

Assessing the Impact of InsideOut Dad™ on Newark
Community Education Centers (CEC) Residential
Reentry Center Residents

Full Report

Rutgers University, Economic Development Research Group

8/31/2011

Table of Contents

I – Introduction	4
II – The InsideOut Dad™ Program.....	8
III – Purpose of the Current Evaluation	10
IV – Methodology.....	11
V – Quantitative Findings.....	13
VI – Qualitative Findings.....	32
VII – Limitations.....	44
VIII - Conclusion	46
IX – Recommendations.....	49
X – References	51
XI - Appendix	54

Acknowledgements

The authors of this report would like to express their gratitude to Community Education Centers personnel who were integral to this evaluation at each of the sites. Assistance was continually provided for the project across all sites from Dr. Louis Barretti and Dr. Ralph Fretz. At Delaney Hall, Ms. Laura Green and Dr. Erin Walker managed and organized the project to assure that the entire evaluation progressed smoothly. Also at Delaney Hall, Mr. Paul Domingue and Ms. Sophia Strong provided assistance for data collection on-site. At the Harbor and Logan Hall, Ms. Gwendolyn Hinton was responsible for maintaining the program and coordinating data collection. Additionally, Mr. Michael Oliver arranged for data collection at the Harbor. At Delaney Hall, Mr. Ronald Morrison provided assistance with data collection and program organization throughout the entirety of the program.

I – Introduction

This report presents a multi-method evaluation of the InsideOut Dad™ program in three Community Education Centers (CEC) Residential Reentry Centers in New Jersey. The current evaluation includes both quantitative and qualitative data in the form of participant surveys, institutional data collection, participant interviews, and stakeholder interviews. These methods are used to determine if the program has had an impact across a series of outcome measures.

In March of 2010, National Fatherhood Initiative agreed to an evaluation framework for Inside Out Dad™ with Rutgers University’s Economic Development Research Group (EDRG). Specifically, the objective of the research project was stated as an effort to evaluate the program’s effectiveness and assess the potential for further expansion. The program was initially implemented at each of the three facilities by the summer of 2010. During the evaluation period, a total of 307 participants graduated from the program, completing both pre- and post-test surveys. The evaluation period ended in June of 2011 although post-program data was collected on participants through August of 2011. Table 1 provides an overview of the number of participants and groups at each site.

Table 1-1 - The Number of Participants and Groups for the InsideOut Dad™ Program from April 2010 to June 2011 at Delaney Hall, the Harbor, and Tully House

	Delaney	Harbor	Tully	Total	Control
Graduates	101	89	117	307	104
# of Groups	13	9	5	27	4

National Fatherhood Initiative’s (NFI) InsideOut Dad™ program was implemented at three sites in Newark, New Jersey: Delaney Hall, the Harbor, and Tully House. Delaney Hall, opened in 2000, houses a capacity of 1,196 adult male offenders from both Essex County and New Jersey State Parole Board populations. The site operates programs including “substance abuse treatment, life skills training, individual and group counseling, relapse prevention, anger management, and educational and GED services” (Community Education Centers). The facility also operates a well-staffed Family Services program. Delaney Hall is the largest of the CEC sites in New Jersey. Delaney Hall graduated 101 participants from the InsideOut Dad™ program for this evaluation.

The Harbor, opened in 2000 with a capacity of 234, contracts residents from the New Jersey Department of Corrections. Originally located in Hoboken, the facility was moved to Newark in 2009 at a site adjacent to Tully House. The Harbor offers “GED preparation, adult basic education, life skills, anger management, relapse prevention, Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy, twelve step education, family groups and job skills” (Community Education Centers). The Harbor graduated 89 participants from the InsideOut Dad™ program.

Tully House, opened in 1998, contracts residents from the New Jersey Department of Corrections. The site has a capacity of 315 residents. At the facility a variety of services are offered including “work release, vocational, educational, and college educational referral enrollment” (Community Education Centers). Tully House also focuses on “domestic violence, anger management, relapse prevention, parenting skills and criminality groups” (Community

Education Centers). An active Family Service Program is also operated at the facility. Tully House graduated 117 participants from the InsideOut Dad™ program.

This report is presented in several sections. The remainder of this section provides a concise review of the research on the effects of parental incarceration and programs for fathers in prisons. The second section contains a brief summary of the components to the InsideOut Dad™ program and discusses two previous evaluations of the program conducted in Maryland and Ohio. The third section rephrases the purpose of the current evaluation. The fourth section details the methodology utilized within this evaluation. Data collection and analysis procedures are described in detail. In the fifth section, the quantitative results are presented and analyzed from survey and institutional data. The sixth section introduces the qualitative results of the study from interviews with participants and stakeholders. The seventh section describes the most important limitations associated with the study. The eighth section offers a conclusion that reiterates the main findings and implications of the current evaluation. The final section provides recommendations from the study.

An Overview of Paternal Parent Incarceration

A convergence of several factors, including an increase in criminal activity and a “get tough” sentencing policy for violent and drug crimes, was responsible for an unprecedented increase in the United States prison population during the 1980s. Almost three decades later, the U.S. prison population has reached over 1.6 million people (West & Sabol, 2010). Despite a decrease in crime rates and many state efforts to cut back prison populations for fiscal and social reasons, the U.S. still leads the industrialized world with the highest imprisonment rate (Hartney, 2006).

Although there has been an increase in the relative proportion of female prisoners, as of 2009, there were 1,500,278 male prisoners under the jurisdiction of state or federal correctional institutions (West & Sabol, 2010). The Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities in 2004 found that 55 percent of male state inmates and 63 percent of male federal inmates are parents. About half of these fathers lived with at least one of the children before their period of incarceration. Based on these incarceration figures, it is estimated that over 7 million children have parents under correctional supervision (Herman-Stahl et al., 2008). As a cause for further concern, there are substantial racial and ethnic disparities in the percentage of incarcerated fathers in comparison to the overall population in society (Swisher & Waller, 2008).

Many prisoners are serving lengthy periods of incarceration. Sixteen percent of prisoners released from state prisons in 2008 served at least three years of time during their current prison admission (West & Sabol, 2010). However, the majority of incarcerated fathers will be released from prison at some point and, in many cases, reunited fully with their child(ren) (Dyer, 2005). Therefore, the parent-child relationship is complicated by the removal of the parent and, in most cases, the re-introduction of the parent months or years later.

The Effects of Parental Incarceration

Hairston (2007) categorizes the effects of parental incarceration into three general groups: economic, emotional, and social. Economic effects include lost income from the potential provider as well as costs associated with visiting that family member. Emotional consequences

occur due to the removal of a marital partner/father figure. Hairston (2007) cites high rates of divorce and break-ups as evidence of the emotional effects of incarceration. Several policies, such as geographic distance (Maldonado, 2006) and institutional visitation and contact restrictions may accentuate these harms. Social effects include the informal stigma associated with incarceration. For family members, there may be a degree of embarrassment related to the incarceration of a spouse or father. Additionally, the short- and long-term effects on children have also been well documented. These negative effects may include negative school-related outcomes, increased stress, and anxiety (Hairston, 2007; Maldonado, 2006). All of these issues are especially relevant for incarcerated fathers based on research that shows much higher contact with children for female inmates compared to males (Maldonado, 2006).

The impact of parental incarceration is felt by both the incarcerated parent and the child. Previous interviews with incarcerated fathers have demonstrated that while fathers experience a variety of different circumstances surrounding fatherhood, the paternal role is one of great importance to most such men (Buston, 2010). Accordingly, Lanier (1993) found that poor father-child relationships were related to elevated levels of depression and general concern about their children.

Other research has examined the long-term effects of parental incarceration on their children. Geller et al. (2011) found that, due to decreased activity in the labor market, incarcerated fathers contribute minimally to the finances of their children. Multiple recent studies using the The Fragile Families Study dataset confirmed expectations that fathers who have experienced periods of incarceration earn substantially less than non-incarcerated fathers even after obtaining employment (Lewis, Jr. et al., 2007; Swisher & Waller, 2008).

While incarceration has several negative effects on familial relationships, it should be noted that the birth of a child can have beneficial effects on fathers (Edin et al., 2001; Laub & Sampson, 1993; Tripp, 2009). Specifically, the presence of a child serves as a “turning point” for some incarcerated men when they change the direction of their life away from criminality. Therefore, both the negative effects of imprisonment and the possible positive effects of parenthood must be considered in program construction and research studies.

Fathering Program Evaluations

Although several policies target family dynamics when a parent is incarcerated, such as parent-child visitation programs, child-in-residence programs, mentoring programs, and counseling support groups, parent education programs are the most widespread (Hairston, 2007). Glaze and Maruschak (2008) report that about 11 percent of state prisoners are exposed to parenting programs while incarcerated. Such programs addressing the father-child relationships are not a modern-day phenomenon. Programs were created in state prisons before the prison boom of the 1980s (Peck & Edwards, 1977). However, the recent dramatic increase in the prison population has been accompanied by a growth in parenting programs considering the re-emergence of the rehabilitative ideal. Recent developments have built upon previous evaluation research and refined theory to produce more robust programs.

Bronte-Tinkew et al. (2008) argue that in-depth evaluations of parenting programs are relatively scarce. This is attributed to the contemporary nature of the expansion of such programs. In their review of “model” programs, only four programs fit their criteria that included experimental evaluations, adequate sample sizes, and significant results: Center for Employment

Opportunities in New York; Filial Therapy Training with Incarcerated Fathers in New York; Parental Training for Incarcerated Fathers in Oklahoma, and Systematic Training for Effective Parenting for Incarceration throughout the U.S. Within their analysis, eight important components from the “model” programs were identified including (1) staff training, (2) theoretically driven models, (3) sufficient time to complete activities, (4) teaching and providing opportunity to practice skills, (5) providing incentives, (6) engaging fathers in small group settings, (7) addressing unique needs of participants, and (8) providing diversity in the delivery of services.

In another recent review of the research literature on parenting programs, Loper and Tuerk (2006) summarize effects of parenting programs. Generally, studies have revealed mixed results in determining whether program participation positively affects parenting attitudes, institutional adjustment, and descriptive improvements in interactions. For the most part, qualitative interviews with participants have produced more favorable results than quantitative methods.

These reviews of the literature on parenting programs in jails and prisons indicate that more research is needed. Few studies have used rigorous methods for evaluating programs leading to cautious conclusions about the effectiveness of programs. In other instances, evaluations of programs have been restricted to only quantitative or qualitative designs. More academic research in the field will build upon the current literature to establish what works in educating incarcerated parents.

