

THE ACTUALIZATION AND IMPACT OF TEAM CLASSIFICATION  
IN STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS\*

John R. Hepburn, Ph.D.,  
Department of Sociology  
University of Missouri-St. Louis

and

Celesta A. Taylor, Director  
Criminal Justice Planning  
Missouri Division of Corrections

Presented in Panel 11: "Institutional Treatment of Offenders"  
at The National Conference on Criminal Justice Evaluation.

\* This project was jointly funded by the Missouri Division of Corrections and Grant #75-ED-07-0003 from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. The findings and conclusions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the U.S. Department of Justice or the Missouri Division of Corrections.

53998

The concept of a treatment team working together in routine inmate classification decisions is a rather new and untested correctional innovation (Loveland, 1960; Burns, 1975). The treatment team concept, as an alternative to the conventional classification team, was first implemented in 1961 at the Federal Reformatory in El Reno, Oklahoma, modified somewhat when introduced at the Federal Youth Center at Englewood, Colorado, and refined further before its inauguration at the Federal Correctional Institution at Tallahassee, Florida (Hagan and Campbell, 1968). The major characteristics of Team Classification as implemented are (1) caseloads structured around housing units, (2) teams of a small number of specialists, and (3) assignment to the team of the full range of case management responsibility.

Team Classification in Missouri is designed to exemplify a team approach to the decentralization of decision-making. The team consists of the inmate and those institutional staff who theoretically are most closely and directly involved with the inmate and are most aware of his assets and needs: his caseworker, his parole officer, his immediate work supervisor and the correctional officer supervisor or counselor assigned to the inmate's housing unit. The combined effort of these staff and the inmate is to formulate and implement a personalized plan for each inmate around which will be made decisions pertaining to such matters as cell, educational and job program assignments, furlough and work release, and disciplinary action.

The inmate's presence on the team as an active participant with equal voice and vote in deciding the immediate issue that concerns him is designed to facilitate an understanding of the different positions of staff and inmate. Furthermore, the inclusion of the inmate is designed to foster a greater

understanding of the rationale underlying the decision, resulting in greater inmate cooperation with and conformity to that decision. The observations and combined efforts of Team Classification are, by design, to culminate in an accurate, wholistic view of the inmate's adjustment to the institution and provide a basis for more appropriate and less fragmented decision-making. Similarly, while each staff member makes a unique contribution to the decision-making process, it is felt that the inclusion of both treatment and custody staff will create fewer misunderstandings, will develop a spirit of fair play, and will develop mutual goals with other staff members of the team. Through the inclusion of all relevant persons in the decision-making process, therefore, team classification, as a conceptual model is designed to facilitate greater understanding among staff and between staff and inmates and thereby achieve more favorable attitudes between and among these two segments of the institution.

The team's central overall task is that of developing a personalized plan for each inmate. Relatedly, the team is to continually re-evaluate the inmate's behaviors and attitudes in light of present staff observations. The team is to accomplish its tasks through collective decision-making with all five team members having an equal vote. By formulating an overall plan which theoretically reflects the needs and desires of the inmate and which takes into account the institution's ability to meet these defined needs, fair and appropriate decisions are to result. In summary, the team is structured and charged to provide for "continuity of responsibility, which reduces program fragmentation, increases the likelihood of meeting inmates' individual needs, and fosters improved interpersonal relationships among staff and between inmates and staff" (Directive on Team Classification, 1975:2).

Research Objectives

This evaluation of Team Classification focuses on program actualization and program impact. The assessment of actualization will provide information pertaining to the extent to which Team Classification is being implemented according to its original conceptualization, for there is no available evidence that the existing operation of Team Classification adequately reflects the concept as previously delineated. Among the criteria for effective implementation of Team Classification are the following: (1) development of personalized plan which meets the needs of the inmate appearing before the team; (2) granting an equal role to participating members; (3) decisions based on inmates' present behavior rather than past behavior; (4) open discussions in team meetings; (5) familiarity of team members with inmate team members; (6) team responsiveness to inmate needs. Data pertaining to these criteria, in addition to data regarding the frequency of involvement, will permit an assessment of the degree to which Team Classification has been actualized in the Missouri Correctional System.

