been linked to change factors related to readiness for change (Murtaza, Shad, Shahzad, Shah, & Khan, 2011). When there is disruption to what inmates deem is respectful and fair, the lack of wanting to change their behaviors occur. In fact, studies have shown that justice within an organization enhances acceptance and cooperation with change (Tyler & Blader, 2005; Greenberg, 1994; Wanberg & Banas, 2000).

Negative attitudes toward the organization and any measures taken by the organization occurs when procedures used in decision making are not just. For example, experiencing bias during operations or not taking everyone's statements into consideration (Lee, Sharif, Scandura, & Kim, 2017). Not only those negative attitudes arise, but also, the lack of commitment to be involved in any changes (Brockner & Wiesenfeld, 1996). For instance, Folger and Konovsky (1989) found a positive relationship in involvement and commitment. In addition, Foster (2010)

revealed that higher levels of fairness warranted more commitment to change as well as feeling enabled to be committed to change.

Prison Conditions. Prison conditions are another external source of motivation that may influence an inmate's decision to engage in change initiatives or prison programs. Prison conditions are the environmental factors experienced by inmates inside prison facilities. These factors of influences can include their quality of living, availability of resources and leisure time, security level, safety measures, violence, peer groups, seclusion etc. (Nilsson, 2003). For example, in the influence of security levels, Chen and Shapiro (2007), found in their study that inmates housed in higher security facilities tend to have a significant reoffending rate.

Another example of prison condition is the prison culture. Dhami, Ayton, and Loewenstein (2007) reported that a lack of academic and social skills causes a struggle to adapt to prison culture. This struggle can cause inmates to revert back to their old criminal ways and even discourage them from change readiness. Other sources of prison conditions include external pressure. Prendergast, Farabee, Cartier, and Henkin (2002) concluded in their study that external pressure along with actual engagement in the program was found to change the motivations of inmates. Among external pressures are factors such as inmates' sentences, program acceptance, and program legitimacy (Meyer, Tangney, Stuewig, & Moore, 2014). External factors are different from internal factors as they are not always at the control of inmates. By studying these external sources of motivation, this study has the opportunity to advocate for the alterations of these factors that discourage inmates' participation.

Summary

Using the Treatment Readiness model, this study measured motivation through the internal and external factors surrounding inmates. The model has been used by previous scholars

to measure offenders' willingness to change based on their readiness. This study examined the various factors that contribute to motivating inmate participation. Readiness for change shows the characteristics for which an individual will respond to change. For example, if inmates deem their actions as being unworthy and wanting to fix how they respond through their actions, they then possess a high readiness for change. Inmates who do not see their actions as being a problem to themselves or others will correlate to a lower readiness of change. By looking at readiness to change, self-efficacy, prison conditions, and procedural justice, an evaluation of motivation to participation will show the deficiency in retention and recruitment.

III.   CURRENT FOCUS

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to understand what influences inmates' motivation in participating in prison programming. With the knowledge of what factors shape inmates' participation, criminal justice administers and leaders can modify the correction programs to retain and recruit more effectively. The objective of this study will have long-term effects of successful program completion and change in offenders as well.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions that were aimed at understanding the concept of inmate's motivation/interest to participating in programming:

1.   What internal and external factors motivate inmates to participate in prison programs?

2.   Do these factors vary or differ between prison program type (educational, religious, vocational life skills/treatment)?

IV. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents information on the data, instrumentation, and analytic strategy used in this study. This study used data from a larger research project on inmate perceptions of prison programming.

Population and Sample

This study used data collected as part of a larger study conducted at a Southern, private prison. The sampling method employed at the prison was convenience sampling. This particular institution is private and houses about 1,000 male inmates. The custody level of the inmates varies between medium to high custody level. Inmates that were housed in segregated units were not included in this study due to their lack of access to programming in the facility. Inmates were voluntarily asked to participate in the survey asking the questions of "whether they had participated, are preparing, or have not participated in prison programming." A total of 259 completed surveys were collected. Demographics of the sample are provided in Table 1.

Descriptive statistics was used to understand the demographics of each offender and to find comparisons in their responses. The additional variables included age, race, level of education, and length of incarceration. Age is measured by the question, "What is your age?" Race is measured by the question, "How would you describe yourself?" The response choices were "American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian or Other; Pacific Islander; White; and Other". Level of education was measured by the question,

"What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?" The response choices were "Less than high school diploma; High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED); Some college, no degree; Associate degree (e.g., AA or AS); Bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, BS); Master's degree (e.g., MD, DDS, DVM); and Doctorate (e.g., PhD, EdD)." The length of incarceration will be measured by "How long have you been at the facility?" The response choices were "Less than 1 month; 1-6 months; 7-12 months; More than 1 year, but less than 5 years; and 5 years or more."

The sample is represented by the majority of African American inmates (about 60%) and with less inmates identifying as Asian (about 1%). Inmates also described themselves as Alaska Native (about 1.4%), White (about 28%), and other (about 9%). The average age among inmates was about 45 years ranging from 20-73 years. Most inmates were single (46%) compared to the least percentage of inmates who were widowed (about 5%). Other inmates were married (about 20%) and some were divorced (28%). About 43% of inmates had a high school degree or equivalent that represented most respondents while about 1% held a Master's degree. Education among inmates also included those who had some college but no degree (about 21%), an Associate degree (about 4%), and a Bachelor's degree (about 4%). A larger percentage of inmates was sentenced to more than 1 year but less than 5 years (about 30%) while a smaller percentage had less than 1 month in MCCF (about 5%). Length of incarceration was also represented by about 13% who were sentenced to 1 to 6 months, about 7% with 7 to 12 months, and about 6% with 5 years or more.

Table 1

Demographics of Sample (n = 212)

Variable	Frequency	Mean or % (SD)	Range
Race			
Alaska Native	3	1.4	
Asian	2	1.0	
African American	125	60.1	
White	58	27.9	
Other	20	9.4	
Age		44.82 (11.90)	20-73
Marital Status			
Single	94	46.3	
Married	41	20.2	
Widowed	11	5.4	
Divorced	57	28.1	
Education			
Less than high school diploma	54	26.5	
High school degree or equivalent	87	42.6	
Some college, no degree	42	20.6	
Associate degree	9	4.4	
Bachelor's degree	9	4.4	
Master's degree	3	1.5	
MCCF length			
Less than 1 month	11	5.3	
1-6 months	24	11.5	
7-12 months	11	5.3	
More than 1 year, less than 5 years	67	32.2	
5 year or more	95	45.7	

Data Collection and Procedures

From January of 2019 until May 2019, paper-pencil surveys were administered by the primarily researchers to those willing to participate (See Appendix A). The survey questions were composed to be accessible at a 6th grade reading level. A pre-test of the survey was also done with graduate students and five inmates to measure readability and to clarify survey questions. All of the survey questions were read aloud to groups of inmates. Additionally, the primary research staff were available to answer all inquiries or provide clarification if needed.

The in-person, paper method survey used in this study was appropriate for this sample because of convenience, ability to reach inmates and to directly view the perspectives of inmates' motivations.

Before administering the survey, all research protocols were approved by the University of Mississippi Institutional Review Board. To recruit inmates, researchers walked around every unit and cell block with a recruitment script (See Appendix C). This recruitment script provided the name of the researcher, their occupation, purpose of the study, the length of the survey, voluntary notice, confidentiality of information, and how the responses would be reported. If interested, the inmates received a consent form to sign with the recruiting researcher before the survey was administered (See Appendix B). This consent form explained their right to refuse to participate, their right to withdraw from the study at any time, and the right to skip questions. The consent form also explained their rights to have a researcher administer the surveys, be present for reading questions, answering concerns, and explain the questions in depth if needed. Furthermore, the consent form explained the longevity of the research, the purpose of the research, and the use of their responses and identification numbers.

