

## Abstract

A detailed description of the roles of First, Second and Third Force Psychology in relation to preparing prison inmates for Parolee success. Second Force Psychology is considered the appropriate psychological theory for use among prison inmates. The theory being to identify the hidden feelings of personal pains deep in the unconscious; so that an individual can deal with such unconscious pains on a conscious level.

### First, Second, and Third Force Psychology Serve as the Only Scientific Means for Determining Parole Readiness and Prison Reform

Rusell N. Cassel, Ed.D., ABPP, FASP  
The Cassel Research Institute,  
(Where Today is Tomorrow in Health Care)  
1362 Santa Cruz Court,  
Chula Vista, California 91010

As a student of Ernest Hilgard of Stanford University for a number of years, and then in 1976 I did a feature on his theory in Education, and later I did a second feature on a friend Publisher of Hilgard, and learned to know him as a friend .He insists that today there are clearly three distinct and independently organized theories of psychology, and that each one of those is directly related to the independence demonstrated by individuals involved.

#### **First Force Psychology**

First Force Psychology was developed in large part by B.F.Skinner (1969), and it is typically imposed by persons external to individuals involved. It employs a hypothetico-deductive method using behaviorism and a stimulus-response theory that is essential on a continuing bases for effectiveness. It is no longer used for human beings except for persons in a “Closed” Neuro-Psychiatric Ward, or for prisoners in Solitary Confinement, because people never become fully cognitive in their general orientation through operant conditioning.

#### **Second Force Psychology**

Second Force Psychology is the theory underlying the use of psychoanalysis throughout the health care facilities of the world today (Taylor, 1992). It derives directly from the early work of Sigmund Freud in the 1880s, and where “free association” is used to reveal areas and nature of “hurts” lying deep in one’s unconscious that serve to demobilize one’s full capacity. In theory when one becomes fully aware of the location and nature of such unconscious hurts, they can reconcile them in a reasoning and logical manner. Second Force Psychology is typically used with Neuro-Psychiatric patients, or with addicted individuals with psychiatric problems evident. The Cognitive Dissonance Test (Cassel & Chow) is designed to reveal the area and nature of such unconscious hurts. A Psychologist or Counselor can then help the individual deal with each hurt individually.

#### **Scientific Approach Using Cognitive Dissonance**

It was Leon Festinger of Stanford University (1957) who introduced “Cognitive Dissonance” as a substitute for “Free Association” as used by Freud, and defined it as “feelings of unpleasantness” which an individual possesses lying deep in the unconscious, and where the individual seldom if ever realizes the reasons for such feelings. The Cognitive Dissonance Test was developed based on the Festinger theory to serve as a means for helping individuals discover the areas and nature of “cognitive dissonance;” so that on a conscious level they might help to plan for ways to eliminate such hurts. The Psychologist and even the Guidance Counselor are capable of employing the same theory being used by the Psychiatrist in Psychoanalysis, but in a much more simplified manner. Four of the eight part scores are included within the Internal and Personal areas of life; while the other four are from the External and Impersonal areas of one’s life space. A Confluence Score (CON) is included to insure that the items on the DISS test are really read and understood.

- |                              |                                |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| I. Internal & Personal:      | II. External & Impersonal:     |
| 1. Home & Family – HOM       | 5. School & Learning – SCH     |
| 2. Emotional Development-EMO | 6. Social Affiliation-SOC      |
| 3. Moral Development- MOR    | 7. Survival & Power-SUR        |
| 4. Health & Well-being-HEA   | 8. Racial & Social Class - RAC |
| Part I Total – IPTOT         | Part II Total – EITOT          |
| DISS Total Score – DISTOT    |                                |
| Confluence Score - CON       |                                |

### **Eight Part Scores**

1. Home & Family – the period involving the early rearing of the child and the support system that is involved in that period of life.
2. Emotional Development – the feeling and emotional development in relation to interaction with others.
3. Moral Development – acceptance and following of the rules and laws of the land and becoming a role model for others.
4. Health & Well-being – physical and mental health of individual as displayed in the personal development process.
5. School & Learning – educational and learning process and ability to use such development.
6. Social Affiliations – the interrelations between the individual and the rest of society.
7. Survival & Power – the continued growth of an individual and ability to manipulate the environment and others.
8. Race and Social Class – the general acceptance of all others and the ability to interact in a meaningful way with them.