The evaluation of program impact is directed to (1) staff and inmate attitudes toward Team Classification as a decision-making process and (2) staff and inmate attitudes toward general conditions in the facility. Those attitudes toward Team Classification which are operationalized include: fairness of Team Classification, staff's perceived impact of Team Classification on their job, staff support of Team Classification, impact of Team Classification on inmates, and perceived effect of Team Classification on the relations among staff and between staff and inmates. The following general conditions in the

facility are utilized to ascertain the broader impact of Team Classification among staff: attitude toward inmates, attitude toward work assignment, staff attitude toward other staff, treatment vs. punishment orientation, and role conflict. The general attitudes among inmates are attitude toward living assignment, attitude toward program assignment, attitude toward staff, and alienation.

The underlying model guiding this research (see Suchman, 1969) assumes that greater actualization of Team Classification will lead to more positive attitudes toward Team Classification by both inmates and staff, which, in turn, will result in more positive staff and inmate attitudes toward their general conditions within the facility. More specifically, the evaluation is directed toward the assertions made by the proponents of Team Classification, assertions which explicitly state that a highly actualized implementation of Team Classification will gain the cooperation of inmates, promote inmate-staff and staff-staff understanding, and provide a fair vehicle of decision-making. It is reasoned, further, that if the implementation of Team Classification can realize these objectives it may also, as a result, have a larger impact within the facility, such as the reduction of role conflict among staff and alienation among inmates.

#### Research Methods

Although an experimental research design would be desirable, Team Classification had been an operational program in the institutions for at least two years prior to the funding of this research project. This evaluation, consequently, had to be based on a cross-sectional design (Suchman, 1970)

without the more desirable protest measure and control group. A 90-item, anonymously completed survey was verbally administered to a random sample of inmates in groups of approximately 25 persons at each institution. A combined total of 1,297 inmates were surveyed from all of the correctional institutions. Table 1 reports the inmate population and the size of the inmate sample; each sample size allows for 98 per cent precision in 99 out of 100 samples. A self-administered instrument was distributed in each correctional institution to all those staff who directly interact with inmates on a routine basis. Table 1

---

TABLE 1 HERE

---

also reports the number of anonymous questionnaires returned by staff at each facility. The data analysis is thus performed on the responses to forced-choice items by 27.6 per cent of Missouri's adult inmate population and 67.6 per cent of all treatment and custody staff working within Missouri's adult correctional institutions.

Each variable is measured by means of a summated, Likert scale consisting of items to which the respondent indicates the extent of his agreement or disagreement on a five-point continuum from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. In each case the items of the scale are significantly ( $p < .001$ ) correlated with one another and with the total scale score value. Measures of split-half reliability indicate greater reliability with those scales measuring staff attitudes, but all scales meet the minimum reliability requirements. Actualization is operationalized as the summated score of the individual scale scores of its components: familiarity, personalized plan,

equal role, present behavior, open discussions and, for inmates, responsiveness. Perhaps a more reliable assessment of Team Classification's actualization could be obtained by means of systematic observation of Team Classification meetings; this would require a large sample of lengthy observations within each facility, however, which was precluded by restraints on time and resources. The absence of an objective criterion of the degree of actualization has mandated a reliance on the views of respondents, acknowledging that respondents may perceive a higher or lower level of actualization than actually (if measured in other ways) exists. From a social-psychological view, however, it is the perception of actualization, rather than the actual degree of actualization, that will have whatever attitude impact is associated with Team Classification.