There were several steps taken to ensure confidentiality. Correctional officers were instructed to be at a distance inside the room where inmates were so that they were unable to view inmate responses. Additionally, inmates were affirmed that their responses would be kept confidential and their individual responses would not be shared with correctional staff or administration. Inmates' names were not recorded; however, their identification numbers were collected and only accessible by primary researchers. For the purposes of data analysis, all responses have not been identified.

After the initial stages of data collection, additional surveys with attached sealed envelopes were left with each cell block to be completed by those who were unable to participate in-person. Those sealed envelopes containing the surveys were placed in a locked box not accessible to correctional staff. To further protect the participants of this study, the correctional institution's name was not provided and only group findings are reported.

Measures

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables of interest for this study are the level of interest in participating in three categories of prison programming: (1) educational/vocational, (2) religious programs, and (3) treatment. To examine interest by program type, participants were asked to rate their level of interest on a 4-point Likert scale with responses "Not at all interested" (1); "Minimally Interested" (2); "Somewhat Interested" (3); and "Very Interested" (4). Respondents were asked, "Please indicate your level of interest in the following types of programs." The responses included GED programs and literacy programs which represented interest in education. Other responses included culinary programs (cooking) and computer classes that represented interest in vocational programs. Additional responses were substance abuse programs and moral cognitive therapy that represented interest in treatment while bible study represented interest in religious programs. Descriptive statistics for all variables are provided in Table 2.

Independent Variables

This study included four independent variables. There were two variables used to examine external sources of motivation. These include prison conditions and procedural justice. Two additional variables were used to examine internal sources, including readiness of change and self- efficacy. The internal sources of motivation/interest reflected the personal experiences

of the inmates in wanting to pursue prison programs. The internal sources of readiness of change indicated inmates' level of accepting the change initiative of prison programs while self-efficacy focused on the inmates' level of confidence in engaging in prison programs. In contrast, the external sources reviewed the sources of motivation/interest surrounding the environmental factors around the inmates.

Procedural Justice. The first variable that was used to examine external sources of motivation/interest is *procedural justice*. This measure was adapted from prior research on correctional procedural justice studies (Beijersbergen et. al, 2015; Tyler, 2003; Reisig, & Meško, 2009). Procedural justice measured how inmates are treated by staff as well as their ability to have a voice in decisions (Batchelder & Pippert, 2002; Tyler, T. R. 2006). This measure examined some of the issues that are not necessarily controlled by inmates but rather affects their decision to engage. This measure of procedural justice was created by combining scores on 12 survey items using a 5-point Likert scale. The questions used to measure procedural justice was on a 1 to 5 scale using "Never" (1), "Rarely" (2), "Sometimes" (3), "Often" (4), and "Always" (5). For example, questions included "Staff members of this correctional facility respect my rights"; and "Staff members of this correctional facility treat everyone equally".

Prison Conditions. The second measure used for external sources of motivation/interest is *prison conditions*. This measure included one single question "Please indicate to what extent prison conditions and circumstances have been a barrier to participating in prison programs." This question was reflected on a Likert 4-point scale. The question used to measure prison conditions was on a 1 to 4 scale using "Not a barrier" (1), "Somewhat a barrier" (2), "Moderate barrier" (3), and "Extreme barrier" (4).

Readiness for Change. The first measure used for internal sources of motivation/interest is *readiness for change*. Readiness for change was taken from an instrument previously used by Texas Christian University for psychological functioning and their criminal justice client evaluation of self and treatment (Bartholomew, Dansereau, Knight, Becan, & Flynn, 2013). Readiness for change describes the attributes of an individual in comparison to their level of wanting to and responding to change initiatives (Hicks & McCracken, 2011). The readiness for change measure involved questions that are reflected on 1 to 5 Likert scale using "Strongly disagree" (1), "Disagree" (2), "Neither agree or disagree" (3), "Agree" (4), and "Strongly agree" (5). The questions included "I need help with my problems"; "I desire to better myself"; "I want to get my life straightened out"; "I need help with my emotional troubles"; "My life is out of control"; "I am not ready to participate in programs"; "I am tired of the problems caused by my decisions."

Self-efficacy. The second measure used internal sources of motivation/interest is *self-efficacy*. This measure questions used to measure this independent variable are reflected on a 1 to 5 scale using "Not at all like me" (1), "Not much like me (2), "Somewhat like me" (3) "Mostly like me" (4) & "Very much like me" (5) The questions include "Setbacks don't discourage me"; "I don't give up easily"; "I am able to work effectively toward long-term goals"; "I finish whatever I begin"; "People would say that I have iron self-discipline"; Additional questions are reflected on a 1 to 5 scale using "Never" (1), "Rarely" (2), "Sometimes" (3), "Often" (4), & "Always" (5). The questions include "I feel like a failure"; "I have much to be proud of"; "I am satisfied with myself"; "I feel hopeless about the future."

Analytic Strategy

The analytic strategy for this study was conducted in two stages. First, this study examined the descriptive statistics of all variables in this study. It is necessary to include a descriptive

statistic to describe and summarize the sample. Descriptive statistic, in this study, provided an understanding of the demographics and locate the percentage of respondents to the questions used to measure each variable (Pérez-Vicente & Expósito Ruiz, 2009). Second, bivariate analysis was conducted for the purpose of identifying significance between the dependent and the independent variables. Bivariate statistic is typically used to preliminarily examine relationships among variables (Allen, 2017).

Limitations and Assumptions

There are a few limitations of this study. First, inmates' responses may present a concern about prison administration seeing or learning about their responses which may bias their responses. While researchers made efforts to address this risk, it cannot be confirmed whether their responses are a direct and valid representation of their experiences. Inmates could have exaggerated, had selective memory or attribution in recording their responses. The second limitation of this study is limited access to the entire population within the correctional facility. Only about 32% of inmates participated in the study and these results may not reflect the perceptions of all inmates within the facility. Finally, this study may not be a general representation to other institutions as it was conducted in one private prison in the Southern United States.

V.   RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics of the Independent & Dependent Variables

A univariate analysis was conducted on the dependent variables of overall program interest, as well as level of interest in various prison programs, including GED programs, literacy, culinary, computer classes, substance abuse, moral cognitive therapy, and bible study programs. Of the sample of 212 participants, culinary programs had the highest average level of interest (M = 3.38, SD = .96) while substance abuse programs had the lowest average of interest (M = 2.94, SD = 1.24). The level of interest in other programs included computer programs with the second highest level of interest (M = 3.35, SD = .97), bible study programs were third (M = 3.31, SD = 1.05), moral cognitive therapy programs fourth, (M = 3.25, SD = 1.02), literacy programs fifth (M = 2.98, SD = 1.18), and GED programs sixth, (M = 3.04, SD = 1.29). On average, inmates reported an average level of overall program interest of 3.20 (SD = .67).

Moving to the independent variables used in this study, the internal factor program readiness had the higher average of 3.97 (SD = .73) over internal factor self-esteem 3.89 (SD = .77). The external factors procedural justice and prison programs had the same averages with slightly differing standard deviations. Procedural justice averaged at 2.90 (SD = .86) while prison conditions averaged at 2.82 (SD = 1.16). The results for this univariate analysis is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables (n = 212)

Variable	Mean	SD	Range
Dependent Variables:			
Program Interest	3.20	.67	1-4
GED Programs	3.04	1.29	1-4
Literacy Programs	2.98	1.18	1-4
Culinary Programs	3.38	.96	1-4
Computer Classes	3.35	.97	1-4
Substance Programs	2.94	1.24	1-4
Moral Cognitive Therapy	3.25	1.02	1-4
Bible Study Programs	3.31	1.05	1-4
Independent Variables:			
External Factors			
Procedural Justice	2.90	.86	1-5
Prison Conditions	2.82	1.16	1-4
Internal Factors			
Self-Esteem	3.89	.77	1-5
Program Readiness	3.97	.73	2-5

Bivariate Correlation Analysis

A bivariate correlation analysis was conducted to test the two research questions. A total of seven correlation tables are provided to identify the significance among internal and external factors of motivation/interest and variances among each program to these factors of motivation/interest. The following findings below were found.