### **The DISS Test Profile**

The Cognitive Dissonance Test Profile as depicted in Figure 1 below serves as the basis for interpreting the scores from the test. Generally, the profile is designed to be meaningful to subjects in high school and as adults without other assistance. The two main features for interpretation are: (1) raw score, and (2) DISS profile.

### **Raw Score**

Immediately under the norm profile on Figure 1 below are the raw scores for all part and total scores on DISS. All eight part scores (HOM, INN, EMO, MOR, etc.) range from 0 to 100; so that a score of 50, for example, is just half or 50 percent of what

it might be. They are raw scores and not percentiles, and may be added and multiplied. The purpose for the raw scores is to enable an individual to determine own strengths and weaknesses in relation to need presence as measured by cognitive dissonance in the eight different parts of the test. Average "cognitive dissonance" is estimated to be represented by a score of 50, and scores above 50 represents above average, and below 50 as being below average (this in relation to the 25 items in each of the 8 part scores). The average here is in reference to self; not to some corresponding norm of individuals. The total scores (IPTOT, EITOT, and DISTOT) are always the sum of the respective part scores.

### **The Normed Profile**

. The norm profile immediately above the raw scores in Figure 1 below, is based on group data for two different kinds of individuals: youth, and adults. It uses a McCalley T-Score, (normalized standard score) ranging from 20 to 80 (running up and down the left side of the profile) with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Average scores range from 40 to 60 and include 68 percent of the norm group. Scores above 60 are considered to be above average in relation to a group of peers, and include the top 16 percent of the norm group. Scores below 40 are considered to be below average, and include the bottom 16 percent of norm group. Always, the higher the score, the greater the presence of cognitive dissonance.

### **Confluence Score (CON)**

The "Confluence core (CON) consists of 21 pairs of items, all of them are part of the 200 true/false items in the DISS test, but are scored separately by the computer.. About half of those 21 pairs of items are opposites; so that if a person answers one of those pairs one way, but fails to answer the second item of the paired-opposites in a different way (true or false) there is a lack of confluence in the test results. This, of course, means creditability not only of the test data, but also of the person taking the DISS test. These items represent an assigned task to person taking the DISS test; so the Confluence Scores is a measure of trustworthiness (degree to which items were actually read or even understood). This score is typically not shared with person taking the test, and is used only as a validity index of test data, and trust worthiness of person taking test.. The interpretation of the Confluence Score is as follows:

1. If subject receives a score of 14 or higher, the test data is considered to be invalid, and subject is asked to take the test a second time.
2. Scores from 10 to 13 show that the test data is acceptable and reliable.
3. Scores from 1 to 9 are considered to represent individuals that have done an outstanding job in reading and understanding dynamics involved, and shows better than average intelligence-depicting relatedness of 11 pairs of items in varying degrees of unrelatedness.

### **Comparing Delinquents & Non-Delinquents**

In Tables 1 and 2 below the mean score on DISS for Delinquents and Typical Individuals are compared by use of a t-statistics. Every single score, except the Confluence Score, showed a statistical difference with the Delinquents showing greater Cognitive Dissonance. It should be remember that data for individuals with a Confluence Score greater than 14 were not included in the data.