II – The InsideOut Dad™ Program

NFI's first program for incarcerated fathers was called Long Distance Dads™ (LDD) (Turner & Peck, 2002). As described in the Behrend College's 2001 evaluation of the program, "The Long Distance Dads program is designed to assist incarcerated men in developing skills to become more involved and supported fathers. Trained inmate peer leaders facilitate the program in 12 weekly group sessions. The sessions are structured in a small group format with at least one peer leader per group" (Behrend College, 2001, pg. 8). The LDD program specifically focuses on ensuring responsible parenting by empowering fathers in a variety of ways while focusing on psycho-social development. Eventually, the program was adopted in correctional facilities in over 25 states.

In a major study of the Long Distance Dads™ program, researchers from Behrend College (2001, 2003) conducted an outcome and process evaluation. The outcome evaluation consisted of surveys with 42 inmates and 47 controls as well as qualitative interviews. The researchers ultimately found very little evidence that the program improved inmates' fathering knowledge, attitudes, skills, or behaviors. The process evaluation that was conducted resulted in several recommendations about possible improvements that could be made, including changes in implementation. NFI followed this evaluation with a series of focus groups with facilitators of the program from across the country to get feedback on its content, utility, and effectiveness. NFI concluded from the analysis of the focus group data that a new program was needed.

NFI developed the InsideOut Dad™ program and launched it in 2005. The most significant differences between the two programs were the content (including the reentry component of InsideOut Dad™), structure/design that makes the program easier to facilitate, and the addition of an evaluation tool. The focus of NFI's programming for incarcerated fathers remains, however, on the relationships between incarcerated males and their children. As stated by NFI, the program intends to reduce recidivism and connect or reconnect inmates to their families. The InsideOut Dad™ program, which can be geared toward both short-and long-stay facilities consists of 12 core sessions: (1) Getting Started, (2) About Me, (3) Being a Man, (4) Spirituality, (5) Handling and Expressing Emotions, (6) Relationships, (7) Fathering, (8) Parenting, (9) Discipline, (10) Child Development, (11) Fathering From the Inside, (12) Ending the Program. In addition to the 12 core sessions, there are 26 additional optional sections.

During the program, facilitators are expected to provide opportunities for participants to speak out during group sessions. They are provided with a "Facilitator's Guide," an "Activities Manual," a survey that they can use to evaluate the program (e.g. using a pre-program and post-program methodology), and marketing materials in addition to the "Fathering Handbook" that is provided to the participants. In the "Facilitator's Guide", facilitators are provided with advice for running successful sessions. The "Activities Manual" explicitly describes pre-session procedures and procedures for conducting the sessions (e.g. learning objectives and questions to ask of participants). The handbook is designed to enhance and reinforce the learning that takes place during the sessions. It includes session logs and other open-ended questions that are filled out by participating fathers, as well as instructional materials about child growth and development through the teenage years.

The content within the curriculum focuses on many of the issues highlighted in other parenting programs. The curriculum focuses on criminogenic factors, including anti-social attitudes, values and beliefs, missing or inadequate family relationships, anger and impulse control, and a lack of empathy. As of the writing of this report, the program is used in every state

and several countries. More than 20 states and New York City have standardized the program across their male correctional facilities.¹

Previous evaluations of the InsideOut Dad™ program have been conducted in Maryland and Ohio. Smith (2008) conducted a quantitative evaluation of the InsideOut Dad™ program in Maryland. The evaluation used an experimental group of 89 participants and a control group (N=13) to determine whether exposure to the InsideOut Dad™ curriculum made a quantifiable difference in attitudes and knowledge of the participants. Pre- and post-test surveys were administered to the study participants. This study found that subjects who participated in the program “had statistically significant gains in knowledge about fathering compared to the pre survey responses for those who participated in the Inside Out Dad™ program” (p.12). On the section of the survey that questioned about thoughts on fathering, there were significant improvements on approximately half of the questions.

A second evaluation, conducted in Maryland and Ohio, utilized a similar framework for measuring knowledge and attitudinal changes and comparisons to a control group. A total of 219 participants from the two states completed survey instruments. This study also found statistically significant improvements for many variables measuring fathering knowledge or attitudes when pre-tests were compared to post-tests (Spain, 2009).

The current evaluation of InsideOut Dad™ in New Jersey addresses some of the limitations mentioned by the authors of these two reports, as well as additional shortcomings. First, the current evaluation utilizes a larger experimental (n=307) and control (n=104) group. Both of the previous studies used smaller samples with a modest comparison population. Second, this evaluation includes additional instruments to the InsideOut Dad™ survey such as the Coping Self-Efficacy Scale (Chesney et al., 2006) and the Fathers Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI Q4) (Schaefer & Bell, 1958). Third, the current research adds a qualitative component to the study by interviewing both program participants and stakeholders. This qualitative portion of the study seeks to go beyond statistical analysis to understand strengths and weaknesses of the program.

¹ “Standardized” means that a state has chosen InsideOut Dad™ as their preferred parenting program for use in male correctional facilities.

III – Purpose of the Current Evaluation

The stated goals of this evaluation are to address the following research questions:

1. What is the impact of participation in the InsideOut Dad™ program on participant behavioral, cognitive, attitudinal, and self-efficacy outcomes compared to Newark CEC Residential Reentry Center resident fathers not participating in the program?
2. What are the experiences of InsideOut Dad™ program participants?

IV – Methodology

In order to answer the aforementioned research questions, there are several components to this study. The quantitative portion of the analysis consists of two major aspects: pre- and post-surveys and institutional data collection. The quantitative analysis aims to determine whether the program has a measurable effect on participant confidence, knowledge, behavior, and attitudes in relation to fathering and personal conduct within the institutional environment. The survey consists of five sections. Part A asks questions about the respondent and their family, including their children and spouses. This section contains demographic and background information about respondents. Part B poses Likert scale questions about fathering perspectives and confidence. Statements are taken from the Coping Self-Efficacy Scale (Chesney et al., 2006) with three answer choices, “cannot do at all”, “moderately can do”, and “certain can do”. Part C tests the fathering knowledge of participants through 26 “true or false” and “multiple choice” questions. Additionally, there is a section with 8 Likert scale questions about child behavior taken from the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI). These questions feature responses: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Part D asks respondents seven questions about how they father and their levels of contact with their children. Part E is in Likert scale form with answers ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” for 20 statements. The InsideOut Dad™ curriculum contains a desired answer key for the statements in Part E. The surveys were administered by facilitators at each site along with a consent form that was read aloud to participants.

Due to the timing of the beginning of the InsideOut Dad™ program at the three facilities, some of the earlier completed surveys used the original InsideOut Dad™ survey instrument. These surveys do not contain the questions added by Rutgers researchers from the PARI and Coping Self-Efficacy Scale. However, these surveys completed at the beginning of the evaluation period still contain all the questions of the initial InsideOut Dad™ instrument that includes five sections.

Several of the sections contain questions in different variations of Likert scale form. There is considerable disagreement about whether Likert scale items are categorical or continuous variables and whether it is appropriate to assume that the answer choices are equidistant from one another in the respondent’s mind (Allen & Seaman, 2007; Clason & Dormody, 1993). In this study, Likert scale questions that contain “uncertain” answers are interpreted as forced answer responses in this analysis due to the placement of the “uncertain” label and the rarity of uncertain responses. Therefore, “uncertain” responses are handled as missing data.

Further complications about Likert scale data relate to the respondent’s *response style* (Dittrich et al., 2007). Some respondents are more likely to select extreme responses throughout the Likert scale sections with most answers falling into “strongly agree” or “strongly disagree” categories, while other respondents may tend to consistently respond within the less extreme categories.

To assess changes over time in reported behavior, fathering knowledge, and fathering attitudes for Likert-style questions from the pre-test survey to the post-test survey and between the experimental group and the control group, Mann Whitney U tests are conducted. This statistical technique was chosen instead of t-tests because of the nature of Likert scale data on the non-Gaussian data distribution. Generally, it is inappropriate to use t-tests for ordinal data, such as the scales found in sections B, C, and E of the survey. Additionally, one-way ANOVA, two-

tailed t-tests, and Chi-Square tests are used when appropriate to determine if there are differences between pre- and post-tests or across groups.

Changes in institutional behavior are measured by collecting data on infractions as recorded by institutional staff. The researcher worked with personnel from CEC facilities to use the SecureManager database site which holds data on both positive comments and institutional infractions for each member of the participant or control group. Other evaluation studies have used institutional data, often in women's facilities (Carlson, 2001; Gat, 2000). The institutional data was only compared within facilities because of concerns that each facility has separate informal and formal policies about recording behaviors. The variation in the number of infractions found in the SecureManager system reaffirms the argument that each site maintains different policies about recording positive and negative actions.

Three time periods were used to assess changes in behavior linked to the InsideOut Dad™ program. Measurements took place during a period of 90 days before program entry, the duration of the program, and 90 days after program exit. However, the majority of the respondents did not spend 12 full weeks at the facility before they started the program. In particular, the Delaney Hall site had many participants who arrived at the facility a short time before they entered the program and left the facility shortly after graduation. To address these differences in time-at-risk, the number of days at-risk was calculated for participants who were at the site for less than 90 days before or after the program. Infractions were then computed for each site out of 1,000 days to standardize the at-risk period.

In the qualitative portion of the study, two types of interviews were conducted. Semi-structured interviews (n=27) were held with program participants. These participant interviews were conducted at the beginning of their program experience and within 3 weeks after their graduation from the program, depending on the schedule of the facility. The face-to-face interviews at the respective sites occurred in isolated environments where respondents could speak freely about the program. Although an interview protocol was followed, the interviews were semi-structured in that follow-up questions were asked when necessary. Notes were taken by the interviewer or a tape recorder was used based on the policies of the facility. The participants were asked questions about their background, initiation to the program, experiences, and future plans. The researcher examined the transcripts of participant interviews and identified main themes.

Semi-structured interviews (n=6) were also conducted with stakeholders at the individual sites. These interviews included both employees who worked as facilitators (n=5) as well as personnel responsible for administering the program (n=1) at the three facilities. The interviews with stakeholders were only conducted after that individual had been exposed to multiple InsideOut Dad™ groups. The interview focused on the background of facilitator experiences, their opinions on the program, and their thoughts about possible improvements to the program. The research team reviewed transcripts to identify the major themes from these interviews.