#### Data Analysis

##### Implementation and Actualization

Data presented in Table 2 indicate the scale score range, scale score mean and the proportion of the maximum value approached by the mean for each actualization component for staff and inmates who indicated membership in Team Classification. Since there is no a priori absolute value which, when reached, indicates that effective implementation is occurring or against which the observed level of actualization can be measured, another operational device was created. The scale score range for each actualization component indicates the minimum and maximum scores possible, the scale score mean indicates the average score, and the proportion reveals how close the observed score is to the maximum obtainable score (a proportion of 1.0 would indicate that the maximum and the average are the same). Familiarity among members

and the examination of present rather than past behaviors are the most highly actualized among staff since in both cases the proportion indicates that the degree of actualization is well over half the (measurable) potential. According to inmate responses, responsiveness to inmate needs and familiarity of members are most highly actualized. Given the admittedly crude measurement device of a questionnaire, the results suggest that the components of Team Classification have been implemented to various degrees, and all of them appear to have been implemented to some degree.

---

TABLE 2 HERE

---

Table 2 also reports the Pearsonian correlation coefficients of each component scale score to the total actualization scale score. The coefficients among component scales are all positive and range from .45 to .92 for staff and .16 to .55 among inmates, indicating a high level of concomitant variation among the components. This suggests that (1) those teams in which one or two components are actualized are also those teams which are likely to actualize all components and (2) the various components do not appear to be working at cross-purposes.

According to the survey results, 48.7 per cent of the staff and 79.8 per cent of the inmates have been involved with Team Classification. Difference of means t-tests which examine the difference in staff and inmate attitudes when distinctions are made on Team Classification membership, frequency of participation or length of participation are reported in Table 3. Inmate attitude toward work assignment is significantly more favorable among members than non-members. Yet, inmate alienation is higher and attitude toward staff

is less positive among those with a longer rather than shorter length of participation in the program. Similarly, inmates with a higher frequency of participation have a less favorable attitude toward staff than those with a lower frequency of participation. Furthermore, this apparent negative effect is not limited to inmates. Data for staff reveal that team members have a significantly lower attitude toward both inmates and their work assignment, a significantly more favorable attitude toward punishment of inmates, and a greater degree of role conflict than non-members. Less favorable attitudes toward their work assignments and toward inmates are

---

TABLE 3 HERE

---

also more characteristic of those staff who have participated for longer rather than shorter durations and frequently rather than infrequently.

There is little evidence to suggest that involvement per se improves the general attitudes of inmates or officers. Indeed, it appears that, where any such attitudinal differences do exist, involvement is more likely to result in less favorable rather than more favorable attitudes. Table 3 also reports the mean differences among staff and inmate attitudes by the level of the respondent's perception of the actualization of Team Classification. The results clearly and consistently illustrate a positive effect of higher actualization on the attitudes of both inmates and staff. It is not the existence of the program, then, nor the involvement of personnel in that program that appear to affect attitudes. What appears to be the crucial factor in its affect upon these attitudes is the degree to which those who are involved feel that the program is being implemented in a credible and

efficacious manner consistent with the program's design.

Assessing the Impact of Team Classification

Does the degree to which Team Classification is felt to be actualized affect the attitudes of inmates and staff toward Team Classification, which in turn affects certain attitudes about the facility? The matrix of Pearsonian correlation coefficients presented in Table 4 demonstrates the relationship among the measures of actualization, attitudes toward Team Classification, and general attitudes for those staff who are or have been members. With regard to the relationship between actualization and staff attitudes toward

---

TABLE 4 HERE

---

Team Classification, two important facts emerge. First, actualization is not significantly related to: improved staff understanding, improved inmate understanding, or positive job impact. Second, actualization is negatively associated with staff attitude pertaining to Team Classification's impact on inmates, affect on inmate-staff understanding and support by inmates. When combined with the positive associations between actualization and fairness, staff support and warden support, it appears that a highly actualized Team Classification procedure has no relation to staff understanding of inmates or other staff but is nonetheless favorably received by the staff, who themselves feel it is not favorably received by the inmates.

Table 4 also reports the coefficients of correlation among staff actualization scores and staff attitude toward inmates, work assignment, other staff, punishment and role conflict. These data suggest that actualization is positively associated with staff attitude toward inmates, work

assignment and other staff, and negatively associated with staff attitude toward punishment and role conflict. The relationships existent between the various measures of attitudes toward Team Classification and general attitudes are also presented in Table 4. Attitude toward inmates is positively associated with inmate support for Team Classification, improved inmate-staff understanding and impact on inmates. Staff attitude toward work assignment, other staff, punishment and role conflict, with few exceptions, are significantly associated with each of the measures of attitudes toward Team Classification. It was assumed that a highly actualized Team Classification procedure would reduce role conflict among staff and result in a less punitive attitude toward inmates; the negative relationships reported in Table 4 provide support for that assumption.