Table 1

Comparing the DISS Means by Use of a t-Statistic

(N=116 Delinquent Boys, and 215 Typical High School Students)

DISS Scores	Delinquent Boys	Typical H S Students	Difference	t-Statistic	Probability
Home & Family-HOM:					
M	55.04	35.39	20.25	11.525	0.000
SD	9.69	17.53			
Inner Development – INN:					
M	51.31	42.14	9.17	6.218	0.000
SD	9.94	14.10			
Personal Adjustment – PER:					
M	52.90	43.94	8.96	6.265	0.000
SD	9.50	13.71			
Health and Well-Being-HEA:					
M	53.14	42.29	10.85	7.183	0.000
SD	7.15	15.39			
Internal & Personal – IPTOT:					
M	212.90	167.98	44.92	10.762	0.000
SD	22.09	47.48			
School & Learning-SCH:					
M	53.00	39.61	13.39	8.265	0.000
SD	9.36	16.03			
Social Affiliation-SOC:					
M	52.55	37.73	14.82	10.718	0.000
SD	8.47	13.53			
Survival & Power-SUR:					
M	57.43	42.38	15.05	10.723	0.000
SD	7.77	13.99			
Racial & Class – RAC:					
M	53.41	47.42	5.99	3.674	0.000
SD	8.04	16.53			
External & Impersonal-EITOT:					
M	216.40	167.98	108.42	10.407	0.000
SD	21.69	47.48			
DISS Total Score-DISTOT:					
M	426.60	328.17	98.43	10.738	0.000
SD	49.07	91.86			
Confluence Score – CON:					
M	10.55	9.93	0.062	1.427	n.s.
SD	5.23	5.23			

Table 2

Comparing the DISS Mean Scores by Use of a t-Statistic  
(N=57 Delinquent Girls, and 215 Typical High School Students)

DISS Scores	Delinquent Girls	Typical H S Students	Difference	t-Statistic	Probability
Home & Family-HOM:					
M	53.26	35.39	17.87	7.431	0.000
SD	9.11	17.53			
Inner Development-INN:					
M	48.49	42.14	6.35	3.285	0.001
SD	7.21	14.10			
Personal Adjustment-PER:					
M	48.63	43.94	4.69	2.448	0.015
SD	8.81	13.71			
Health & Well-Being-HEA:					
M	50.04	42.29	7.75	3.699	0.000
SD	6.93	15.39			
Internal & Personal-IPTOT:					
M	200.42	163.72	36.70	5.863	0.000
SD	16.47	46.44			
School & Learning-SCH:					

M	51.44	39.61	11.83	5.268	0.000
SD	10.65	16.03			
Social Affiliation-SOC:					
M	52.40	37.73	14.67	7.765	0.000
SD	8.75	13.53			
Survival & Power-SUR:					
M	56.04	42.38	13.66	7.100	0.000
SD	7.45	13.99			
Race & Class:RAC:					
M	52.00	47.42	4.58	2.010	0.045
SD	9.04	16.53			
External & Impersonal-EITOT:					
M	211.90	167.98	33.92	6.874	0.000
SD	15.86	47.48			
DISS Total Score-DISTOT:					
M	412.32	328.17	84.15	6.833	0.000
SD	26.41	91.86			
Confluence Score-CON:					
M	10.63	9.93	0.70	1.749	n.s.
SD	2.66	2.70			

### Confluence Score

The correlations in Table 2 below show the inter-correlations between the Confluence Score and other data. It is clear that the CON score is first a measure of the validity of the DISS scores, and second the creditability of the Test Taker-whether h/she read and understood the test items. All data for individuals with CON scores of 14 or higher were eliminated from this data. It is important to note that the CON score correlates significantly with all other data shown; so it could be used as a reliable index of any of the other data, including AGE, and Gender.