Table 3 of the bivariate correlations presents the correlations of GED Programs and internal/external motivations. A significant positive relationship was found between program readiness and GED programs, Pearson's R = .32 ($p < .01$). The R-squared indicates that 10% of the variance in GED programs can be explained by program readiness. A Pearson's R of .31 indicates a moderate relationship between program readiness and GED programs.

Table 3

Bivariate Correlations of GED Programs and Internal/External Motivations

	Y	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4
Y: GED Programs	1				
X_1: Program Readiness	.320**	1			
X_2: Self Esteem	.012	.157*	1		
X_3: Procedural Justice	-.019	.081	.121	1	
X_4: Prison Conditions	.044	-.025	-.127	-.259**	1

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The bivariate correlations of literacy programs and internal/external motivations are presented in Table 4. A significant positive relationship was found between program readiness and literacy programs, Pearson's R = .38 *(p < .01)*. There is a 14% variance of literacy programs that can be explained by program readiness using R^2. A Pearson's R of .38 indicates a small relationship between program readiness and literacy.

Table 4

Bivariate Correlations of GED Programs and Internal/External Motivations

	Y	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4
Y: Literacy Programs	1				
X_1: Program Readiness	.378**	1			
X_2: Self Esteem	.096	.157*	1		
X_3: Procedural Justice	-.021	.081	.121	1	
X_4: Prison Conditions	.113	-.025	-.127	-.259**	1

*p<.05, **p<.01,

Presented in Table 5 are the bivariate correlations of substance abuse programs and internal/external motivations. The findings show a significant positive relationship between program readiness and substance programs, Pearson's R = .32 (*p* < .01). Using the R^2 as a predicator, 10% of the variance in substance programs can be explained by program readiness. Pearson's R in this analysis .32 indicates a weak relationship between program readiness and substance programs.

Table 5

Bivariate Correlations of Substance Abuse Programs and Internal & External Motivations

	Y	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4
Y: Substance Abuse Programs	1				
X_1: Program Readiness	.319**	1			
X_2: Self Esteem	.014	.157*	1		
X_3: Procedural Justice	.107	.081	.121	1	
X_4: Prison Conditions	.054	-.025	-.127	-.259**	1

*p<.05, **p<.01,

Table 6 presents the bivariate correlations of culinary programs and internal/external motivations. Findings yielded a significant positive relationship between program readiness and culinary programs, Pearson's R = .22 ($p < .01$). A 6% variance of R^2 in culinary programs can be explained by program readiness. Pearson's R of .22 indicates a weak relationship between program readiness and culinary programs.

Table 6.

Bivariate Correlations of Culinary Programs and Internal & External Motivations

	Y	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4
Y: Culinary Programs	1				
X_1: Program Readiness	.218**	1			
X_2: Self Esteem	.115	.157*	1		
X_3: Procedural Justice	.045	.081	.121	1	
X_4: Prison Conditions	.003	-.025	-.127	-.259**	1

*p<.05, **p<.01,

The bivariate correlations of computer classes and internal/external motivations are presented in Table 7. In this model, there were no statistically significant bivariate correlations between the internal or external motivating factors and interest in computer classes. Table 8 presents the bivariate correlations of bible study and internal/external motivations. A significant positive relationship was found between program readiness and bible study, Pearson's R = .23 ($p < .01$). Pearson's R of .23 also indicates a weak relationship between program readiness and

bible study. The R^2 shows that 5% of the variance between bible study can be explained by program readiness. A significant positive relationship was also found between procedural justice and bible study, Pearson's R = .16 ($p < .01$). The R^2 indicates that 3% of the variance between bible can explained by procedural justice. A Pearson's R coefficient of .19 a very weak relationship between procedural justice and bible study.

Table 7

Bivariate Correlations of Computer Classes and Internal & External Motivations

	Y	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4
Y: Computer Classes	1				
X_1: Program Readiness	.097	1			
X_2: Self Esteem	-.010	.157*	1		
X_3: Procedural Justice	-.009	.081	.121	1	
X_4: Prison Conditions	.042	-.025	-.127	-.259**	1

*p<.05, **p<.01,

Table 8

Bivariate Correlations of Bible Study and Internal & External Motivations

	Y	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4
Y: Bible Study	1				
X_1: Program Readiness	.232**	1			
X_2: Self Esteem	-.001	.157*	1		
X_3: Procedural Justice	.164*	.081	.121	1	
X_4: Prison Conditions	.040	-.025	-.127	-.259**	1

*p<.05, **p<.01,

The bivariate correlations of moral cognitive programs and internal/external motivations are given within Table 9. Findings showed a significant positive relationship between program readiness and moral cognitive therapy, Pearson's R = .34 ($p < .01$). The R^2 indicates that 12% of the variance between moral cognitive therapy can be explained by program readiness. The Pearson's R of .22 a weak relationship between program readiness and moral cognitive therapy.

Table 9

Bivariate Correlations of Moral Cognitive Therapy and Internal & External Motivations

	Y	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4
Y: Moral Cognitive Therapy	1				
X_1: Program Readiness	.362**	1			
X_2: Self Esteem	.114	.157*	1		
X_3: Procedural Justice	.082	.081	.121	1	
X_4: Prison Conditions	.089	-.025	-.127	-.259**	1

*p<.05, **p<.01,

Table 10 presents bivariate correlations of overall program interest and internal/external motivations. A significant positive relationship was found between program readiness and program interest, Pearson's R = .43 ($p < .01$). The R^2 indicates that 16% of the variance between program interest can be explained by program readiness. The Pearson's R of .23 a weak relationship between program readiness and program interest.

Table 10

Bivariate Correlations of Overall Program Interest and Internal & External Motivations

	Y	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_4
Y: Moral Cognitive Therapy	1				
X_1: Program Readiness	.427**	1			
X_2: Self Esteem	.108	.157*	1		
X_3: Procedural Justice	.086	.081	.121	1	
X_4: Prison Conditions	.090	-.025	-.127	-.259**	1

*p<.05, **p<.01,

VI.   DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary and Conclusion

There were three conclusions made from the findings within this study. The first conclusion is that bible study was the only programming that was significantly related to procedural justice. Procedural justice includes how inmates are treated, how policies are implemented, and how inmates are regarded in policy decisions and, in comparison, to other inmates. Similarly, religion promotes moral and fairness within its practice (Kerley et al., 2011). Therefore, this variance from other programs could be explained as inmates who reported higher scores on or levels of procedural justice scale had increased likelihood of participating in bible study. This means that when inmates believe they are treated fairly by the system, they are more likely to show interest in participating in programs such as bible study. Studies such as Johnson (2004) have shown links between post-release and incarceration behavioral changes to bible study and procedural justice individually.

The findings of this study provide a slightly deeper understanding of the correlations among these factors that locates the interest/motivation in prison programming. There were not any previous findings found that looked into the relationship between bible study and procedural justice. It is important to know what influences behavior changes however, it is equally important to know the direction and relationship between these factors for the implementation of change initiatives such as prison programs. This finding could be utilized in improving the

standards of procedural justice for the successful implementations of religious programs among correctional facilities.

Second, readiness of change is associated with every type of programming that targets positive inmate change. Computer classes was the only programming that was not associated with any significance among the internal and external sources of motivation. This finding could be that computer classes offers an escape from prison conditions/environment as well as provide inmates with a hobby rather than as an initiative towards change. In contrast, the results may suggest that the other prison programs such as moral cognitive therapy, substance abuse, and GED programs may require inmates' willingness or readiness to participate in programming that could drastically alter their behaviors, lifestyles, and future. This finding is consistent with prior research (De Leon, 1996; Knight et al., 2000; Margolin et al., 1997; Simpson & Joe, 1993).