Table 5 presents the matrix of coefficients between inmate measures of actualization, attitudes toward Team Classification and general attitudes. The relationships between Team Classification actualization and all inmate attitudes toward Team Classification are at a level of statistical significance and, with one exception, indicate a strong, positive relationship between actualization and support for Team Classification, especially the improvement of inmate-staff understanding and relations.

---

TABLE 5 HERE

---

The correlations between actualization and general inmate attitudes indicate that the higher the actualization, (1) the more favorable the attitude toward work assignment, cell assignment and staff and (2) the lower the inmate's feeling of alienation. The associations between these general

attitudes and each of the measures of inmate attitudes toward Team Classification are also presented in Table 5. Team Classification's fairness, impact on job, improvement of inmate-staff relations and understanding, impact on inmates and helpfulness are all strongly associated with the inmate's attitude toward staff (positive) as well as his feeling of alienation (negative). While attitudes toward Team Classification are largely unrelated to attitude toward both cell and work assignment, their strong association with alienation and attitude toward staff suggest that a favorably received Team Classification procedure reduces some sources of stress and conflict among inmates.

#### Causal Inferences

In summary, data from inmate respondents reveal that (1) actualization is significantly associated with attitudes toward Team Classification, (2) actualization is significantly associated with inmate alienation and attitude toward both staff and work assignment, and (3) nearly all attitudes toward Team Classification are significantly associated with inmate alienation and attitude toward staff. Covariation, however, is not causation and the causal order among these factors cannot be established within the limitations of these data. Yet inferences of causation can be made on the basis of partial correlation coefficients. Subsequent analysis of inmate responses examine (1) the relationship between actualization and attitudes toward Team Classification when the effects of general attitudes are partialled out and (2) the relationship between actualization and general attitudes when the effects of attitudes toward Team Classification are partialled.

Performing the first set of partials, the findings reported in Table 6

indicate little observed change in the relationship between actualization and each of the attitudes toward Team Classification when inmate alienation, attitude toward cell assignment, attitude toward work assignment, or attitude toward staff is controlled. This suggests that these general attitudes do not intervene between actualization and attitudes toward Team Classification; apparently, then, it is not the case that more favorable general attitudes lead to more favorable attitudes toward Team Classi-

---

TABLE 6 HERE

---

fication. Furthermore, the coefficients between actualization and general attitudes, when partialling on attitudes toward Team Classification, remain quite strong. Yet some of these measures should reduce the bivariate relation to near-zero if attitude toward Team Classification intervenes completely in this relationship. Apparently there is a strong relationship between actualization of Team Classification and general inmate attitudes which is not dependent upon a favorable attitude toward Team Classification. Finally, the bivariate relation between attitude toward Team Classification and general attitudes is reduced but strong when actualization is partialled. This suggests that although actualization is related to both of the other measures, the relation between those other measures is not spurious.

The emergent conclusion is that (1) actualization has an effect on both attitudes toward Team Classification and on general attitudes, and (2) attitude toward Team Classification has an effect on general attitudes. The multiple correlation coefficients of all Team Classification attitudes and actualization on attitude to living assignment, work assignment, staff and

alienation are .15, .20, .55 and .38, respectively, indicating that a significant amount of the variation in inmate alienation and attitude toward staff is explained.

Summarizing the analysis of staff data, the following associations have already been noted: (1) actualization is positively associated with Team Classification fairness, impact on job, and both staff and warden support, and negatively associated with improved inmate-staff understanding, impact on inmates, and inmate support; (2) actualization is positively associated with staff attitude toward inmates, work assignment, and other staff and negatively associated with punishment of inmates and role conflict; (3) nearly all staff attitudes toward Team Classification are significantly related to staff attitude toward work assignment, other staff, punishment of inmates and role conflict. In addition, analyses not presented herein demonstrate that (4) whatever affects attitudes toward Team Classification has on general attitudes is largely limited to those staff that are members of Team Classification and (5) among members, actualization is more strongly associated with attitudes toward Team Classification among treatment staff but more strongly associated with general attitudes among custody staff.