V – Quantitative Findings

Demographic and Background

The surveys administered to InsideOut Dad™ participants and the control group contained questions about age of the participant, educational levels, marital status, race, and upbringing. Although respondents answered questions on both pre- and post-test surveys, the post-test responses for these demographic variables were predictably quite similar to the responses at pre-test because of the static nature of these variables. Therefore, the pre-test responses to demographic variables are presented here.

Table 5-1 –Age of InsideOut Dad™ Participants and Control Group

	Delaney (n=101)	Harbor (n=89)	Tully (n=117)	Total (n=307)	Control (n=104)
Mean	34.53	34.91	35.41	34.98	39.09
St. Dev	9.74	8.22	7.39	8.45	9.17
Range	18-62	20-54	20-52	18-62	20-67

One-way ANOVA compared results across three test sites.

Two-tailed T-test compared total experimental group to total control group.

Table 5-1 shows the descriptive statistics for the age of participants at each of the three experiment sites, the total experiment group, and the control population. Although there are substantial differences in their criminal justice status across site (e.g. arrested but not yet charged, county conviction, state conviction), the ages of participants were approximately 35 at Delaney Hall, the Harbor, and Tully House. The control population had a higher average of slightly more than 39. The variation in the ages of participants is illustrated by the standard deviations and wide ranges at each site. Participants in their 50s and 60s were in groups with residents as young as 18 or 20 at each of the sites. In the control group, respondents ranged from age 20 to 67.

A one-way ANOVA test was run to determine if there were any significant differences across sites for the age variable, but no statistically significant differences were identified. A two-tailed t-test was conducted to compare the mean ages of the experiment and control groups. There was a statistically significant difference between the ages of the experiment and control populations at the 99 percent confidence level.

Table 5-2 - Education Level of InsideOut Dad™ Participants and Control Group

	Delaney (n=97)	Harbor (n=88)	Tully (n=115)	Total (n=300)	Control (n=98)
Mean	11.60	11.40	11.10	11.35	11.39
St. Dev	1.55	1.74	1.49	1.59	1.54
Range	8-16	3-16	7-16	3-16	5-16

One-way ANOVA compared results across three test sites.

Two-tailed T-test compared total experimental group to total control group.

Respondents were asked to indicate their highest level of achievement in education. Table 5-2 shows that at each of the three experiment sites there is an average of between 11 and 12 years of education, representing junior and senior years of high school. The control group average (11.39 years of education) is nearly identical to the experimental group (11.35). The range shows that some participants have only elementary or middle school educations, while at least one participant at each site has completed 4 years of post-secondary education. This finding is important because it suggests possible complications could occur with reading comprehension during the program. The wide variation in education levels could have other implications beyond reading such as willingness to communicate and the consideration of various viewpoints.

A one-way ANOVA test across experiment sites identified a statistically significant difference in the means at the 90 percent confidence level. Scheffe's post-hoc test showed that the statistically significant result was related to differences between the Delaney Hall and Tully House populations with Delaney Hall's mean years of education significantly higher than Tully House. A two-tailed t-test found no significant differences in education level between the overall experiment and control populations.

Table 5-3 - Relationship Status of InsideOut Dad™ Participants and Control Group

	Delaney (n=101)	Harbor (n=89)	Tully (n=117)	Total (n=307)	Control (n=103)
Married	8.9% (9)	21.3% (19)	11.1% (13)	13.4% (41)	14.6% (15)
Single	58.4% (59)	55.1% (49)	54.7% (64)	56.0% (172)	59.2% (61)
Divorce	5.9% (6)	2.2% (2)	6.0% (7)	4.9% (15)	5.8% (6)
Separated	5.9% (6)	2.2% (2)	3.4% (4)	3.9% (12)	4.9% (5)
Liv. Partner	17.8% (18)	18.0% (16)	23.9% (28)	20.2% (62)	13.6% (14)
Widowed	1.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.3% (1)	1.0% (1)
Other	2.0% (2)	1.1% (1)	0.9% (1)	1.3% (4)	1.0% (1)

Chi-Square tests compared results across test sites and experiment and control groups.

Table 5-3 reveals the self-reported marital status of survey respondents. For each population, over half of the respondents reported being single at the time of the pre-test survey. Combined with substantial responses for the divorced, separated, living partner, and widowed categories, there are complicated relationships between fathers and their children's mother within this population. The site with the highest percentage of married participants was the Harbor at 21.3 percent. There were no statistically significant differences when chi-square tests were run across test sites or comparing the experimental and control groups.

Table 5-4 - Race of InsideOut Dad™ Participants and Control Group

	Delaney	Harbor	Tully	Total	Control
White	17	9	5	31	9
Black	73	69	88	230	86
Hispanic	14	14	18	46	10
Asian	0	0	0	0	0
Nat. Amer.	0	4	2	6	0
Other	3	1	4	8	0

Table 5-4 reveals the self-reported racial and ethnic distribution for respondents in the experimental and control groups. The majority of the respondents are Black, however both Whites and Hispanics are well-represented at each site, demonstrating the diversity within the programs. There are no clear differences in race/ethnicity between the experimental and control populations. A small number of respondents also reported Native American heritage or some other racial/ethnic group.

Table 5-5 - Who Raised Respondent for InsideOut Dad™ Participants and Control Group

T6 Raised By	Delaney	Harbor	Tully	Total	Control
Mother/Father	55	34	47	136	47
Mother	30	40	49	119	48
Father	6	2	2	10	1
Stepparent	1	4	2	7	2
Grandparent	20	22	23	65	13
Relatives	4	3	4	11	3
FosterParents	1	0	4	5	2
Adoptive	1	1	1	3	1
Other	6	2	8	16	2

Respondents were asked to select one or multiple persons who raised them. A noticeable difference in comparing across sites was the comparison of "mother/father" responses to "mother" responses across sites. Delaney Hall respondents more commonly reported having both mothers and fathers playing a role in their upbringing. Conversely, at the Harbor, Tully House, and the control population, there were more respondents who were raised by only their mother versus both their mother and father. The third highest response group is "grandparents". The absence of a paternal role in their upbringing is important to much of the material in the curriculum and discussions of the InsideOut Dad™ program. Although less common, some respondents reported being raised by foster parents, adopted parents, and step parents, which demonstrates the importance of considering non-traditional families during the group.

Effect on Confidence

Part B of the participant survey contained 10 statements from the Coping Self-Efficacy Scale. These questions were administered on the updated version of the survey. Respondents were asked to state whether they believed they "cannot do at all", "moderately certain can do", or "certain can do" ten statements. Within the Delaney Hall experimental population, statistically significant improvements in confidence were found at the 90 percent confidence level for Statement 8, "Think about one part of the problem at a time" and at 95 percent confidence for Statement 10, "Get needed support from Newark CEC Residential Reentry Center Support staff". At the Harbor, Statement 5 "Look for something good in a negative situation" and Statement 8 both showed increases in respondent confidence at the 90 percent confidence level. For the

overall experiment group sample, Statements 5, 7 “Do something positive for yourself when you are feeling discouraged”, 8, and 10 showed statistically significant improvements. None of the statements yielded statistically significant decreases in confidence for the experiment group. As expected, the control group experienced no statistical significant changes between the pre-and post-test surveys. The changes in confidence in support from the CEC staff are particularly noteworthy. Respondents were much more confident after participating in the InsideOut Dad™ program that they could rely on staff when needed. Therefore, changes in self-confidence found between pre- and post-tests also relate to relationships with facility workers that might influence the overall institutional environment.

Table 5-6 – Mann Whitney U Results on Part B “Confidence” Questions from Coping Self-Efficacy Scale

	Delaney Mean Rank	Harbor Mean Rank	Tully Mean Rank	Total Mean Rank	Control Mean Rank
B4- 1 Pre	65.16 (n=63)	57.00 (n=58)	-	121.86 (n=121)	49.58 (n=50)
B4- 1 Post	64.85 (n=66)	61.92 (n=60)	-	126.06 (n=126)	51.42 (n=50)
B4- 2 Pre	62.04 (n=65)	58.53 (n=57)	-	119.96 (n=122)	53.74 (n=50)
B4- 2 Post	69.90 (n=66)	59.45 (n=60)	-	128.90 (n=126)	47.26 (n=50)
B4- 3 Pre	61.79 (n=63)	57.12 (n=56)	-	118.37 (n=119)	50.18 (n=49)
B4- 3 Post	67.13 (n=65)	58.84 (n=59)	-	125.49 (n=124)	49.82 (n=50)
B4- 4 Pre	63.88 (n=65)	56.47 (n=58)	-	119.80 (n=123)	48.58 (n=50)
B4- 4 Post	68.09 (n=66)	62.43 (n=60)	-	130.07 (n=126)	52.42 (n=50)

B4-5 Pre	60.73 (n=65)	54.81 (n=58)	-	114.81 (n=123)	48.29 (n=50)
B4-5 Pos t	70.27 (n=65)	64.03* (n=60)	-	134.04** (n=125)	52.71 (n=50)
B4-6 Pre	63.49 (n=66)	56.47 (n=58)	-	119.55 (n=124)	50.41 (n=49)
B4-6 Pos t	68.55 (n=65)	62.43 (n=60)	-	130.41 (n=125)	49.60 (n=50)
B4-7 Pre	61.28 (n=66)	56.16 (n=58)	-	117.08 (n=124)	51.49 (n=50)
B4-7 Pos t	70.79 (n=65)	61.79 (n=59)	-	131.92* (n=124)	49.51 (n=50)
B4-8 Pre	59.95 (n=65)	54.27 (n=58)	-	113.67 (n=123)	49.77 (n=49)
B4-8 Pos t	70.13* (n=64)	64.26* (n=60)	-	134.25*** (n=124)	49.24 (n=50)
B4-9 Pre	64.82 (n=62)	55.72 (n=54)	-	120.08 (n=116)	49.86 (n=48)
B4-9 Pos t	64.20 (n=66)	56.26 (n=57)	-	119.93 (n=123)	49.15 (n=50)
B4-10 Pre	57.17 (n=61)	52.47 (n=55)	-	109.06 (n=116)	49.87 (n=46)
B4-10 Pos t	69.44** (n=65)	62.19* (n=59)	-	131.20*** (n=124)	46.24 (n=49)

*Mann Whitney U test compared pre- and post-test survey results for each statement in each column.
*p<0.10, **p<.05, ***p<.01*

Effect on Parenting Knowledge

Part C of the pre-test and post-test surveys feature questions about parenting knowledge. The first 26 questions are from the original InsideOut Dad™ survey. The material covered in these questions is derived from the specific lessons throughout the program curriculum. Next, eight questions were added to the updated survey from the Parent Attitude Research Instrument (PARI). Table 5-7 presents the percentages and sum totals of correct responses at pre-test and post-test for the first 26 questions.