These findings support the notion that prison programs may be dependent on the readiness for change of inmates (Desplaces, 2005). When inmates are ready to commitment to change or acknowledge the need for change, they may then become motivated to participate in the various forms of change. Therefore, an explanation for the significance of these findings could be that inmates who are ready for change are more likely ready for programs that have personal benefits. As previous research has found, when readiness for change is not present participation in prison programs and motivation suffers (Armenakis et al., 1993; Jones et al., 2005).

The third conclusion comes from the finding that interest in programs varies from program type. Culinary and computer classes had the highest level of interest while substance abuse programs and literacy programs had the lowest. These findings could be that inmates who

are interested in culinary and computer classes are interested at the convenience of their satisfaction or lack in the level of readiness for change.

Inmates may be interested in programs that can seem more enjoyable during leisure rather than programs that requires more time, effort, and trust. Hicks & McCrackens (2011) found that it is intrusive and extrusive benefits that is weighted in inmates' decision to engage in prison programs. The programs that were ranked latter than the top programs, impacts inmates' lives more drastically. While culinary and computer classes could provide them skills, the other programming provides them healing, restorative justice methods, and life improvement (Evans et al., 1995; Johnson, & Larson, 2003; Vluth, 2004). Perhaps, a further study could be done to see if the length of incarceration impacts inmates' decision to take on programs that challenges these factors. Typically, these programs may seem beneficial to inmates who would return back to society rather than inmates who are serving life or close to life sentences. Another direction for study is to look in depth at the factors that influence readiness for change and then evaluate these by each inmate's level of readiness for change.

One of the objectives of this study was to locate the internal and external sources of motivation/interest that influence inmates' decisions to engage in prison programming. Another objective was to locate any variances of motivation/interest by program type. These findings provided will guide future implications of prison programming and guide studies to more in-depth research on what specific factors of program readiness mainly impacts inmates in their interest in prison programming. The findings also can guide research in promoting program readiness within the facility studied as well other correctional facilities within the United States. This study and future studies are needed to increase the retention and completion rate of prison programs.

Recommendations and Future Research

The future of correctional facilities ability to meet the goal of reduced recidivism depends on the active and sustainable efforts made by researchers for successful policies. This study targeted to initiate the appropriate change in this correctional goal by focusing on an area of policy that has great contributions. Prison programming is a policy initiative that has been found to reduce recidivism; however, the lack of completion is a major concern (Phelps, 2011). This study focused on emerging directions for addressing this issue by attempting to locate the internal and external interest/motivations of inmates in participating in the different areas of programming. There are a few recommendations from this study's findings for future studies and for improving the facility studied.

Change in the facility studied is recommended first. Majority of inmates at the prison facility preferred less change initiative programming. The findings also linked most of the programs interest to inmates' program readiness. The facility is advised to assess the factors of program readiness within inmates and find methods to increase program readiness for active inmate participation. This could be a major factor in understanding why programs are not completed.

A focus method the facility could take in targeting inmates' readiness is by enforcing three areas in policy: healthy minds, motivated minds, and loving minds. Healthy minds would focus on building inmates' mind from issues that would distract their chances of becoming better versions of themselves. This would also include addressing any psychological issues, deprivation issues, and relational issues. An example of this area of focus would be partnering with community organizations such as counseling centers. Counseling centers could provide inmates an escape to release their emotions and enable effective coping methods. The facility could also

start annual Father's Day programs to build relations between the inmates and their families reducing all three issues.

The area of motivated minds would reflect encouraging inmates to engage in initiatives that would improve their circumstances. That includes participating in programs, building their work ethic and self-esteem, teaching goal setting, and engaging in effective decision-making. A program that could be implemented under this umbrella is a mentoring program with former, successful inmates, business owners, and community leaders. These relationships can improve inmates' readiness by encouraging hope in positive goal setting, building their expectations of the future, and motivating them to engage in programs that could change them. The facility could also promote inmate readiness by bringing in motivational speakers, all of which would show inmates that they are cared about and not condemned by their crimes.

The last area, loving minds, would focus on inmates taking pride in the society and others' lives. For example, finding methods to bridge the gap between the community and the inmates for better practices of restorative justice. One way that this could be implemented is through engaging in more community service events in conjunction to the prison. Another way program readiness could be increased with this area of focus is by inmate leadership opportunities. The facility could look into having an advisory council of inmates for the opportunity of voicing prison condition concerns and giving them a chance to engage in policies that affect them.

By enacting these areas as policies, inmates could be more interested in participating in prison programming. However, the study of prison program participation needs to be an effort by studies on prisons across the U.S. It is recommended that a continual and more in-depth

investigation of inmates' interest be conducted. Studies could divide studies of interest based on male and female inmates, private and federal prisons, regional, and by crimes committed. Studies could also take the approach of conducting semi-quarterly assessments of inmates who engage in programming and audit their program participation over a year's time. This could increase the knowledge and understanding of where the interest of program participation lies as well as discovering any patterns of interest. Since procedural justice was another significant factor, studies could also take the approach of studying correlations of how monthly staff training on sensitizing inmate readiness to inmates' readiness and interest in participating in programming.

In conclusion, the goal for future studies in inmates' motivation/interest to engage in prison programs should focus on two areas: (a) locating factors that are evitable in program readiness and how it would affect inmate's willingness to participate and complete programming and (b) how change initiative programs can be reconstructed to appeal to inmates' readiness. More in depth research is vital to contribute to correctional goals through the voluntary engagement in prison programming. This study provides a promising direction to asserting and reforming affluent policies.

REFERENCES

References

Adams, K., Bennett, K., Flanagan, T., Marquart, J., Cuvelier, S., Fritsch, E., & Burton, V. (1994). A large-scale multidimensional test of the effect of prison education programs on offenders' behavior. *The Prison Journal*, *74*(4), 433-449.

Allen, M. (2017). *The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (Vols. 1-4). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications: 10.4135/9781483381411

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*(2), 179-211.

Andrews, D. A. (1995). The psychology of criminal conduct and effective treatment. In J. McGuire (Ed.), *What works: Reducing reoffending — Guidelines for research and practice* (pp. 35–62) Chichester: Wiley.

Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating for organizational change. *Humans Relations*, *46*, 681-703.

Bandura, A. (2010). Self☐efficacy. *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology*, *4*, 1-3.

Bartholomew, N. G., Dansereau, D. F., Knight, D. K., Becan, J. E. & Flynn, P. M. (2013). *Treatment readiness and Induction Program (TRIP)*. Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University, Institute of Behavioral Research.

Batchelder, J. S., & Pippert, J. M. (2002). Hard time or idle time: Factors affecting inmate choices between participation in prison work and education programs. *The Prison Journal*, *82*(2), 269-280.

Beijersbergen, K. A., Dirkzwager, A. J. E., Eichelsheim, V. I., Van der Laan, P. H., & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2015). Procedural justice, anger, and prisoners' misconduct: A longitudinal study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *42*(2), 196–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854814550710

Berg, M. T., & DeLisi, M. (2006). The correctional melting pot: Race, ethnicity, citizenship, and prison violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *34*(6), 631-642.

Boddie, S. C., & Funk, C. (2012). *Religion in prisons: A 50-state survey of prison chaplains*. Retrieved from https://www.pewforum.org/2012/03/22/prison-chaplains-exec/

Brockner, J. & Wiesenfeld, B.M. (1996). An integrative framework for explaining reactions to decisions: interactive effects of outcomes and procedures, *Psychological Bulletin*, *120*(2), 189-208.

Burrowes, N., & Needs, A. (2009). Time to contemplate change? A framework for assessing readiness to change with offenders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *14*(1), 39-49.

Camp, S. D., Daggett, D. M., Kwon, O., & Klein-Saffran, J. (2008). The effect of faith program participation on prison misconduct: The Life Connections Program. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *36*(5), 389-395.