The partialling technique was utilized to make inferences about the causal order of actualization, Team Classification attitudes and general attitudes, and these data are provided in Table 7. The bivariate relation between actualization and each attitude toward Team Classification remains unchanged when each general attitude is partialled, indicating that general attitudes do not intervene in the relation of actualization and Team Classification attitudes and demonstrating that general attitudes are not a cause of both actualization and Team Classification attitudes. When partialled by attitudes to Team

Classification, the covariation between actualization and general attitudes remain rather constant, suggesting that the effect of actualization on general attitudes is more direct than indirect (through attitudes toward Team Classification) and that attitude toward Team Classification is not the cause of both its actualization level and general attitudes. Finally,

---

TABLE 7 HERE

---

the coefficients of attitudes toward Team Classification and general attitude remain quite strong when partialled by actualization and, consequently, it cannot be said that general attitudes affect the (perceived) degree of actualization, which in turn affects attitudes toward Team Classification.

The results of the partial correlations suggest that general staff attitudes are directly affected by both the level of actualization and attitude toward Team Classification and that attitude toward Team Classification is affected by level of actualization. The multiple correlation coefficients of .35, .41, .56, .43 and .53 are obtained when actualization and Team Classification attitudes are correlated with staff attitudes toward inmates, work assignment, other staff, punishment of inmates and role conflict, respectively. It is noteworthy that a significant amount of the variation in each of the five general attitudes is explained by actualization level and attitudes toward Team Classification.

As a final note, the relationships between actualization, Team Classification attitudes and general attitudes for both inmates and staff were examined by each of the seven correctional facilities in the state. No systematic variation was found according to size or security level. In general, the impact of actualization level varies somewhat among the facilities

and the higher the level of actualization, the more favorable the inmate and staff attitude toward Team Classification and general conditions.

### Implications

Numerous implications emerge from the findings to inform and instruct those who would administer such a classification program. Among the major factors to be considered are the following: (1) membership and participation per se are not likely to produce the given results; decisive measures must be taken to maximize the degree to which the operation of Team Classification adheres to the tenets and guidelines around which the concept has developed; (2) those tenets and guidelines can be put into operation and they are not mutually incompatible; (3) when well implemented, Team Classification appears to improve inmate understanding of and relations to staff and reduce inmate alienation; (4) when well implemented, Team Classification appears to improve staff relationships, reduce role conflict among staff, and improve their outlook on their job and on inmates; (5) the effects of Team Classification will be greater on members than on non-members, and treatment staff will respond in a different manner than custody staff. As a caveat, it should be noted that this evaluation focused on desired or positive consequences of Team Classification; little can be said of the negative consequences or costs of such a program.

Perhaps the most obvious implication to emerge from this evaluative effort is the need for a more systematic and longitudinal evaluation, an experimental design initiated prior to the program's implementation to randomly assign subjects, assemble pre-program data, monitor the development and operation of the program and gather post-program data for comparison purposes.

The utilization of cross-sectional research designs provides inadequate and, at best, inconclusive results regardless of the sophistication of the data collection and data analysis processes. Because of the inherent limitations within this evaluation of Team Classification, the implications derived from the data must be viewed as more suggestive than informative. Some associations have been observed in this, the "Reconnaissance Phase," and the impetus now must be to use an experimental design to measure the extent of the effect (Rossi, 1972).