Most of the questions were answered correctly by the majority of participants in both the experimental and control groups. Exceptions include Question 11, “The adult that a child becomes has nothing to do with his or her nature, but everything to do with how the child was raised” and Question 14, “Good discipline sometimes means making your child feel ashamed for something they did wrong.” Each of these questions were answered incorrectly by the majority of participants at pre-tests, however both questions also experienced large increases in correct responses at post-test for the experimental groups.

Table 5-7 - Percentages of Correct Responses on Part C Fathering Knowledge Questions

	Delaney	Harbor	Tully	Total	Control
C1-Pre	82.0% (82/100)	71.9% (64/89)	73.3% (85/116)	75.7% (231/305)	68.6% (70/102)
C1-Post	79.0% (79/100)	63.6% (56/88)	83.5%* (96/115)	76.2% (231/303)	68.6% (70/102)
C2-Pre	68.3% (69/101)	68.5% (61/89)	75.9% (88/116)	71.2% (218/306)	71.3% (72/101)
C2-Post	73.3% (74/99)	67.4% (60/88)	79.5% (93/117)	74.7% (227/304)	72.5% (74/102)
C3-Pre	72.3% (73/101)	75.3% (67/89)	74.1% (86/116)	73.9% (226/306)	71.6% (73/102)
C3-Post	76.2% (77/101)	71.6% (63/88)	70.9% (83/117)	72.9% (223/306)	65.0% (67/103)
C4-Pre	66.0% (66/100)	75.3% (67/89)	55.6% (65/117)	64.7% (198/306)	68.0% (68/100)
C4-Post	72.3% (73/101)	66.7% (58/87)	64.1% (75/117)	67.5% (206/305)	57.3% (59/103)
C5-Pre	84.2% (85/101)	96.6% (86/89)	93.0% (107/115)	91.1% (278/305)	93.1% (95/102)
C5-Post	94.1%** (95/101)	94.4% (84/89)	98.3%* (115/117)	95.8%** (294/307)	88.3% (91/103)
C6-Pre	99.0% (100/101)	97.8% (87/89)	97.4% (113/116)	98.0% (300/306)	98.0% (100/102)
C6-Post	99.0% (100/101)	96.6% (85/88)	100.0%* (117/117)	98.7% (302/306)	98.1% (101/103)
C7-Pre	92.1% (93/101)	96.6% (86/89)	98.3% (114/116)	95.8% (293/306)	94.1% (95/101)
C7-Post	99.0%**	97.8%	98.3%	98.4%*	97.1%

	(99/100)	(87/89)	(114/116)	(300/305)	(100/103)
C8-Pre	76.2% (77/101)	75.3% (67/89)	75.9% (88/116)	75.8% (232/306)	84.0% (84/100)
C8-Post	91.0%*** (91/100)	96.6%*** (86/89)	94.9%*** (111/117)	94.1%*** (288/306)	85.4% (88/103)
C9-Pre	85.1% (86/101)	96.6% (86/89)	94.9% (111/117)	92.2% (283/307)	93.1% (94/101)
C9-Post	97.0%*** (98/101)	97.7% (86/88)	95.7% (111/116)	96.7%** (295/305)	91.3% (94/103)
C10-Pre	79.2% (80/101)	78.4% (69/88)	78.4% (91/116)	78.7% (240/305)	79.0% (79/100)
C10-Post	87.1% (88/101)	85.2% (75/88)	80.0% (92/115)	83.9% (255/304)	75.0% (75/100)
C11-Pre	32.7% (33/101)	33.3% (29/87)	25.6% (30/117)	30.2% (92/305)	35.7% (35/98)
C11-Post	51.5%*** (51/99)	42.0% (37/88)	39.1%** (45/115)	44.0%*** (133/302)	27.2% (28/103)
C12-Pre	70.3% (71/101)	67.4% (60/89)	67.2% (78/116)	68.3% (209/306)	62.4% (63/101)
C12-Post	85.1%** (86/101)	81.8%** (72/88)	85.5%*** (100/117)	84.3%*** (258/306)	67.0% (69/103)
C13-Pre	85.1% (86/100)	76.4% (68/89)	81.0% (94/116)	81.3% (248/305)	87.3% (89/102)
C13-Post	79.2% (80/99)	78.4% (69/88)	79.5% (93/117)	79.6% (242/304)	73.8%* (76/103)
C14-Pre	48.5% (49/101)	39.8% (35/88)	46.2% (54/117)	45.1% (138/306)	46.5% (47/101)
C14-Post	65.3%** (66/101)	55.2%** (48/87)	55.2% (64/116)	58.6%*** (178/304)	49.0% (50/102)
C15-Pre	82.8% (82/99)	87.2% (75/86)	74.1%* (86/116)	80.7% (243/301)	75.0% (75/100)
C15-Post	94.1% (95/101)	94.1% (80/85)	90.4% (103/114)	92.7%** (278/300)	81.0% (81/100)
C16-Pre	89.1% (90/101)	92.0% (80/87)	94.0% (109/116)	91.8% (279/304)	90.2% (92/102)
C16-Post	96.0%* (97/101)	92.0% (80/87)	94.9% (111/117)	94.4% (288/305)	94.1% (96/102)
C17-Pre	65.3% (62/95)	75.0% (63/84)	65.5% (74/113)	68.2% (199/292)	60.4% (61/101)
C17-Post	77.8%* (77/99)	83.5% (71/85)	71.9% (82/114)	77.2% (230/298)	61.6% (61/99)
C18-Pre	93.1% (94/101)	96.6% (84/87)	99.1% (114/115)	96.4% (292/303)	97.0% (98/101)
C18-Post	98.0%* (99/101)	97.7% (85/87)	97.4% (114/117)	97.7% (298/305)	98.1% (101/103)
C19-Pre	96.0%	95.4%	95.7%	95.7%	97.1%

	(97/101)	(83/87)	(112/117)	(292/305)	(99/102)
C19-Post	95.0%	96.6%	94.0%	95.1%	94.2%
	(96/101)	(84/87)	(110/117)	(290/305)	(97/103)
C20-Pre	68.3%	73.9%	56.4%	65.4%	53.9%
	(69/101)	(65/88)	(66/117)	(200/306)	(55/102)
C20-Post	74.3%	60.5%*	56.0%	63.4%	58.3%
	(75/101)	(52/86)	(65/116)	(192/303)	(60/103)
C21-Pre	83.0%	89.7%	87.9%	86.8%	83.3%
	(83/100)	(78/87)	(102/116)	(263/303)	(85/102)
C21-Post	92.1%*	97.7%**	92.2%	93.8%***	89.3%
	(93/101)	(85/87)	(107/116)	(285/304)	(92/103)
C22-Pre	81.0%	89.7%	88.8%	86.5%	91.2%
	(81/100)	(78/87)	(103/116)	(262/303)	(93/102)
C22-Post	90.1%*	97.7%**	91.4%	92.8%**	86.3%
	(91/101)	(85/87)	(106/116)	(282/304)	(88/102)
C23-Pre	65.3%	74.7%	60.0%	66.0%	61.8%
	(66/101)	(65/87)	(69/115)	(200/303)	(63/102)
C23-Post	72.0%	73.6%	65.5%	70.0%	62.1%
	(72/100)	(64/87)	(76/116)	(212/303)	(64/103)
C24-Pre	82.2%	87.5%	81.9%	83.6%	91.2%
	(83/101)	(77/88)	(95/116)	(255/305)	(93/102)
C24-Post	87.1%	93.1%	92.2%**	90.8%***	88.2%
	(88/101)	(81/87)	(106/115)	(275/303)	(90/102)
C25-Pre	83.2%	89.7%	82.8%	84.9%	87.0%
	(84/101)	(78/87)	(96/116)	(258/304)	(87/100)
C25-Post	87.1%	88.5%	88.7%	88.1%	86.4%
	(88/101)	(77/87)	(102/115)	(267/303)	(89/103)
C26-Pre	82.5%	86.0%	81.4%	83.1%	79.0%
	(80/97)	(74/86)	(92/113)	(246/296)	(79/100)
C26-Post	87.8%	85.7%	80.7%	84.5%	80.4%
	(86/98)	(72/84)	(92/114)	(250/296)	(78/97)
Total-Pre	78.0%	80.2%	77.1%	78.3%	77.7%
	(2021/2591)	(1832/2283)	(2322/3013)	(6175/7887)	(2044/2629)
Total-Post	84.8%	82.9%	78.5%	81.9%	76.7%
	(2214/2611)	(1882/2269)	(2369/3016)	(6465/7896)	(2039/2657)

Two-tailed t-tests compared pre- and post-test survey results for each question for each column.

p<0.10, **p<.05, *p<.01*

Table 5-7 shows the percentage of correct answers for each question for the different groups in addition to the statistically significant differences as found in two-tailed t-tests. For the Delaney Hall group, there were 12 questions that experienced positive changes at the 90 percent confidence level and 7 questions that experienced positive changes at 95 percent confidence. At the Harbor, 5 questions experienced positive changes at 95 percent confidence or better. However, one question, question #20, actually moved significantly toward the incorrect responses from pre-test to post-test. At Tully House, there were 8 questions that improved significantly at 90 percent confidence and 4 questions that improved at 95 percent confidence.

In comparing the overall experimental group and the control group, the experimental group significantly improved for 11 questions at 90 percent confidence and 10 questions at 95 percent confidence. Conversely, the only significant change between pre-test and post-test surveys for the control group was Question #13 which moved toward incorrect answers at post-test.

At the bottom of Table 5-7, the overall percentages of correct responses are tallied for each of the three sites, the total experimental population, and the total control group. At pre-test, the percentage of correct answers is relatively similar across each of the sites. The experimental group scored 0.6% higher when compared to the control group during the pre-test surveys. Each of the three sites experienced increases in the number of correct answers from pre- to post-test. The largest increase was at Delaney Hall where respondents answered 78.0% of the questions correctly at pre-test and 84.8% of the questions correct at post-test. Overall, the percentage of correct responses for the entire experimental group increased from 78.3% to 81.9%. Conversely, the control group's percentage correct dropped from 77.7% at pre-test to 76.7% at post-test. The results from the 26 questions of fathering knowledge suggest that fathers at each of the three sites experienced improvements.