Casey, S., Day, A., Howells, K., & Ward T (2007). Assessing suitability for offender rehabilitation:
Development and validation of the treatment readiness questionnaire. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34,* 1427-1440.

Cauce, A. M., Domenech-Rodriguez, M., Paradise, M., Cochran, B. N., Shea, J. M., Srebnik, D., & Bayday, N. (2002). Cultural and contextual influences in mental health help-seeking: A focus on ethnic minority youth. *Journal of Consulting and Counseling Psychology*, *70*, 44–55.

Chambers, J. C., Eccleston, L., Day, A., Ward, T., & Howells, K. (2008). Treatment readiness in violent offenders: The influence of cognitive factors on engagement in violence programs. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *13*(4), 276-284.

Chen, M. K., & Shapiro, J. M. (2007). Do harsher prison conditions reduce recidivism? A discontinuity-based approach. *American Law and Economics Review*, *9*(1), 1-29.

Choi, M., & Ruona, W. E. (2011). Individual readiness for organizational change and its implications for human resource and organization development. *Human Resource Development Review*, *10*(1), 46-73.

Clark, D. D. (1991). *Analysis of return rates of the inmate college program participants*. Albany, New York: Division of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation.

Clear, T. R., & Sumter, M. T. (2002). Prisoners, prison, and religion: religion and adjustment to prison. *Journal of offender Rehabilitation*, *35*(3-4), 125-156.

Crowther, J., Maclachlan, K. & Tett, L. (2010) Adult literacy, learning identities and pedagogic practice. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *29*(6), 651–664.

Cunningham, C. E., Woodward, C. A., Shannon, H. S., MacIntosh, J., Lendrum, B., Rosenbloom, D., & Brown, J. (2002). Readiness for organizational change: A longitudinal study of workplace, psychological and behavioural correlates. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*, 377-392.

Day A., Casey S., Ward T., Howells K., Vess J. (2010) *Transitions to Better Lives: Offender Readiness and Rehabilitation*. Portland, Oregon:Willan Publishing.

Day A., Howells K., Casey S., Ward T., Chambers J. C., & Birgden A. (2009) Assessing treatment readiness in violent offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 618-635.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The what and the why of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self- determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227–268.

De Leon, G. (1996). Integrative recovery: A stage paradigm. *Substance Abuse,17*, 51-63.

Desplaces, D. (2005). A multilevel approach to individual readiness to change. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 7(1), 25.

Dhami, M. K., Ayton, P., & Loewenstein, G. (2007). Adaptation to imprisonment: Indigenous or imported? *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*(8), 1085-1100.

Doherty, S., Forrester, P., Brazil, A., & Matheson, F. I. (2014). Finding their way: Conditions for successful reintegration among women offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 53*(7), 562-586.

Durose, M. R., Cooper, A. D., & Snyder, H. N. (2014). Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010. (NCJ 244205). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Duwe, G. (2018). The effects of the timing and dosage of correctional programming on recidivism. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 57*(3-4), 256-271.

Easton, C., Swan, S., & Sinha, R. (2000). Motivation to change substance use among offenders of domestic violence. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 19,* 1–5.

Emmons, R. A. (1999). *The psychology of ultimate concern: Motivation and spirituality in personality*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Engle, D., & Arkowitz, H. (2006). *Ambivalence in psychotherapy: Facilitating readiness to change.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Evans, T. D., Cullen, F. T., Dunaway, R. G., & Burton, V. S. (1995). Religion and crime reexamined: The impact of religion, secular controls, and social ecology on adult criminology. *Criminology, 21*, 29-40.

Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*(1), 115-130.

Foster, R. D. (2010). Resistance, justice, and commitment to change. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 21*(1), 3-39.

Freeman, A., & McCloskey, R. D. (2003). Impediments to effective psychotherapy. *Roadblocks in Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy*. New York, NY: The Guildford Press.

Gendreau, P. (1996). The principles of effective intervention with offenders. *Choosing Correctional Options That Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply*, 117-130.

Gendreau, P., French, S. A., & Gionet, A. (2004). What works (what doesn't work): The principles of effective correctional treatment. *Journal of Community Corrections,13,* 4–6, 27–30.

Gerber, J., & Fritsch, E. J. (1995). Adult academic and vocational correctional education programs: A review of recent research. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *22*(1-2), 119-142.

Gordon, H. R., & Weldon, B. (2003). The impact of career and technical education programs on adult offenders: Learning behind bars. *Journal of correctional education*, *54*(4), 200-207.

Greenberg, J. (1994). Using socially fair treatment to promote acceptance of a work site smoking ban. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79,* 288- 297.

Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., & Caldwell, S. D. (2007). Beyond change management: A multilevel investigation of contextual and personal influences on employees' commitment to change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(4), 942.

Hicks, R., & McCracken, J. (2011). Readiness for change. *Physician Executive*, *37*(1), 82-85.

Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *43*(2), 232-255.

Hough, M., Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Myhill, A., & Quinton, P. (2010). Procedural justice, trust, and institutional legitimacy. *Policing:A Journal of Policy and Practice*, *4*(3), 203-210.

Howells, K., Day A (2003) Readiness for anger management: Clinical and theoretical issues. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23*, 319-337.

Hull, K. A., Forrester, S., Brown, J., Jobe, D., & McCullen, C. (2000). Analysis of recidivism rates for participants of the academic/vocational/transition education programs offered by the Virginia Department of Correctional Education. *Journal of Correctional Education*, *51*(2), 257-260.

Johnson, B. R. (2004). Religious programs and recidivism among former inmates in Prison Fellowship programs: A long-term follow-up study. *Justice Quarterly*, *21*, 329−354.

Johnson, B. R., & Jang, S. J. (2011). Crime and religion: Assessing the role of the faith factor. *Contemporary Issues in Criminological Theory and Research: The Role of Social Institutions*, 117-149.

Johnson, B. R., & Larson, D. B. (2003). The InnerChange Freedom Initiative: A preliminary evaluation of a faith-based prison program. *Philadelphia: Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society.*

Johnson, B. R., Larson, D. B., & Pitts, T. C. (1997). Religious programs, institutional adjustment, and recidivism among former inmates in prison fellowship programs. *Justice Quarterly*, *14*(1), 145-166.

Jones, L. (1997). *Developing models for managing treatment integrity and efficacy in a prison-based TC: The Max Glatt Centre.* Chichester: Wiley.

Jones, R. A., Jimmieson, N. L., & Griffiths, A. (2005). The impact of organizational culture and reshaping capabilities on change implementation success: The mediating role of readiness for change. *Journal of Management Studies*, *42*(2), 361-386.

Karoly, P. (1993). Enlarging the scope of the compliance construct: Toward developmental and motivational relevance. *Developmental Aspects of Health Compliance Behavior*, 11-27, 8-24

Kerley, K. R., Copes, H., Tewksbury, R., & Dabney, D. A. (2011). Examining the relationship between religiosity and self-control as predictors of prison deviance. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *55*(8), 1251-1271.

Kerley, K. R., Matthews, T. L., & Blanchard, T. C. (2005). Religiosity, religious participation, and negative prison behaviors. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *44*, 443−457.

Knight, K., Hiller, M. L., Broome, K. M., & Simpson, D. D. (2000). Legal pressure, treatment readiness, and engagement in long-term residential programs. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *31*(1-2), 101-115.

Landenberger, N. A., & Lipsey, M. W. (2005). The positive effects of cognitive–behavioral programs for offenders: A meta-analysis of factors associated with effective treatment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *1*(4), 451-476.

Lawrence, S., Mears, D. P., Dubin, G., & Travis, J. (2002). The practice and promise of prison programming. *Research Report*. Retrieved from https://www.urban.org/research/publication/practice-and-promise-prison-programming

Lee, K., Sharif, M., Scandura, T., & Kim, J. (2017). Procedural justice as a moderator of the relationship between organizational change intensity and commitment to organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *30*(4), 501-524.