TABLE 1  
INMATE AND STAFF SAMPLES BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Inmates			Staff		
	Total Inmate Population	Sample Size	Percent of Population	Number Surveyed	Number of Respondents	Percent Return
Missouri State Penitentiary	2,341	356	15.2	325	198	60.9
Missouri Training Center for Men	1,025	199	19.4	178	120	67.4
Church Farm	386	169	47.8	34	27	79.4
Renz Farm	169	95	56.2	32	25	78.1
Fordland Honor Camp	153	101	66.0	34	27	79.4
State Correctional Center for Women	111	90	81.1	38	30	78.9
Missouri Intermediate Reformatory	516	287	55.6	110	81	67.4
	TOTAL: 4,701	1,297	27.6	751	508	67.6

TABLE 2  
ACTUALIZATION OF TEAM CLASSIFICATION: AN ANALYSIS  
OF ITS COMPONENTS

Team Classification Components	Scale Score Range	Scale Score Mean	Mean to Maximum Value Proportion	Pearsonian Correlation To Actualization Scale Score
<u>Staff:</u>				
a. familiarity	1-5	3.426	.69	.73
b. personalized plan	4-20	12.402	.62	.87
c. equal role	6-30	14.653	.49	.91
d. present behavior	3-15	11.502	.77	.77
e. open discussions	9-45	23.246	.52	.92
<u>Inmates:</u>				
a. familiarity	1-5	2.89	.58	.60
b. personalized plan	4-20	9.45	.47	.64
c. equal role	9-45	18.44	.41	.74
d. present behavior	2-10	4.28	.43	.61
e. open discussions	4-20	10.32	.52	.67
f. responsiveness	2-10	7.04	.70	.54

TABLE 3

MEAN DIFFERENCES ON INMATE AND STAFF GENERAL ATTITUDES BETWEEN  
LEVELS OF TEAM CLASSIFICATION MEMBERSHIP, PARTICIPATION AND ACTUALIZATION

	<u>Team Membership</u>			<u>Length of Participation</u>			<u>Frequency of Participation</u>			<u>Actualization Level</u>		
	<u>Non-Member</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>T-Value</u>	<u>1 Year Or Less</u>	<u>More Than</u>		<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>T-Value</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>T-Value</u>
					<u>1 Year</u>	<u>1 Year</u>						
<u>Inmates:</u>												
a. Living Assignment	6.05	6.11	.28	6.13	6.04	.64	6.08	6.15	.48	5.90	6.31	3.29*
b. Work Assignment	2.97	3.62	2.06*	3.65	3.39	1.38	3.67	3.36	1.54	3.08	4.08	5.77*
c. Staff	11.17	10.71	1.08	11.11	10.10	3.80*	10.91	10.30	2.23*	9.09	12.53	15.36*
d. Alienation	14.99	15.42	1.20	15.23	15.63	1.86*	15.38	15.40	.11	16.28	14.40	9.88*
<u>Staff:</u>												
a. Inmates	6.40	5.53	5.14*	5.75	5.28	1.80*	5.83	5.38	1.54	5.29	5.82	2.02*
b. Work Assignment	11.94	10.49	4.42*	11.18	10.03	2.17*	11.38	10.31	1.59	9.83	11.89	4.04*
c. Other Staff	13.17	12.89	.80	13.75	12.77	1.63	13.92	13.04	1.27	12.44	14.68	3.77*
d. Punishment	10.69	11.86	3.44*	12.50	11.93	1.08	12.63	12.05	.96	12.71	11.22	2.84*
e. Role Conflict	17.14	18.50	2.89*	17.99	19.05	1.42	17.85	18.73	1.03	19.60	16.60	4.10*

\*Indicates the T-Value is significant at or greater than  $p < .05$

1

Since staff had a higher average frequency of participation than did inmates, "low" inmate frequency is four or less meetings and "high" inmate frequency is five or more meetings while "low" and "high" frequency for staff are nine or less meetings and ten or more meetings, respectively.

2

Actualization level is dichotomized into "low" and "high" around the mean actualization level score. The mean for inmates is 15.55 and the mean for staff is 15.15.