Table 5-8 reveals the number of questions that experienced improvements in the number of correct responses at each site, the overall experimental group, and the control group. At Delaney Hall, the experimental group scored higher on 22 questions on the post-test compared to the pre-test. Improvements were found in 15 of the 26 questions at the Harbor and 19 of 26 questions at Tully House. When the entire experimental population is analyzed together, there were improvements in the number of correct responses for 22 of the 26 questions. The control group only featured 14 questions with increases in correct responses.

Table – 5-8 - Number of Questions with Increase, Decrease or No Change in Part C Fathering Knowledge by Site

	Delaney	Harbor	Tully	Total	Control
Increases	22	15	19	22	14
Decreases	3	10	6	4	11
No Change	1	1	1	0	1
Total	26	26	26	26	26

Table – 5-9 - Mann Whitney U Results for PARI “Knowledge” Questions

	Delaney	Harbor	Tully	Total	Control
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank	Rank
C27	64.70	59.51	-	123.77	47.56
Pre	(n=66)	(n=57)		(n=123)	(n=50)
C27	66.33	52.30	-	118.11	53.44
Post	(n=64)	(n=54)		(n=118)	(n=50)
C28	65.45	54.02	-	119.07	45.42

Pre	(n=62)	(n=48)		(n=110)	(n=46)
C28	62.62	48.26	-	110.24	51.33
Post	(n=65)	(n=53)		(n=118)	(n=50)
C29	58.99	53.04	-	111.56	42.58
Pre	(n=56)	(n=47)		(n=103)	(n=46)
C29	56.06	45.20	-	100.69	50.42
Post	(n=58)	(n=50)		(n=108)	(n=46)
C30	67.44	55.05	-	115.99	47.35
Pre	(n=65)	(n=57)		(n=120)	(n=51)
C30	61.47	58.98	-	125.97	54.72
Post	(n=63)	(n=56)		(n=121)	(n=50)
C31	58.53	57.45	-	115.85	49.59
Pre	(n=61)	(n=56)		(n=117)	(n=51)
C31	64.47	53.48	-	117.17	52.44
Post	(n=61)	(n=54)		(n=115)	(n=50)
C32	66.57	53.95	-	119.98	48.53
Pre	(n=66)	(n=55)		(n=121)	(n=50)
C32	65.42	51.95	-	116.95	49.50
Post	(n=65)	(n=50)		(n=115)	(n=47)
C33	57.52	56.92	-	114.03	47.11
Pre	(n=59)	(n=55)		(n=114)	(n=50)
C33	66.13	57.08	-	122.68	52.95
Post	(n=64)	(n=58)		(n=122)	(n=49)
C34	65.55	57.58	-	122.76	50.10
Pre	(n=66)	(n=59)		(n=125)	(n=49)
C34	67.45	57.42	-	124.26	44.67
Post	(n=66)	(n=55)		(n=121)	(n=45)

Mann Whitney U test compared pre- and post-test survey for each column.

p<0.10, **p<.05, *p<.01*

Table 5-9 features results from the Mann Whitney U test run on 8 statements from the PARI to measure differences between pre-tests and post-tests at each site, the total population, and the control group. None of the differences between pre- and post-tests were statistically significant. These findings can be interpreted in several ways. One possibility is that the responses were relatively strong at pre-test, yielding little room for improvement. A second possibility is that the modest sample size combined with the lack of statistical power in the nonparametric test reduced the likelihood of individual statements leading to significant results.

Effect on Parenting Behavior

Section D contains statements about parenting behavior through the three most common mechanisms of contacting children from an institution: phone calls, writing letters, and visits. Respondents were given several ordinal level choices to summarize their parenting behavior at the time of pre- and post-test surveys.

Table 5-10 – “I call my children” from Part D at Pre- and Post-Test

	Delaney	Harbor	Tully	Total	Control
Pre -Less 1x Month	3.3% (3)	9.9% (8)	3.6% (4)	5.3% (15)	10.9% (10)
Post – Less 1x Month	4.0% (4)	5.4% (4)	4.5% (5)	4.7% (13)	11.7% (11)
Pre – 1x Month	6.5% (6)	14.8% (12)	8.5% (10)	9.8% (28)	13.0% (12)
Post – 1x Month	7.4% (7)	16.2% (12)	9.1% (10)	10.4% (29)	10.6% (10)
Pre – 1x Week	28.3% (26)	19.8% (16)	27.4% (32)	26.0% (74)	22.8% (21)
Post – 1x Week	40.4% (38)	27.0% (20)	23.6% (26)	30.2% (84)	28.7% (27)
Pre – More 1x Week	46.7% (43)	43.2% (35)	47.0% (55)	46.7% (133)	43.5% (40)
Post – More 1x week	38.3% (36)	45.9% (34)	59.1% (65)	48.6% (135)	37.2% (35)
Pre – Don’t Call	15.2% (14)	12.3% (10)	9.4% (11)	12.3% (35)	9.8% (9)
Post – Don’t Call	9.6% (9)	4.5% (4)	3.4% (4)	6.1% (17)	11.7% (11)
Total - Pre	92	81	112	285	92
Total - Post	94	74	110	278	94

Mann Whitney U test compared pre- and post-test survey results for each column.

p<0.10, **p<.05, *p<.01*

Table 5-10 reveals the results for calling behavior between incarcerated fathers and their children. At each site, there was a substantial drop in the percentage of respondents who reported not calling their child(ren) at all. In the overall experimental group, the number of respondents who did not report calling their children was cut in half from 35 to 17. Conversely, the control group experienced an increase in the number and percentage of respondents who call more than once a week (the highest category). However, the decline in the control group from 43.5% at pre-test to 37.2% at post-test alludes to possible institutional controls or other incarceration effects that might make calling less common as the incarceration experience extends over time.

A Mann Whitney U test was conducted to determine if there were statistically significant results for the experimental sites, the overall experiment group, and the control group. Although there were slight movements toward more reported calling at the Harbor and Tully House, the changes were not significant. Similarly, the entire experimental group moved in the desired direction toward more calling, but not at a significant level. The control group experienced no significant changes.

Table 5-11 – “I write to my children” from Part D at Pre- and Post-Test

	Delaney**	Harbor	Tully	Total*	Control
Pre -Less 1x Month	10.5% (10)	17.1% (14)	7.4% (8)	11.2% (32)	9.5% (8)
Post – Less 1x Month	10.6% (10)	8.2% (6)	9.7% (11)	9.6% (27)	11.8% (11)
Pre – 1x Month	11.6% (11)	24.4% (20)	22.2% (24)	19.3% (55)	20.2% (17)
Post – 1x Month	18.1% (17)	32.9% (24)	31.9% (36)	27.5% (77)	18.3% (17)
Pre – 1x Week	22.1% (21)	22.0% (18)	33.3% (36)	26.3% (75)	22.6% (19)
Post – 1x Week	36.2% (34)	30.1% (22)	38.1% (43)	35.4% (99)	24.7% (23)
Pre – More 1xWeek	17.9% (17)	19.5% (16)	13.0% (14)	16.5% (47)	17.9% (15)
Post – More 1x Week	17.0% (16)	13.7% (10)	6.2% (7)	11.8% (33)	21.5% (20)
Pre – Don’t Write	37.9% (36)	17.1% (14)	24.1% (26)	26.7% (76)	29.8% (25)
Post – Don’t Write	18.1% (17)	15.1% (11)	14.2% (16)	15.7% (44)	23.7% (22)
Total - Pre	95	82	108	285	84
Total - Post	94	73	113	280	93

Mann Whitney U test compared pre- and post-test survey results for each column.

p<0.10, **p<.05, *p<.01*

Table 5-11 contains participant responses about writing behavior with children. Similar to the results for phone calls, the number of participants who did not write to their children at the time of the survey declined at each site. Overall, this percentage fell from 26.7% of all surveyed InsideOut Dad™ participants to 15.7% of the population. The differences in this category between pre- and post-tests were more modest for the control group. Surprisingly, the number of participants who wrote more than once a week actually declined at each of the three sites. This might be interpreted by considering that participants could be calling instead of writing to children.

Results from the Mann Whitney U test for writing behavior showed a rise in writing at Delaney Hall at the 95 percent confidence level. No significant changes were found for the Harbor or Tully House. When the entire sample was analyzed, there were positive significant changes at the 90 percent confidence level, while there were no changes in the control group writing behavior.

Table 5-12 – “I visit with my children” from Part D at Pre- and Post-Test

	Delaney	Harbor	Tully	Total	Control
Pre -Less 1x	7.5% (6)	11.8% (9)	10.5% (10)	10.0% (25)	19.5% (17)

Month					
Post – Less 1x Month	10.3% (8)	13.6% (9)	10.2% (11)	11.1% (28)	7.5% (6)
Pre – 1x Month	10.0% (8)	18.4% (14)	17.9% (17)	15.5% (39)	11.5% (10)
Post – 1x Month	11.5% (9)	13.6% (9)	20.4% (22)	15.9% (40)	16.3% (13)
Pre – 1x Week	17.5% (14)	28.9% (22)	32.6% (31)	26.7% (67)	24.1% (21)
Post – 1x Week	23.1% (18)	36.4% (24)	35.2% (38)	31.7% (80)	35.0% (28)
Pre – More than 1x Week	36.3% (29)	21.1% (16)	18.9% (18)	25.1% (63)	31.0% (27)
Post – More than 1x week	28.2% (22)	22.7% (15)	18.5% (20)	22.6% (57)	23.8% (19)
Pre – Don’t Visit	28.8% (23)	19.7% (15)	20.0% (19)	22.7% (57)	13.8% (12)
Post – Don’t Visit	26.9% (21)	13.6% (9)	15.7% (17)	18.7% (47)	17.5% (14)
Total - Pre	80	76	95	251	87
Total - Post	78	66	108	252	80

Mann Whitney U test compared pre- and post-test survey results for each column.

p<0.10, **p<.05, *p<.01*

Participant results for visiting behavior are found in Table 5-12. Again, the percentage of respondents who did not visit with children fell between the pre- and post-test. This percentage rose slightly for the control group. The percentage of total experiment group respondents who reported visiting more than once a week (25.1) at pre-test dropped to (22.6) at post-test. Results from the Mann Whitney U test for significance found no changes in self-reported visitation for any of the sites, the entire test population, or the control group,

The results about parenting behavior while incarcerated should be interpreted while considering several factors of the incarceration experience. First, as discussed in the qualitative portion of this study, contact with children can be limited by institutional policies. Some residents reported only being able to call their children a certain number of times over a given period due to their status within the facility. Therefore, restrictions on parenting behavior are likely to influence contact with children regardless of the intentions of the resident. Second, there are often other factors outside the institution that influence contact with children including the caregiver's attitude about contact through the jail/prison system and barriers such as distance and time.