Durose, M. R., Cooper, A. D., & Snyder, H. N. (2014). *Recidivism of Prisoners Released in 30 States in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010* (Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2014), available at bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rprts05p0510.pdf.

Margolin, A., Avants, S. K., Rounsaville, B., Kosten, T. R., & Schottenfeld, R. S. (1997). Motivational factors in cocaine pharmacotherapy trials with metha- done-maintained patients: Problems and paradoxes. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, *29*, 205-212.

Manger, T., Eikeland, O. J., Diseth, Å., Hetland, H., & Asbjørnsen, A. (2010). Prison inmates' educational motives: Are they pushed or pulled? *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *54*(6), 535-547.

McMurran, M. (2009). Motivational interviewing with offenders: A systematic review. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *14*(1), 83-100.

McMurran, M., & Theodosi, E. (2007). Is offender treatment non-completion associated with increased reconviction over no treatment? *Psychology, Crime, and Law*, *13*, 333–343.

McMurran, M., & Ward, T. (2004). Motivating offenders to change in therapy: An organizing framework. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *9*(2), 295-311.

McMurran, M., & Ward, T. (2010). Treatment readiness, treatment engagement and behaviour change. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, *20*(2), 75-85.

Melnick, G., De Leon, G., Thomas, G., Kressel, D., & Wexler, H. K. (2001). Treatment process in prison therapeutic communities: Motivation, participation, and outcome. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, *27*(4), 633-650.

Meyer, C. L., Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Moore, K. E. (2014). Why do some jail inmates not engage in treatment and services? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 58*(8), 914-930.

Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2002). Motivational interviewing: Preparing people for change. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 63*(6), 776-777.

Morag, M., & Teman, E. (2018). The watchful eye of God: The role of religion in the rehabilitation and reentry of repentant jewish prisoners. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *62*(7), 2103-2126.

Morgan, R.D., Rozycki, A.T., & Wilson, S. (2004). Inmate perceptions of mental health services. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *35(*4), 389–396.

Murphy, K., Bradford, B., & Jackson, J. (2016). Motivating compliance behavior among offenders: Procedural justice or deterrence? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *43*(1), 102-118.

Murphy, M. C. (2001). *Natural law and practical rationality*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Murtaza, G., Shad, I., Shahzad, K., Shah, M. K., & Khan, N. A. (2011). Impact of distributive and procedural justice on employees' commitment: A case of public sector organization of Pakistan. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, *29*, 73-80.

Needs, A. (1995). Social skills training. In Towl, G. (Ed.), Groupwork in prisons. Issues in Criminological and Legal Psychology. *Leicester: The British Psychological Society*, *1(*23), 100-102.

Neves, P. (2009). Readiness for change: Contributions for employee's level of individual change and turnover intentions. *Journal of Change Management*, *9*(2), 215-231.

Newman, A. P., Lewis, W. & Beverstock, C. (1993). Prison Literacy. *Philadelphia: National Center of Adult Literacy, 93*(1),31-35.

Nilsson, A. (2003). Living conditions, social exclusion and recidivism among prison inmates. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, *4*(1), 57-83.

O'Connor, T. P., & Perreyclear, M. (2002). Prison religion in action and its influence on offender rehabilitation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *35*(3-4), 11-33.

Oreg, S., Vakola, M. & Armenakis, A. (2011), Change recipients' reactions to organizational change: A sixty-year review of quantitative studies. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *47*(4), 461-524.

Ötting, S. K., & Maier, G. W. (2018). The importance of procedural justice in human–machine interactions: Intelligent systems as new decision agents in organizations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *89*, 27-39.

Paul. M. (1991). *When words are bars*. Kitchener, Ontario: Core Literacy.

Pelissier, B., & Jones, N. (2006). Differences in motivation, coping style, and self-efficacy among incarcerated male and female drug users. *Journal of substance abuse treatment*, *30*(2), 113-120.

Pérez-Vicente, S., & Expósito Ruiz, M. (2009). Descriptive statistics. *Allergologia Et Immunopathologia, 37*(6), 314.

Phelps, M. S. (2011). Rehabilitation in the punitive era: The gap between rhetoric and reality in US prison programs. *Law & Society Review*, *45*(1), 33-68.

Piehl, A. M. (1995). Learning while Doing Time: A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *37*(4), 347-368.

Prendergast, M. L., Farabee, D., Cartier, J., & Henkin, S. (2002). Involuntary treatment within a prison setting: Impact on psychosocial change during treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *29*(1), 5-26.

Rafferty, A. E., Jimmieson, N. L., & Armenakis, A. A. (2013). Change readiness: A multilevel review. *Journal of Management*, *39*(1), 110-135.

Reisig, M. D., & Meško, G. (2009). Procedural justice, legitimacy, and prisoner misconduct. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 15*(1), 41–59.

Rosen, P. J., Hiller, M. L., Webster, J. M., Staton, M., & Leukefeld, C. (2004). Treatment motivation and therapeutic engagement in prison-based substance use treatment. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, *36*(3), 387-396.

Schroeder, R., Broadus, E., & Bradley, C. (2018). Religiosity and crime revisited: Accounting for non-believers. *Deviant Behavior*, 39(5), 632-647.

Serin, R. (1998) Treatment responsivity, intervention and reintegration: A conceptual model. *Forum on Corrections Research, 10*, 29-32.

Simpson, D., & Broome, K. M. (1998). Effects of readiness for drug abuse treatment on client retention and assessment of process. *Addiction*, *93*(8), 1177-1190.

Simpson, D. D., & Joe, G. W. (1993). Motivation as a predictor of early dropout from drug abuse treatment. *Psychotherapy*, *30*, 357-368.

Sinha, R., Easton, C., Renee-Aubin, L., & Carroll, K. M. (2003). Engaging young probation-referred marijuana-abusing individuals in treatment: A pilot study. *American Journal on Addictions*, *12*, 314–323.

Stein, K. F., & Markus, H. R. (1996). The role of the self in behavioral change. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, *6*(4), 349−384.

Stein, L. A., Colby, S. M., Barnett, N. P., Monti, P. M., Golembeske, C., Lebeau-Craven, R., & Miranda, R. (2006). Enhancing substance abuse treatment engagement in incarcerated adolescents. *Psychological Services*, *3*(1), 25.

Sumter, M. T. (2000). Religiousness and post-release community adjustment. *ProQuest Dissertations Publishings.*

Swann, R., & James, P. (1998). The effect of the prison environment upon inmate drug taking behaviour. *The Howard Journal, 37*(3), 252−265.

Tetenbaum, T.J. (1998). Shifting paradigms: From Newton to chaos. *Organizational Dynamics*, *26*(4), 21-32.

Trusty, B., & Eisenberg, M. (2003). Initial process and outcome evaluation of the InnerChange Freedom Initiative: The faith-based prison program in TDCJ. *Criminal Justice Policy Council*. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=206435

Tyler, T. (2003). *Procedural justice, legitimacy, and the effective rule of law*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press

Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law*. Woodstock, Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press.

Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2005). Can businesses effectively regulate employee conduct? The antecedents of rule following in work settings. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(6), 1143-1158.

United States Department of Justice (2019). *Prisoner and prisoner reentry.* Retrieved from https://www.justice.gov/archive/fbci/progmenu_reentry.html

Vacca, J. S. (2004). Educated prisoners are less likely to return to prison. *Journal of Correctional Education*, *15,* 297-305.

Vakola, M., Armenakis, A., & Oreg, S. (2013). Reactions to organizational change from an individual differences' perspective: A review of empirical research. *The Psychology of Organizational Change: Viewing Change from the Employee's Perspective*, *25*, 95-122.

Visian, J. E., Burke, L. O., & Vivian, J. E. (2001). The effect of college programming on recidivism rates at the Hampden County House of Correction: A 5-year study. *Journal of Correctional Education*, *52*(4), 160-162.

Wallace, L. H., Moak, S. C., & Moore, N. T. (2005). Religion as an insulator of delinquency in schools. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *29*(2), 217-233.