TABLE 4  
CORRELATION MATRIX OF ACTUALIZATION, ATTITUDE TOWARD  
TEAM CLASSIFICATION AND GENERAL ATTITUDES, FOR STAFF

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>Actualization of Program:</u>															
1. Actualization Score	1.00	.15	.11	-.16	.17	.16	-.04	-.04	-.21	-.22	.17	.19	.19	-.09	-.15
<u>Team Classification Assessment:</u>															
2. Fairness		1.00	.90	.40	.29	.26	.87	.84	.49	.48	.08	.18	.08	-.20	-.19
3. Positive Job Impact			1.00	.29	.20	.19	.93	.93	.40	.44	.09	.17	-.02	-.27	-.19
4. Inmate Support				1.00	.43	.23	.27	.20	.52	.52	.19	.27	.33	-.20	-.30
5. Staff Support					1.00	.43	.15	.07	.55	.51	.04	.27	.44	-.04	-.36
6. Warden Support						1.00	.13	.12	.32	.35	.05	.17	.22	-.08	-.24
7. Improve Staff Understanding							1.00	.96	.34	.31	.09	.12	-.01	-.19	-.12
8. Improve Inmate Understanding								1.00	.22	.24	.07	.10	-.10	-.19	-.06
9. Improve Inmate/Staff									1.00	.69	.17	.34	.40	-.21	-.42
10. Impact on Inmates										1.00	.25	.33	.28	-.34	-.47
<u>General Attitudes:</u>															
11. Inmates											1.00	.37	.15	-.22	-.13
12. Work Assignment												1.00	.47	-.16	-.45
13. Other Staff													1.00	.01	-.51
14. Punishment														1.00	.28
15. Role Conflict															1.00

TABLE 5  
CORRELATION MATRIX OF ACTUALIZATION, ATTITUDE TOWARD  
TEAM CLASSIFICATION AND GENERAL ATTITUDES, FOR INMATES

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Actualization of Program:</u>													
1. Actualization Score	1.00	.55	.51	.15	.18	.57	.46	-.24	.50	.09	.14	.46	-.31
<u>Team Classification Assessment:</u>													
2. Fairness		1.00	.54	.17	.33	.59	.50	-.09	.70	.08	.13	.44	-.22
3. Positive Job Impact			1.00	.19	.27	.51	.54	.01	.52	.08	.13	.34	-.21
4. Staff Support				1.00	-.03	.09	.18	.15	.16	.03	.02	.08	.01
5. Inmate Support					1.00	.24	.28	.03	.33	.03	.08	.18	-.04
6. Improve Inmate/Staff Relations						1.00	.46	-.17	.51	.11	.06	.47	-.26
7. Improve Inmate/Staff Understanding							1.00	.01	.46	.06	.10	.32	-.17
8. Impact on Inmates								1.00	-.10	.04	-.02	-.16	.24
9. Helpfulness									1.00	.09	.18	.37	-.23
<u>General Attitudes:</u>													
10. Living Assignment										1.00	.09	.07	-.02
11. Work Assignment											1.00	.20	-.11
12. Staff												1.00	-.29
13. Alienation													1.00

TABLE 6  
 PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD TEAM  
 CLASSIFICATION, GENERAL ATTITUDES AND ACTUALIZATION, FOR INMATES

Team Classification:	Coefficient of Actualization and Attitudes Toward Team Classification When General Attitudes Partialled				Coefficient of Attitudes Toward Team Classification and General Attitudes When Actualization Partialled				Coefficient of Actualization and General Attitudes When Attitudes Toward Team Classification Partialled			
	General Attitudes				General Attitudes				General Attitudes			
	Living Assignment	Work Assignment	Staff	Alienation	Living Assignment	Work Assignment	Staff	Alienation	Living Assignment	Work Assignment	Staff	Alienation
69 Fairness	.40	.39	.28	.37	.04	.06	.26	-.22	.05	.08	.28	-.24
Positive Job Impact	.38	.37	.29	.35	.05	.07	.14	-.06	.05	.08	.35	-.24
Staff Support	.08	.09	.07	.10	.07	-.01	.01	.07	.08	.14	.45	-.32
Inmate Support	.10	.09	.04	.09	.02	.06	.11	.02	.08	.13	.44	-.31
Improve Inmate/Staff Relations	.44	.44	.32	.40	.07	-.02	.28	-.10	.03	.12	.26	-.21
Improve Inmate/Staff Understanding	.33	.32	.24	.30	.02	.04	.14	-.03	.07	.11	.37	-.27
Impact on Inmates	-.26	-.25	-.21	-.21	.06	.01	-.06	.17	.10	.14	.44	-.27
Helpfulness	.37	.36	.28	.33	.06	.13	.18	-.09	.05	.06	.34	-.24