Effect on Parenting Attitudes

Part E of the administered survey contains 20 questions from the InsideOut Dad™ survey. Respondents were asked to respond to 20 statements and mark whether they “strongly agree”, “agree”, “disagree”, “strongly disagree” or are “uncertain” about these statements. According to

the InsideOut Dad™ curriculum, there are desired responses for each statement. This “correct” direction is identified for each of the 20 statements below. If the statement is expected to elicit “strongly disagree” responses then predicted results would be higher values on post-tests, while statements eliciting “strongly agree” responses are predicted to have lower values on post-tests.

Table 5-13 - Part E – Mann Whitney U Test on Fathering Attitudinal Statements

	Delaney	Harbor	Tully	Total	Control
E1 Pre	101.30 (n=100)	87.28 (n=87)	108.99 (n=115)	296.48 (n=302)	100.15 (n=102)
E1 Post (SA)	99.70 (n=100)	86.72 (n=86)	121.07 (n=114)	306.56 (n=300)	100.87 (n=98)
E2 Pre	92.10 (n=94)	90.92 (n=85)	99.11 (n=107)	281.55 (n=286)	92.96 (n=102)
E2 Post (SD)	101.66 (n=99)	77.92* (n=83)	121.18*** (n=113)	300.16 (n=295)	108.35** (n=98)
E3 Pre	95.89 (n=96)	89.71 (n=84)	117.58 (n=112)	302.36 (n=292)	94.20 (n=97)
E3 Post (SD)	99.08 (n=98)	78.22 (n=83)	106.36 (n=111)	282.64* (n=292)	105.52 (n=102)
E4 Pre	86.18 (n=88)	72.36 (n=73)	105.62 (n=100)	263.23 (n=261)	93.64 (n=95)
E4 Post (SD)	95.56 (n=93)	83.02 (n=82)	105.39 (n=110)	282.91 (n=285)	100.26 (n=98)
E5 Pre	99.83 (n=96)	86.10 (n=87)	114.34 (n=114)	299.12 (n=297)	94.41 (n=98)
E5 Post (SA)	94.20 (n=97)	87.91 (n=86)	114.66 (n=114)	295.88 (n=297)	105.43 (n=101)
E6 Pre	98.30 (n=94)	81.59 (n=83)	114.61 (n=114)	293.67 (n=291)	98.08 (n=97)
E6 Post (SA)	93.77 (n=97)	87.34 (n=85)	114.39 (n=114)	294.33 (n=296)	100.87 (n=101)
E7 Pre	93.74 (n=90)	82.81 (n=82)	104.27 (n=109)	279.79 (n=281)	100.26 (n=98)
E7 Post (SA)	92.30 (n=95)	85.15 (n=85)	119.39* (n=114)	295.85 (n=294)	100.73 (n=102)
E8 Pre	92.51 (n=97)	86.86 (n=84)	114.73 (n=111)	293.01 (n=292)	100.38 (n=100)
E8 Post (SD)	102.49 (n=97)	81.11 (n=83)	110.31 (n=113)	292.99 (n=293)	101.62 (n=101)
E9 Pre	90.19 (n=85)	75.10 (n=75)	106.21 (n=106)	270.40 (n=266)	94.59 (n=98)
E9 Post (SD)	85.93 (n=90)	80.72 (n=80)	110.70 (n=110)	276.44 (n=280)	98.49 (n=94)
E10 Pre	97.72 (n=97)	86.94 (n=85)	119.68 (n=116)	303.36 (n=298)	94.43 (n=97)

E10 Post(SA)	100.24 (n=100)	86.07 (n=87)	110.19 (n=113)	295.66 (n=300)	103.43 (n=100)
E11 Pre	94.82 (n=99)	87.63 (n=83)	117.71 (n=115)	299.12 (n=297)	100.10 (n=101)
E11 Post(SD)	106.07 (n=101)	82.47 (n=86)	109.14 (n=111)	296.89 (n=298)	100.90 (n=99)
E12 Pre	100.68 (n=97)	87.44 (n=86)	116.05 (n=116)	303.20 (n=299)	97.27 (n=97)
E12 Post(SA)	96.37 (n=99)	85.56 (n=86)	115.95 (n=115)	296.81 (n=300)	102.59 (n=102)
E13 Pre	96.54 (n=94)	78.09 (n=79)	112.40 (n=110)	286.10 (n=283)	96.37 (n=96)
E13 Post(SD)	95.47 (n=97)	81.89 (n=80)	109.61 (n=111)	285.90 (n=288)	98.61 (n=98)
E14 Pre	103.56 (n=95)	85.57 (n=82)	115.48 (n=112)	303.80 (n=289)	92.93 (n=96)
E14 Post(SA)	89.59** (n=97)	80.46 (n=83)	112.56 (n=115)	281.43* (n=295)	103.85 (n=100)
E15 Pre	98.33 (n=97)	86.98 (n=87)	117.89 (n=115)	302.12 (n=299)	102.05 (n=98)
E15 Post(SD)	97.67 (n=98)	82.90 (n=82)	112.09 (n=114)	291.80 (n=294)	98.01 (n=101)
E16 Pre	97.86 (n=92)	81.92 (n=83)	117.44 (n=110)	296.68 (n=285)	94.59 (n=92)
E16 Post(SD)	90.26 (n=95)	82.08 (n=80)	109.77 (n=116)	280.49 (n=291)	96.35 (n=98)
E17 Pre	98.13 (n=84)	84.25 (n=79)	115.34 (n=104)	296.81 (n=267)	95.69 (n=92)
E17 Post(SA)	80.75** (n=93)	78.89 (n=83)	106.16 (n=116)	264.63*** (n=292)	94.35 (n=97)
E18 Pre	104.55 (n=96)	85.66 (n=84)	119.51 (n=115)	308.70 (n=295)	98.95 (n=98)
E18 Post(SA)	92.69* (n=100)	82.32 (n=83)	113.54 (n=117)	287.48* (n=300)	101.02 (n=101)
E19 Pre	88.83 (n=95)	82.46 (n=83)	113.66 (n=111)	283.46 (n=289)	105.84 (n=99)
E19 Post(SD)	106.72** (n=100)	84.54 (n=83)	113.34 (n=115)	304.22 (n=298)	94.22 (n=100)
E20 Pre	79.80 (n=93)	79.35 (n=83)	110.27 (n=112)	268.66 (n=288)	98.42 (n=98)
E 20Post(SD)	111.37*** (n=98)	87.65 (n=83)	113.74 (n=111)	312.04*** (n=292)	103.46 (n=103)

Mann Whitney U test compared pre- and post-test survey results for each column.

p<0.10, **p<.05, *p<.01*

Table 5-13 shows results for a Mann Whitney U test run to identify statistically significant differences in fathering thoughts. Overall, several statements were found to have significant

changes between pre- and post-test surveys at individual sites and overall. Most of these changes were in the expected direction, although two statements experienced significant changes in the opposite direction of InsideOut Dad™ program expectations.

At Delaney Hall, statistically significant results at 90 percent confidence or higher were identified for 5 statements. At post-test, Delaney Hall participants were more likely to move toward "strongly agree" for Statement #14, "The view we have of ourselves comes from our past, even as far back as childhood" at the 95 percent confidence level. Further, at the 95 percent confidence level, respondents were more likely to "strongly agree" to Statement #17, "When family spiritually is present, family members are more likely to cooperate, love, and respect each other" at post-test than at pre-test. Statement #18, "Self-worth is how a man values himself" moved toward "strongly agree" at post-test from pre-test at 90 percent confidence. Statement #19, "A good father knows that discipline is used to punish children instead of to teach and guide" moved toward "strongly disagree" between pre- and post-test at 95 percent confidence. Last, there was a statistically significant change for Statement #20, "A dad can't help his children take care of their physical health while he is locked up" at the 99 percent confidence level.

At the Harbor, the only statistically significant change between pre- and post-test was in the unexpected direction. The 2nd statement, "A dad can't be a role model to his children while he's locked up" actually moved in the direction toward "strongly agree".

At the third site, Tully House, there were two statements that experienced statistically significant changes. One of these changes was in the unexpected direction. Statement #2, "A dad can't be a role model to his children while he's locked up" moved in the desired direction toward "strongly disagree" at 99 percent confidence level. However, Statement #7, "It is just as vital for a dad to show his daughter what a good man looks like as it is for him to show his son what a good man looks like" moved toward strongly disagree at 90 percent confidence when it was expected to move toward "strongly agree".

For the entire experimental group, several statements revealed statistical significant differences from pre- to post-surveys. Surprisingly, the third statement, "It is not vital for the well-being of your child to respect his/her mother" moved toward "strongly agree" rather than "strongly disagree". However, four statements moved in the expected direction including Statement #14, "The view we have of ourselves comes from our past, even as far back as childhood" at 90 percent confidence; Statement #17, "When family spirituality is present, family members are more likely to cooperate, love, and respect each other" at 99 percent confidence; Statement #18, "Self-worth is how a man values himself" at 90 percent confidence; and Statement #20, "A dad can't help his children take care of their physical health while he is locked up" at 99 percent confidence. The control group only experienced one statistically significant change to Statement #2, "A dad can't be a role model to his children while he's locked up" at 95 percent confidence in the desired direction.

Table 5-14 - Part B- "What is the degree of happiness you feel about being a parent?"