Table 2  
Pearson Correlations of DISS Scores  
(N=2212)

Variable	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
AGE	1000												
GENDER	-196	1000											
HOM	-179	149	1000										
INN	-177	102	529	1000									
PER	-213	081	456	691	1000								
HEA	-143	043	497	594	718	1000							
IPTOT	-215	111	768	817	856	849	1000						
SCH	-140	220	531	496	468	511	612	1000					
SOC	-201	162	513	608	633	606	715	556	1000				
SUR	-180	174	467	564	621	640	694	541	654	1000			
RAC	-270	166	547	569	555	516	666	566	635	630	1000		
EITOT	-239	220	607	664	680	675	798	787	847	840	845	1000	
DISTOT	-234	166	733	781	803	803	949	738	810	801	796	925	1000
CON	-214	171	415	477	456	420	536	426	490	439	525	550	582

\*  $r = 0.062$  sig 05 level, and  $0.081$  sig. 01 level

### DISS Profile

The DISS Profile is shown in Figure 1 below. This is the profile of a Typical Individual in relation to the appropriate norm for such individual. This profile is for a Typical Male Youth, and using the Male/Youth Norm. The CON score is 4 out of the 21 pairs. Any such score below 7 depicts an exceedingly responsible individual. Note that all 8 part scores are well below the 50 which would be average Dissonance in relation to

the test content; while the profile depicted in relation to Typical Male Youth except for LIF (Life Pursuits); which is about average in relation to other Male Youth.

### **Third Force Psychology & Typical Individuals**

Third Force Psychology, only old since the 1960s, derived largely from Carl Rogers and his client centered therapy, and was a first uniquely American challenge to the psychoanalytic technique (Taylor, 1992). Gordon Allport, Gardner Murphy, Henry A. Murray, and Abraham Maslow all made valuable contributions to the new Third Force Psychology. The DSM-IV studies, one of the greatest health care research studies of all times, showed how Personal Development (Global Assessment Functioning Scale) is central to one's effective social, family, and occupational functioning. The Personal Development Test (PDT) (Cassel & Chow, 2002b) was developed to depict the Global Assessment Functioning in a meaningful and effective manner. It is designed to assess the readiness of prison inmates for parole, and what might be needed to make such individuals more risk-free for parole success. The PDT serves to bring science to our prisons processes for the first time in history. Predicting parole success is no longer a guess.

### **Personal Development**

It is clear that "personal Development" is a much better description of what was developed in DSM-III and DSM-IV as "Global Functioning." This, to be sure, includes the basis for academic success in high school and college; for it is during those adolescent years when individuals seek to make a transition from child to adult, and where accountability in our high schools must include plans and activities for their personal development. Effective academic achievement can only emerge when personal development of student is present, and there are no exceptions to that very basic rule. In a similar manner it is an excellent index for success as a Prison Parole.

### **Incarcerated Juvenile Delinquents and Prison Inmates**

Today we have one million high school dropout students in our prisons, and another million that have not gone to college, with large sampling of African American and Hispanic students present. These two later populations have a lower literacy rate than do the rest of the prison population. Our prison population has doubled in the last 10 years, and continues to increase. The use and involvement of alcohol and drugs as the basis for imprisonment is excessive; for example, in San Diego in the year 2000 4 out of every 5 arrests involved alcohol and drugs. Our high schools must take immediate action to curb delinquency and crime, and it must include programs for the Personal Development of students. Prisons must do the same if they plan to increase the parole readiness of such individuals.

### **High School and College Drop-out Norm Base**

Every one of the incarcerated Juvenile Delinquents represent a high school drop-out, or "at-risk" youngster for drop-out prevention purposes. The adult Prison Population serves as an excellent high school and college dropout norm base; since one million of the prison population represent high school drop-outs, i.e., individuals who have failed to graduate from high school. Few of the other million prison inmates have graduated from college; so they represent a dropout in relation to college as well. Therefore, our prison population serves as an excellent basis for predicting high school and college drop-outs; so we can begin identifying the "at-risk" students, and which serves as a parole success index as well.

## **The Personal Development Test (PDT)**

The Personal Development Test (PDT) (Cassel and Chow, 2002) was designed to provide a functional basis for assessing the Global Functioning of individuals, and it is based on John Dewey's definition of a Democracy—The Interdependence of independent individuals (Dewey, 1938). The test is comprised of 200 true/false items, with 25 in each of the 8 part scores. The first four of those scores measure Personal Maturity for the Independence portion of the Dewey definition, and the second four measure Social Integration for the Interdependence element.