Wanberg, C. R., & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(1), 132.

Ward, T. (2002). Good lives and the rehabilitation of offenders: Promises and problems. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, *7*, 513–528.

Ward, T., & Brown, M. (2004). The good lives model and conceptual issues in offender rehabilitation. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *10*(3), 243-257.

Ward, T., Day, A., Howells, K., & Birgden, A. (2004). The multifactor offender readiness model. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *9*(6), 645-673.

Ward, T., & Stewart, C. (2003). The treatment of sex offenders: Risk management and good lives. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *34*(4), 353−360.

Wilson, P. R. (1994). Recidivism and vocational education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 45*(4), 158-163.

Winters, C. A. (1995). Inmate opinions towards education and participation in prison education programmes. *The Police Journal*, *68*(39), 48-49.

APPENDICES

Inmate Program Participation Survey at Marshal County Correctional Facility

Your ID number: _____

Part A: Instructions: The following questions ask about how you see yourself, program opportunities and your treatment in this facility.

Please indicate your level of interest in the following types of programs:

		Not at all Interested	Minimally Interested	Somewhat Interested	Very Interested
1	GED programs	1	2	3	4
2	Literacy Programs	1	2	3	4
3	Substance abuse programs	1	2	3	4
4	Culinary programs (cooking)	1	2	3	4
5	Computer classes	1	2	3	4
6	Pre-release programs	1	2	3	4
7	Moral Cognitive Therapy	1	2	3	4
8	Restorative Justice Programs	1	2	3	4
9	Gardening classes	1	2	3	4
10	Bible Study	1	2	3	4
11	Painting or arts classes	1	2	3	4

12. Are there any programs not listed that you would be interested in? Please specify:

13. Have you participated in any programs offered by MCCF?

    ☐ Yes   ☐ No **(if no, skip to question 16)**

14. If so, please indicate all programs you have participated in (select all that apply):

☐ GED programs	☐ Literacy Programs
☐ Substance abuse programs	☐ Culinary (cooking) classes
☐ Computer classes	☐ Pre-release programs
☐ Moral Cognitive Therapy	☐ Restorative Justice Programs
☐ Gardening classes	☐ Bible Study
☐ Painting or arts classes	☐ Other (Please specify):_____

15. How would you rank the quality of the program(s) I have participated in at MCCF?

    ☐ Very poor   ☐ Poor   ☐ Fair   ☐ Good   ☐ Very good

 a. Why did you choose that ranking of program quality?

16. How satisfied are you with the variety of programs offered at MCCF?

    ☐ Very Dissatisfied   ☐ Dissatisfied   ☐ Neither   ☐ Satisfied   ☐ Very Satisfied

17. Please indicate to what extent, if any, the following factors have been a barrier to participating in MCCF programs:

		Not a Barrier	Somewhat a Barrier	Moderate Barrier	Extreme Barrier
1	Lack of space in program.	1	2	3	4
2	Amount of time to complete program.	1	2	3	4
3	Pre-requisites to get into program.	1	2	3	4
4	Program requirements.	1	2	3	4
5	Program not offered often enough.	1	2	3	4
6	Lack of program variety.	1	2	3	4
7	Prison conditions/circumstances.	1	2	3	4
8	Other (please specify):	1	2	3	4

18. Please elaborate on what factors you found to be moderate or extreme barriers and why they prevent you from participating in programs. Please give examples:

Part B: Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I need help with my problems.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I desire to better myself.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I am tired of the problems caused by my decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I want to get my life straightened out.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Programs and classes give me a chance to solve my problems.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I am concerned about my legal problems.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I feel a lot of pressure to participate in programs.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I have serious health problems related to my past choices.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I have family members that want me to participate in programs while incarcerated.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I need help with my emotional troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I need counseling sessions.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I need educational or vocational training.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I need medical care and services.	1	2	3	4	5
14	My life is out of control.	1	2	3	4	5
15	The kinds of programs offered are not helpful to me.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I participate in programs only because they are required.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I am not ready to participate in programs.	1	2	3	4	5

18. Why did you choose to participate or not participate in a prison program?

Part C: Instructions: Using the 1 to 5 scale, please indicate how much each of the following statements reflects how you typically are: circle the correct number response to each question

		Not at all like me	Not much like me	Somewhat like me	Mostly like me	Very Much like me
1	I am very temperamental (grumpy).	1	2	3	4	5
2	I have an irritable character.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I refuse things that are bad for me.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I get angry when I do something well and it is not appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I wish I had more self-discipline.	1	2	3	4	5
6	It makes me furious when I am criticized in front of other people.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I am a hard worker.	1	2	3	4	5
8	It makes me furious when I do a good job and people do not give value to it.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I get mad when someone screws up my plans.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I have an angry mood.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I am good at resisting temptation.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I have a hard time breaking bad habits.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I am lazy.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I say inappropriate things.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I do certain things that are bad for me, if they are fun.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Setbacks don't discourage me. I don't give up easily.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I get angry very easily.	1	2	3	4	5
18	People would say that I have iron self-discipline.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Pleasure and fun sometimes keep me from getting work done.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I have trouble concentrating.	1	2	3	4	5
21	I am able to work effectively toward long-term goals.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Sometimes I can't stop myself from doing something, even if I know it is wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I often act without thinking through all the alternatives.	1	2	3	4	5

24	New ideas and projects sometimes distract me from previous ones.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I blow up easily.	1	2	3	4	5
26	I often set a goal but later choose to pursue a different one.	1	2	3	4	5
27	It makes me furious when I do stupid mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5
28	I have difficulty maintaining my focus on projects that take more than a few months to complete.	1	2	3	4	5
29	I finish whatever I begin.	1	2	3	4	5
30	My interests change from year to year.	1	2	3	4	5
31	I am diligent. I never give up.	1	2	3	4	5
32	I have been obsessed with a certain idea or project for a short time but later lost interest.	1	2	3	4	5
33	I have overcome setbacks to conquer an important challenge.	1	2	3	4	5

Part D: Instructions: Using the 1 to 5 scale, please indicate how much you agree with the following statements: circle the correct number response to each question.

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	Staff members of this correctional facility treat me with respect.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Staff members of this correctional facility apply the rules accurately..	1	2	3	4	5
3	Staff members of this correctional facility respect my rights.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Staff members of this correctional facility give honest explanations for their actions	1	2	3	4	5
5	Staff members of this correctional facility try to get the facts before doing something.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Staff members of this correctional facility give me a chance to express my views before they make decisions..	1	2	3	4	5
7	Staff members of this correctional facility are courteous to me.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Staff members of this correctional facility listen to me when deciding what to do with me	1	2	3	4	5
9	Staff members of this correctional facility treat me fairly.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Staff members of this correctional facility take decisions based on opinions instead of facts.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Staff members of this correctional facility make decisions in fair ways.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Staff members of this correctional facility treat everyone equally.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I should accept the guards' decisions even if I think they are wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I should do what the guards tell me even if I disagree.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I should do what the guards tell me to do even if I do not like the way I am treated.	1	2	3	4	5
16	People like me must break the law to get ahead.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I should not break the law to try to get ahead in life.	1	2	3	4	5
18	There is never a good reason to break the law.	1	2	3	4	5
19	A hungry man has the right to steal.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Only obey laws that seem reasonable.	1	2	3	4	5

21	It is best to earn an easy living, even by breaking the law.	1	2	3	4	5
22	The guards are doing well in controlling violent crime.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I feel safe in community spaces in the prison.	1	2	3	4	5
24	The guards are doing a good job of preventing crime in the prison.	1	2	3	4	5

Part E: Using the 1 to 5 scale, please indicate how much you agree with the following statements: circle the correct number response to each question.