	Delaney	Harbor	Tully	Total	Control
Pre	92.95 (n=98)	85.33 (n=88)	112.17 (n=115)	289.68 (n=301)	103.33 (n=101)
Post	104.99* (n=99)	91.67 (n=88)	119.79 (n=116)	315.24** (n=303)	99.67 (n=101)

Mann Whitney U test compared pre- and post-test survey results for each column.

p<0.10, **p<.05, *p<.01*

Table 5-14 reveals responses for a question posed in Part B of the survey. Respondents were asked to gauge their level of happiness in being a parent on a Likert scale with answer options: very bad, bad, okay, good, and very good. A Mann Whitney U test was conducted to determine if there were significant differences from pre- and post-test at each of the sites and for the total experiment and control group. The only site to show any significant change was Delaney Hall at the 90 percent confidence level. The entire experimental population showed a statistically significant improvement at 95 percent confidence. There were no changes in the control group.

The results for the 20 statements on fathering attitudes show several statistically significant results using the Mann Whitney U test. Many other results changed in the expected direction, but failed to reach levels of statistical significance. These findings indicate that program participants are experiencing positive changes in their attitudes toward fathering as an incarcerated individual after being exposed to the InsideOut Dad™ curriculum.

Effect on Institutional Behavior

Table 5-15 compares institutional infraction data for the Delaney Hall site for both the experimental and control group. The experimental group had a very modest increase in the number of positive comments per 1,000 days after participating in the program compared to before entry. Minor violations increased slightly, while major violations decreased. The number of total violations for the experimental group per 1,000 days dropped from 44.92 to 41.71. The control group experienced larger increases in positive comments and larger decreases in total violations when compared to the experimental group.

Table 5-15 – Number of Institutional Infractions per 1,000 Days at Delaney Hall for Experiment and Control Group

	Positive	Minor Infractions	Major Infractions	Total Infractions
Delaney Exp. – Pre	8.10	17.83	9.26	44.92
Delaney Exp - During	6.90	14.96	7.77	36.24
Delaney Exp. – Post	8.45	20.33	6.34	41.71
Delaney Control - Pre	13.80	30.79	6.37	63.69
Delaney Control - During	23.32	25.19	6.53	41.98
Delaney Control - Post	37.78	19.29	5.63	32.96

Table 5-16 – Number of Institutional Infractions per 1,000 Days at the Harbor for Experiment Group

	Positive	Minor Infractions	Major Infractions	Total Infractions
Harbor Exp. – Pre	0	.40	.40	2.02
Harbor Exp. - During	0	1.05	.26	2.10
Harbor Exp. – Post	0	1.56	.35	4.86

Table 5-16 shows institutional data for the Harbor participants. The number of recorded infractions at the Harbor was much smaller than Delaney Hall. Although major violations per 1,000 days decreased when comparing the group before program participation to after the program, the number of minor violations per 1,000 days jumped from .40 to 1.56. The number of total violations was 4.86 per 1,000 days after participation while that statistic was 2.02 before the program.

Table 5-17 – Number of Institutional Infractions per 1,000 Days at Tully House for Experiment and control group

	Positive	Minor Infractions	Major Infractions	Total Infractions
Tully Exp. – Pre	0	.45	.60	6.30
Tully Exp. – During	0	.44	.44	5.22
Tully Exp – Post	0	1.00	.75	8.59
Tully Control - Pre	0	1.00	0	5.98
Tully Control – During	0	0	0	3.95
Tully Control - Post	0	.80	2.40	11.19

Table 5-17 reveals the institutional data from the Tully House experiment and control groups. The experiment group experienced slight increases in the number of major, minor, and overall infractions between pre- and post-test periods. The control group, while experiencing very few minor or major violations during the study period, had a higher rate of violation at post-test than at pre-test.

The findings here show that for both the experimental and control groups, there were higher levels of infractions after program participation than before participation. This finding can likely be explained by a few important factors. One aspect to consider is that some of the post-test periods were ended earlier because of serious violations that returned the subject to state prison or transferred the subject to another facility. Therefore, the infraction might minimize the number of days after program participation to inflate post-test infraction results. Second, there may be a natural increase in poor behavior or a change in the relationships between residents and staff that occurs over time. For many of the program and control group participants, the data collection period occurred relatively early during the stay at the facility. Therefore, the surprising increase in infractions is likely caused by other factors not related to the InsideOut Dad™ program. The corresponding results from the control groups also support such an interpretation.

VI – Qualitative Findings

Participant Interviews

Participant Backgrounds

The interviewed participants in the program represent a wide variety of circumstances regarding their family situation. While many of the participants had recently given birth to their first child, other participants had adult children and/or several children. Additionally, many residents had children with multiple women, complicating the relationships that would be discussed in the InsideOut Dad™ program. A small number of respondents had unborn children “on the way.”

Despite their incarceration, very few participants have completely lost contact with children. Similar to national-level surveys that show that parents utilize multiple methods of communication (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2004), InsideOut Dad™ participants utilize all three basic methods of contact: writing letters, phone calls, and visits. Several of the residents expressed disappointment in not being able to consistently see their children because of geographic distances or strained relationships with the child’s caregiver. For instance, one father of five had tried to keep contact with his children but the children’s mother refused, forcing the participant to file petitions. Previous studies have found that spouses often purposely avoid child contact with incarcerated fathers due to a concern about the detrimental effects on the child (Clarke et al., 2005; Hairston, 2002). Phone calls are a common way of keeping in touch with children who are unable to visit, however there are still challenges with this method of communication, as well. A younger father with three young children explained that he struggles to find extra work to do in the prison to obtain 5 minute phone calls through merits.

Relationships with Family upon Program Entry

During the pre-test interview, subjects were asked to describe their relationship with their child(ren) and their child(ren)’s mother(s). The array of responses portray the diversity of family situations for incoming InsideOut Dad™ participants. On one hand, some participants reported very positive relationships with children. The words “beautiful”, “wonderful”, and “real good” were used by different respondents to describe the relationship with their children. For some fathers, the relation with the child’s mother influenced their relation with their child or children.

The majority of participants who reported to have issues with children or mothers tied the problems to their incarceration. For some fathers, the length of incarceration has created a spiteful perspective from mothers or adult children. For one older father with three children, his relationship was described as “not as good as it should be.” This was linked to a period of incarceration that has lasted most of 20 years. Another father with four young children stated about one of his younger male children, “I’m supposed to teach how to be a man and to guide him and to be that figure in their life. Incarceration has limited that, so it could have been better.”

Views on Fatherhood upon Program Entry

Despite mixed responses evaluating their relationships with children, the majority of respondents reported positive feelings about fatherhood during the pre-test interview. A father with two children described his feelings about being a father, “I like it. I’m with him everyday – do homework with him. I lost my leg and they didn’t think I could take care of him, but on weekends, he’s been with me.” Another respondent summed up his opinions on the role of fatherhood, “I love being a father. I get along with my kids and its one of the best things I’ve done in my life.”

Some fathers looked at the role of fatherhood as a responsibility to do more for their children than what their fathers did for them, “I think having the presence of a father is important to a child’s success. I didn’t have my father. I had my grandfather who died at 16 and things went haywire. I don’t want to be like him.” For another father, the viewpoint was similar, “I look at my father – what he gave me – and do the opposite. I’m still learning.” A father with two pre-teenage sons stated, “I love being a father to my kids cause my father wasn’t there.” These sentiments are representative of the view of many incoming participants that the program could help them learn to not repeat mistakes of their own father. The findings from these interviews about the role of incarcerated men’s fathers are similar to some previous studies (Buston, 2010; Meek, 2007)

Initiation to the Program

Program participants were questioned why and how they entered the InsideOut Dad™ program. When asked what they wanted to get out of the program, most of the respondents had very broad, general expectations. Common responses were well represented by one father’s statement that he wanted “to become a better dad from inside and get better when (I) get out.” Other participants focused particularly on being incarcerated, as one father “wanted to learn how (I) can be a father while being in here.” The challenge of being a father while in prison was a major theme for participants. For some residents, incarceration had meant an inability to build relationships with their children. One respondent stated when coming into the program, “I am open to new information. I haven’t participated in my child’s life, only for 2 years, so I haven’t built a well-rounded relationship with him.”

Many respondents introspectively expressed their faults as fathers. In one case, an elderly resident with two children in their 30’s categorized his relationships with them as “shaky”, stating that it had “been a long time since I’ve been a proper father to them.” Another participant analyzed his own parenting style at the pre-test interview, stating, “I have a relatively good relationship. I’m quite stern. Sometimes civil; sometimes uncivil. I need to show that parents can be civil.”

Other fathers produced more vague responses about their fathering, yet acknowledged that there were issues that could be addressed, “I want to be a better dad, I mean, emotionally, and also learn about my faults, my problems.” The introspective nature of many of the participants was clear in pre-test interviews.

Other program participants saw the program as an opportunity to strengthen their relationships with younger children as relationships with older children had weakened. A father with children of 23, 11, and 3 was intent on not repeating previous mistakes with older children

and stated that he was “hoping to learn how to be a better parent cause I have a young child.” This participant felt that it would be difficult to affect his relationship with his older kids, but the relationship with the younger child could still be salvaged.

Participants learned of the program in a variety of ways. More than half of the interviewed participants had decided to join the program after hearing about InsideOut Dad™ through word of mouth within the facility. The setting in each institution allows for considerable interaction with other residents for much of the day within the unit. Some respondents observed cellmates carrying the program handbook and were intrigued by the materials. The remaining program enrollees had either seen sign-up sheets for the program when moving around the facility or had been made aware of the program by a counselor or other member of the staff. Often, the respondents reported being encouraged to consider the program during their family counseling sessions or during an intake process.

Participant attitudes toward the program at the outset were split. Some participants viewed the program as a way of passing time and gaining favor within the system. Conversely, other participants were extremely eager to begin the program. Many of the participants falling into the latter grouping were influenced by the positive feedback they had received from previous InsideOut Dad™ graduates. In fact, multiple interviewees insinuated that the program was well-known throughout the facilities after a few sessions had already run.

Opinions on Program Curriculum

The InsideOut Dad™ curriculum consists of a series of units with additional optional unit sessions. Interview respondents were asked during the post-test to provide feedback about the material contained within the program. Additionally, the respondents were asked if there were any topics that they felt should have been (1) discussed, but were not, or (2) were discussed, but should be more prominently featured. The majority of the interviewees were extremely satisfied with the content covered in the class. Relatively few subjects were able to cite specific subjects that they felt were skipped over or not covered adequately enough.

As a general assessment of the material from the InsideOut Dad™ curriculum, one father with four adolescent children said, “the program pretty much gave me what I wanted to hear. More is always better, but the book [handbook] was right on point with a broad overview also.” Other respondents not only thought the handbook adequately met expectations, but also thought that the handbook “covered more subjects than (I) thought it would.”