Personal Maturity – PERMAT:	Social Integration- SOCINT:
1. Self-efficacy – EFF	5. Team Member - TEA
2. Coping Skills – COP	6. Sympathy – SYM
3. Positive Assertiveness – ASS	7. Self-esteem – EST
4. Locus of Control – LOC	8. Caring – CAR
Total PERMAT:	Total SOCINT:
Total PDDTOT	
Confluence Score – CON	

### **Description of the PDT 8 Part Scores**

1. Self-efficacy – the full exercise of control through high personal expectations with the necessary expansion of one's actions to complete task successfully.
2. Coping Skills – individual's possession and ability to develop and use manipulative skills needed to complete many different kinds of tasks successfully.
3. Positive Assertiveness – begins with character education that includes the evils of cigarettes, alcohol, and drugs, and with goal setting using positive actions directed at offensive and defensive strategies for goal attainment.
4. Locus of Control – full acceptance and belief that personal success is not a matter of 'luck,' but scientific decision making focused squarely on life goals.
5. Team Member – an individual's continuous acceptance and actions are always in full agreement with values and practices of own group membership, and the team spirit..
6. Sympathy – an individual's continued ability and practice to empathize and feel the pleasures and pains of all people and animals, and the ability to share those feelings..
7. Self-esteem – an individual's perception of peers' depicted worth or feelings of importance of self, and ability and willingness to be a full team member.
8. Caring – whatever happens to one person or animal anywhere in the world is of great importance to all people everywhere.

### **PDT Profile**

The PDT Profile is shown in Figure 2 below. The numbers immediately below the profile are raw scores for the PDT test. The Part Scores range from 1 to 100; so that a score of 50, for example, is just half of what it might be, and the higher the score the better the Personal Development. By examining those scores an individual is able to get a realistic estimate of how well h/she is doing in relation to the PDT test. The Profile above those numbers is based on a McCally Standard Score (T-Score) that ranges from 20 to 80, and is a comparison with one of the six different select norm groups: (1) Adults-Male, Female, or General; and (2) Youth-Male, Female, or General. The "General" norm Includes both male and female individuals; as laws in the united States require the use of such norms in certain situations. The top 16 % have scores above 60, and the bottom 16 percent have scores below 40. An average score includes 68% of

norm group and ranges from 40 to 60. By examining the profile, an individual gets a realistic estimate of self in comparison to one of the six norms.

### Confluence Score

The notion for the Confluence Score derives from the LIE Score in the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (1970), and makes use of 21 pairs of the PDT 200 test items—half of which are direct opposites, and the other half lack agreement with each others in varying degrees. Since the 2 items in each of the 21 pairs are either opposites or lack agreement with each other; the Contingency Score is a measure of the degree to which the Test Taker agrees with self in the taking of the test. If h/she marks one of those items in each of the 21 pairs one way, to agree with fact, h/she must mark the second item of the pair in the opposite direction. Thus, the “Confluence Score” is a measure of agreement with self of the Test Taker. Thus, it is a measure of creditability not only for the test results, but also of the test taker. (Cassel & Blackwell, 2001).

The validity of the Confluence scores is very high as depicted in the data in Table 3 below. Every single score on the PDT correlates negatively at the 0.000 level of confidence with the Confluence Score, and could be used as a substitute for the PDT Test Scores effectively. It also correlates negatively at the 0.000 level of confidence with the Grade Point Average (GPA) of students with an  $r = -0.262$ , showing that the better students receive lower Confluence Scores. It represents a real “break through” in the use of computers to test the validity of psychological tests.