		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1	I am angry.	1	2	3	4	5
2	I consider how my actions will affect others.	1	2	3	4	5
3	I am furious.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I plan ahead.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I feel irritated.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I have trouble sleeping.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I have much to be proud of.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I feel angry.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I am annoyed.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I feel interested in life.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I feel like a failure.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I have trouble concentrating or remembering things.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I feel afraid of certain things, like elevators, crowds, or going out alone.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I feel anxious or nervous.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I wish I had more respect for myself.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I am likely to feel the need to use drugs in the next few months.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I feel sad or depressed.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I think about probable results of my actions.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I feel extra tired or run down.	1	2	3	4	5

20	I have trouble sitting still for long.	1	2	3	4	5
21	I think about what causes my current problems.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I am likely to drink alcohol in the next few months.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I think of several different ways to solve a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I feel I am basically no good.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I worry or brood a lot.	1	2	3	4	5
26	I have trouble making decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
27	I feel hopeless about the future.	1	2	3	4	5
28	I make good decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
29	I am likely to relapse in the next few months.	1	2	3	4	5
30	In general, I am satisfied with myself.	1	2	3	4	5
31	I make decisions without thinking about consequences.	1	2	3	4	5
32	I feel tense or keyed-up.	1	2	3	4	5
33	I feel I am unimportant to others.	1	2	3	4	5
34	I feel tightness or tension in my muscles.	1	2	3	4	5
35	I am likely to have problems in quitting drug use.	1	2	3	4	5
36	I feel lonely.	1	2	3	4	5
37	I analyze problems by looking at all the choices.	1	2	3	4	5

Part F:

1. What is your age? _____

2. Are you Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish Origin?

    ☐ Yes   ☐ No

3. How would you describe yourself?
    ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
    ☐ Asian
    ☐ Black or African American
    ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
    ☐ White
    ☐ Other:_____

4. What is your marital status?
    ☐ Single (never married)
    ☐ Married, or in a domestic partnership
    ☐ Widowed
    ☐ Divorced

What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?
    ☐ Less than high school diploma
    ☐ High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)
    ☐ Some college, no degree
    ☐ Associate degree (e.g., AA or AS)
    ☐ Bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, BS)
    ☐ Master's degree (e.g., MD, DDS, DVM)
    ☐ Doctorate (e.g., PhD, EdD)

5. How long have you been at MCCF?
    ☐ Less than 1 month
    ☐ 1-6 months
    ☐ 7-12 months
    ☐ More than 1 year, but less than 5 years
    ☐ 5 years or more

6. How long is your sentence? _____

APPENDIX B

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
RESEARCH INFORMED CONSENT

1. Principal Researcher: ___Kimberly Kaiser, PhD._____

2. Title of Proposal: __Inmate Participation in Correctional Programs_____

3. Purpose of Research: The purpose of this study is to better understand the inmates' perceptions of correctional programs and their motivations for participating or not in the various programs offered at MCCF._____

4. Methodology: _This study will conduct a paper-pencil survey to all inmates. The survey should take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. After completion, your survey will be linked to your institutional records on program participation and related outcomes.
_____

5. Approximate duration of Research Project: __January – May 2019_____

6. Risks, inconveniences and/or discomforts disclosure: _The risks associated with this study are minimal. Inmates may feel uncomfortable answering some questions about their program participation and feelings about MCCF. Inmates may skip any questions they do not wish to answer. Only pooled responses will be reported. All survey responses will be kept confidential and individual responses will not be shared with any persons affiliated with MCCF or MDOC.

7. The participant's rights, welfare, and privacy will be protected in the following manner:

    A. In signing this consent form, you have not waived any of your legal rights, nor have you released this agency from liability for negligence.

    B. All data obtained from you during the course of this study will be accessible only to the principal researcher(s).

    C. Should the results of this project be published, you will be referred to only by number.

    D. As a research volunteer, you are free to withdraw this consent and to discontinue participation in this study or activity at any time.

I understand the procedures to be used in this study and the possible risks involved. All my questions have been answered. I also understand that my rights and privacy will be maintained, and I freely and voluntarily choose to participate. I understand that I may withdraw at any time.

MDOC Policy does not allow you to receive any gratuities or compensation of any kind.

Participant Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Researcher Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

10-04 F2
Revised: 12/15/05

Verbal Recruitment Script

Hello, my name is (Name of researcher) and I am a faculty member from the Department of Legal Studies at the University of Mississippi. I am conducting research to look at use and experiences with programs that are available within the facility. I am inviting you to participate to give feedback on your experiences with the programs offered within the Marshall County Correctional Facility. If you have not used these programs, I would like to invite you to share your thoughts and experiences to help understand why and what barriers may prevent you from engaging with programs in the facility.

To participate in this research, you will be asked to complete a survey about your attitudes and experiences with the programs at MCCF, which should take about 20 - 40 minutes to complete. Your responses will then be linked to your institutional records to review program engagement and outcomes.

The purpose of this study is to identify ways to better the experiences of inmates within the facility and the Mississippi Department of Corrections more generally. The research team is not affiliated with the facility or the Department of Corrections, and correctional facilities more generally. Your participation is completely voluntary. Your answers to the questions will be kept confidential and your individual responses will not be shared with correctional staff or anyone other than the research team. Only group findings will be reported so there is no way the results can be linked to any individual.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 915-662-251

VITA

Kornicha Shaneice Johnson

Education:

The University of Mississippi, University, MS │2019
Master of Criminal Justice| School of Applied Sciences

The University of Mississippi, University, MS │2018
Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice & Minor in History

Honors and Activities:

- University of Mississippi's Class of 2018 Who's Who
- Dean's Honor Scholar 2018
- Former Alpha Phi Sigma, Mu Rho Chapter's Vice-President (2018)
- Former National Society for Collegiate Scholars' Vice-President (2018)

Work Experience:

University of Mississippi, Legal Studies Department, Oxford, MS
Graduate Teacher Assistant, Current

- Provides resourceful and administrative aids to Criminal Justice Professors within the Legal Studies Department
- Assist in lecturing course material for undergraduate classes of Intro to Homeland Security and Emergency Management
- Assist in engaging course objectives by ensuring the preparation of class materials and post class materials availability
- Contributes to the courses grading and feedback process
- Maintains database for course attendance and student testing
- Represents the Legal Studies Department in various recruitment, interactive, and promotional events

Renasant Bank, Oxford, MS
Full-time Teller, 2018-2019

- Promoted a professional environment that served at the needs of management, colleagues, and customers
- Devoted professional and acquired skills to ensure the company's standards and policies were exceedingly met
  - Received top recognition for a perfect score during mystery shop in our district

- Oversaw and ensured daily transactions were balanced and branch cut-offs were met
- Processed deposits, loan payments, withdrawals, checks, etc.
- Marketed new promotions to recruited customers, while working to increase new account sales goals
- Represented the company at marketing and community events
- Floated from three branch locations in the event of employees' absence or to meet a branch's needs
- Worked beyond the duties of transactions such as trained employees, worked as head teller backup, drafted customer documentations/various forms, assisted in closing/opening procedures, responded to emails/customer calls, scanned forms, etc.

FastTrack Mentor, University of Mississippi
Academic Peer Leader, 2015 & 2017
- Guided over twenty Freshmen students successfully through their transition from high school to college
- Aided as a resource academically and personally by equipping each student with the tools they needed to navigate in their first year
- Provided support to the instructor by leading discussions based on the curriculum topics assigned
- Structured and coordinated lessons inside/outside the classroom setting according to the course calendar
- Conducted personal sessions with each student to help tailor their growth while assisting them in accomplishing their goals at the institution (over 20 students)

The Hatchet Law Firm, P.C., Atlanta, GA
Legal Intern, June-August 2017
- Researched vital materials needed in understanding cases and managing additional findings
- Summarized the facts of assigned cases and created timelines for the interpretation of the attorneys
- Assisted in the decision-making process to accept or decline cases
- Aided in drafting complaints and motions for cases
- Drafted press release for cases; this included keeping up with all social media alerts and providing a sequence of current events
- Accompanied in the preparations of trials, hearings, and depositions