TABLE 7  
 PARTIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD TEAM  
 CLASSIFICATION, GENERAL ATTITUDES AND ACTUALIZATION, FOR STAFF

Team Classification:	Coefficient of Actualization and Attitudes toward Team Classification When General Attitudes Partialled					Coefficient of Attitudes Toward Team Classification and General Attitudes When Actualization Partialled					Coefficient of Actualization And General Attitudes When Attitudes Toward Team Classification Partialled				
	General Attitudes					General Attitudes					General Attitudes				
	Inmates	Work Assign-ment	Other Staff	Punish-ment	Role Conflict	Inmates	Work Assign-ment	Other Staff	Punish-ment	Role Conflict	Inmates	Work Assign-ment	Other Staff	Punish-ment	Role Conflict
Fairness	.28	.26	.28	.26	.25	.04	.10	.00	-.16	-.12	.12	.25	.25	-.13	-.24
Positive Impact on Job	.18	.15	.20	.15	.14	.07	.13	-.07	-.24	-.15	.12	.26	.27	-.14	-.25
Inmate Support	.25	.21	.20	.24	.20	.16	.21	.28	-.16	-.24	.09	.23	.19	-.14	-.21
Staff Support	.25	.19	.16	.25	.17	.01	.21	.41	.01	-.31	.13	.23	.17	-.18	-.21
Warden Support	.20	.16	.15	.19	.15	.03	.12	.18	-.04	-.19	.13	.26	.22	-.17	-.24
Improved Staff Understanding	.11	.09	.13	.09	.10	.07	.09	-.03	-.18	-.09	.13	.27	.26	-.16	-.27
Improved Inmate Understanding	.06	.04	.10	.03	.06	.07	.08	-.12	-.18	-.04	.08	.17	-.12	-.11	-.13
I proved Inmate/Staff Understanding	.38	.33	.32	.37	.31	.13	.26	.34	-.15	-.36	.13	.28	.27	-.17	-.27
Impact on Inmates	.29	.25	.26	.27	.22	.22	.26	.22	-.31	-.42	.06	.20	.19	-.08	-.15

70

## FOOTNOTES

1

The research objectives and data analysis are necessarily abbreviated here. The complete report is available upon request to the Missouri Division of Corrections.

2

There is no doubt that an experimental design with pre-test and control group is desirable. In its absence, however, quasi-controls can be made by examining the observed relationships according to membership and participation in the program.

3

The relationships among the measures of attitudes toward Team Classification and those among the general attitudes presented in Tables 4 and 5 are worthy of examination. Limitations of space, however, prohibit such a discussion and the reader is encouraged to utilize all the data reported rather than only that explicitly discussed.

## References

Burns, Henry

- 1975 Corrections: Organization and Administration.  
Minnesota: West Publishing Company.

Directive on Team Classification

- 1975 Missouri Division of Corrections, 101-080. Jefferson City, Missouri.

Hagan, Charles R., and Charles R. Campbell

- 1968 "Team Classification in Federal Institutions." Federal Probation  
23 (March):30-36.

Loveland, Frank

- 1960 "The Classification Program in the Federal Prison System: 1934-  
1960." 15 Federal Probation (June):7-12.

Rossi, Peter H.

- 1972 "Boobytraps and Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Social Action  
Programs," in Weiss (ed.) Evaluating Action Programs.  
Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Suchman, Edward

- 1969 "Evaluating Educational Programs: A Symposium."  
Urban Review 3 (February): 15-17.

- 1970 "Action For What? A Critique of Evaluative Research."  
M. O'Toole (ed.) The Organization, Management, and Tactics  
of Social Research. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company.



**END**