Table 3  
Pearson r's of the PDT Scores and Other Data  
(N=2131)

Data & Scores	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
1. AGE	1000														
2. GENDER	-062	1000													
3. GRADE	529	-040	1000												
4. EFF	154	-165	091	1000											
5. COP	129	-269	113	422	1000										
6. ASS	191	-182	164	341	494	1000									
7. LOC	131	-277	108	401	570	393	1000								
8. PERMAT	188	-294	152	601	837	708	795	1000							
9. TEA	109	-264	097	342	327	125	454	437	1000						
10. SYM	149	-348	116	335	507	362	476	571	363	1000					
11. EST	153	-101	142	412	458	414	458	594	302	288	1000				
12. CAR	037	-093	017	370	404	298	394	498	335	444	446	1000			
13. SOCINT	091	-113	081	249	271	205	302	368	305	378	374	390	1000		
14. PDTTOT	185	305	152	599	765	609	757	930	594	693	705	683	468	1000	
15. CON	-146	215	-139	-395	-426	-350	-450	-550	-330	-336	-443	-303	-249	-559	1000
16. GPA	-089	-191	-042	247	261	142	217	276	120	209	161	193	236	274	-262

\* The 05 Sig of  $r = 0.062$ , and 01 sig. = 0.081

### Parole Readiness

Today we have maybe Two million prison inmates in the United States, with one million being high school drop-out students. About 80% of these inmates are addicted to substance abuse or drugs, and less than 25% respond effectively to treatment programs. Typically, veteran addicts are considered to be Neuro-Psychiatric Patients, and where Second Force Psychology is most effective basis for treatment. When and if they are able to escape the addiction, they clearly become Third Force Psychology patients or individuals, and it is only then when they become eligible for successful parole.

## Confluence Score

The first requisite for parole readiness is a Confluence Score of less than 14. When records of individuals with scores greater than 14 are included in a group analysis of data for either DISS or PDT the reliability of test scores is no longer statistically significant.

If parole readiness means that the individual's Personal Development is more like Typical Individuals than it is like that of Prison Inmates, there is a satisfactory indication of parole readiness. The data in Table 4 below shows that when the PDTTOT Score is 390 or less, an individual is not ready for being paroled.

Table 4

High-Risk Student Prediction Index for PDT Scores

T-Score	The Personal Development Test Scores											
	EFF	COP	ASS	LOC	PERMAT	TEA	SYM	EST	CAR	SOCINT	PDTTOT	CON
45												
40			50			47	54		49	186	390	10
35	42	52		54	192							
30								50				
25												
20												

## References

- Cassel, R.N. (2001a). Third Force Psychology used to foster Hall-Mareks for success serves as the basis for delinquency and crime prevention. *Education*, 121(4), 642-648.
- Cassel, R.N. (2001b). Second Force Psychology to assess cognitive dissonance areas and restore full service to Delinquents and Prison Inmates. *Education*, 121(4), 649-651.
- Cassel, R.N., and Chow, P. (2002a). *The Cognitive Dissonance Test (DISS)*. Chula Vista, California: The Cassel Research Institute.
- Cassel, R.N., and Chow, P. (2002b). *The Personal Development Test (PDT)*. Chula Vista, California: The Cassel Research Institute.
- Cassel, R.N., and Blackwell, J. (2001). The LIE Score on the PDT serves as an index for creditability of Test Taker and Test Results. *Education*, 122(2), 296-298.
- Dewey, John (1938). *Experience in Education*. New York: MacMillan
- DSM-IV (1994). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Hathaway, S.R., and McKinley, J.C. (1970). *Multiphasic Inventory (MMPI)*. New York: The Psychological Corporation.
- Hilgard, Ernest R. (1977). Psychology's influence on educational practices: A puzzling history. *Education*, 97(3), 203-219.
- Skinner, B.F. (1969). Contingency management in the classroom. *Education*, 90(2), 93.10-0.
- Taylor, Eugene (1992). Transpersonal Psychology: It's Several Virtues. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 20(2), 285-300.