Some respondents were able to identify particular strengths of the material that influenced them the most. A father with two pre-teenager sons said, “The book is on point. You aren’t supposed to holler then talk or try and bribe them. I was doing that. I wasn’t realizing it.” A specific point in the handbook that several respondents mentioned was the focus on religion and spirituality. “It’s a pretty big book and it covered a lot of ground. One thing I didn’t know at all was the religion/spiritual difference and between fathering and mothering. I had no idea what spirituality was.” Some participants tied the messages of religion and spirituality with self-worth. For others, the most important messages were quite specific. Another father with two male children ages 4 and 7 focused on a particular concern, “One thing was when kids become teenagers and start dating – what should we tell kids if it’s too early.” These quotes demonstrate that the messages from InsideOut Dad™ can be broad or specific.

The impact of the text even influenced one father to continue with the material after the program ended, “I’m still reading it. I keep reading it but in the first 11 lessons there was a lot of stuff that I didn’t realize.” For another participant, the text would serve long-term purposes, “The book made me realize a lot about myself and kids. I plan on keeping that book forever. I can get direction from that book. It can guide you to being a good... great father.”

When asked for improvements that could be made for the curriculum, there were few specific suggestions. Most respondents said that they had no recommendations. However, there were some exceptions. One father thought that the handbook repeated itself at times. Another father believed that there were sections that could have been more in-depth. Yet, that same respondent noted specific aspects of the handbook that went beyond previous classes he had participated in. Overall, there were few instructive critiques of the material featured in the InsideOut Dad™ curriculum.

Opinions on Program Facilitators

One of the most consistent sets of responses was in regard to the performance of program facilitators. The interviewed participants were asked at post-test how they felt about the program facilitators and whether there were things that the facilitators could have done better. At each of the program sites, the respondents praised the connections that developed between facilitators and program participants. At one site, a father with one son replied, “Ms. C* is excellent. She helps you dig deep inside yourself and shows you how to complement the book and your lifestyle.” Other respondents noted how facilitators encouraged participation, “They were very helpful. They let us express ourselves, let us speak our minds and never cut us off.” Another specific point that was highlighted in interviews was the connection that developed between facilitators and the InsideOut Dad™ participants, “I thought Ms. V* was great. She’s attentive and concerned. It seemed like she cared about us.” An individual situation where facilitators helped a father through a specific issue was mentioned by one father with two adult female children, “They were wonderful. I had things with my daughter. She blamed me for her mother’s death and I brought that up in group more than once.”

Some fathers said that the facilitators were especially skilled at complementing the material in the handbook. One father said, “The format with the book gave a complete outlook, examples and Ms. C explained it to a T. She didn’t get to certain parts and skip. Each part was intimate.” Overall, the responses to facilitators were extremely positive. No instructive remarks were given by participants for improvements that could make for a better program in relation to facilitators or other staff.

Opinions on Program Overall

InsideOut Dad™ graduates were asked to reflect on the overall value of the program. Additionally, they were asked whether the program met their initial expectations and hopes that they had identified at the pre-test interview. Only a few of the fathers had knowledge about the details of the program when they were interviewed at pre-test. Most of the program participants started the program with an open mind. When asked to evaluate the program and to compare it to

other programs, the majority of the InsideOut Dad™ participants felt that the program met and exceeded their expectations.

When asked to compare the InsideOut Dad™ program with other programs at correctional institutions, several respondents reported participating in previous parenting programs. Although comparisons are difficult to make, respondents who had participated in non-parenting classes in the past were asked to compare the InsideOut Dad™ program to other programs. For some fathers, this program fit a need in their lives more than other programs. One father complained that he could not relate to other programs. In particular, the father complained about attending programs for drug addicts when he had never had problems with addiction. Another father stated, “This and parenting skills are better cause I’m a father and that’s more important than anything. Parenting skills and InsideOut Dad™ are the two meetings at this facility that you want to go back.” Other respondents who enjoyed classes that focused on parenting/fathering highlighted other issues, “This and parenting kept me wanna keep going and learn more and more. Learn about other parents and how they treat their kids, so I liked it a lot.” Another father who recognized the importance of his role of a father said, “Taking care of my kids is my biggest responsibility. My kids are young and my highest priority. I gave up chasing their mother.” For some fathers, the differences were clear. When asked to compare the programs, one father said, “this is the only one I paid attention to.”

A father with one son had participated in a parenting program at another facility. When he was asked to compare the programs, he stated that InsideOut Dad™ was “100% better than parenting skills. It was everything. The instructor in that program—he wasn’t even a father and basically was going off the book. He was learning as we go. I think this class, 100%.” The usefulness of the program was illustrated by another father who clarified that his participation in the program did not depend on his idleness while incarcerated, “Honestly, I’d take it in the free world. I really would.”

The InsideOut Dad™ program offered a unique opportunity to listen to the stories of other men that they might not ordinarily talk to within the institution for others. These relationships were often cited as the most important aspects of the program. One older father stated, “I like the camaraderie. I formed friendship outside of class – more of when we paired off. The dude I was paired off with was 19, but a lot of our problems were the same.”

Opinions on Program Improvements

Although many respondents replied that they had no specific improvements for the InsideOut Dad™ program, there were several participants who thought the program could become even better with modifications. One of the issues that multiple residents mentioned was the lack of participation for family and children. Although there is substantial discussion about their kids, multiple respondents felt disappointed that there was no component to the program that directly included the children. Therefore, the ideas that were discussed in the group format were applied to letters, phone calls, or face-to-face meetings outside of the scope of the program. However, several residents emphasized that the ideas would be easier to put into practice if children and other family members could become more involved in the program.

One respondent who had participated in a program with one facilitator thought that the program would be best suited to have both a male and female facilitator. Noting the differences between a male and female approach to the subject, he thought that more angles could be

explored. At some facilities, some groups did have both a male and female facilitator, while his facility only used one facilitator per group.

Another concern broached by multiple respondents was the attrition within the program. Depending on the site, some groups ended up graduating less than half of the original participants. “The only thing is the way people leave. People leave. Keep the group together and that would make it better. Four or 5 finished out with like 14. They left, bail, parole, sent back, stuff like that.” Respondents felt that the attrition had a negative effect on the morale of the group and the relationships that develop between participants.

The biggest weakness of the program to one respondent was the reality that graduation likely meant the last formal meeting with fellow graduates. When asked what would improve the program, the father said, “When you leave here, some kind of meeting for you guys who leave, at least once or twice a month.” An alumni group was seen by this father as a way of keeping in touch with other fathers and discussing issues that arise after the InsideOut Dad™ program has ended.

Although the facilities arranged for some celebration to mark the graduation from the program, one father was frustrated that his family could not participate in this success. He felt that he had accomplished something significant by earning his certificate from the facility that his children and spouse would benefit from witnessing this celebration. The father did acknowledge the possibility of practical concerns that might arise.

Lastly, some respondents were concerned with the limited scope of the program. Many respondents knew of other people in the facility who wanted to join the program but were told that they would have to wait or be denied. Additionally, one respondent was surprised that the program was available at the Community Education Centers (CECs) but not at the traditional prisons in the state. In total, these fathers wanted to see an expansion of the program so more people would be able to experience what they had. Table 6-1 summarizes the suggested improvements to the InsideOut Dad™ program that were mentioned by participants during the post-test interview.

Influence on Familial Interactions

Participants were questioned during the post-test interview about the effect that joining and graduating the InsideOut Dad™ program has had on contacts with their children and families. Although a small minority of participants had not re-established contact with children at the point of interview, the majority of respondents were able to evaluate whether the program seemed to influence these communications.

For some fathers, participation in the program equated to an increase in communication with children. A father with four children noted this change, “Yeah, I wasn’t writing letters but I read that part and I actually started to do that.....just saying ‘I love you.’”

In other situations, the program did not change the amount of contact with children and significant others, but it affected the nature of the communication. A father who continually embraced his role as a parent throughout the interview explained that the program “helped me realize that I can’t just tell them, but I have to listen and learn from them.” Another father said that when talking on the phone with his 7-year old daughter, “she doesn’t know but sees dad’s a little calmer.” Although his daughter was not explicitly aware of his participation in the program, the respondent believed that she was noticing differences in his more calm approach.

A father with six children utilized the material from the text in a very direct way, “With my wife, it’s funny some stuff in the book stuck right out at me. She’ll say something and it relates back to the class. I took quotes from the book to make me look smart.” Another father with a young daughter responded, “Absolutely, it has affected. I ain’t never forget and every time I look at my baby, I think about some of the stuff in the program. I’m always going to be reminded.” One father, who did not want to talk about the specific details, recalled an incident that occurred with his son. The father explained that he spoke to his facilitator who taught him to go about it in a positive way and the situation eventually “worked out for both of us.”

Release and Future Plans

Each graduated interviewee was asked by the interviewer to project forward what their plans were in terms of their relationship with their children and employment. Depending on the facility, participants had different levels of certainty about their future incarceration period. For some residents in the county population, there was no set release date and they might be incarcerated for several months or years. For most of the participants in the state population, they had a set date in the following 12 months when they would be released from the institution.

When asked about their future relationships with children, a dichotomy formed between fathers who believed that their relationship with their kids would improve because they are released and those who believed that their relationship would not change significantly. Generally, the participants who stated that their relation would not change were those who believed that incarceration had not affected that relationship in a negative way.

Participants in the program have a variety of plans to reintegrate into the workforce. Some of the respondents have specific plans. For instance, one inmate who had served time at Southern State Correctional Facility in Delmont had earned a forklift license that he planned to use to obtain work. However, that same father stated that he wished he received even more job training while incarcerated. Other participants focused on other entrepreneurial alternatives that they believed could be successful upon release. For a couple of respondents, there was a belief that solid work and income could also aid the father-child relationship.

Summary of Participant Interview Results

In summary, the qualitative interviews revealed several important findings that may impact the future implementation of the InsideOut Dad™ program in correctional facilities. The fathers who enter the program are an extremely diverse set of individuals in terms of age, race, and family circumstances. While some of the fathers report very positive relationships with children, others have non-existent or erratic relationships. This variation creates a challenge for facilitators who must gear program discussion toward both successful and struggling relationships.

The interviews also indicate that recruitment within the facilities is not a major barrier for the InsideOut Dad™ program once the program has started. Through informal discussion in the facilities, most of the residents are aware of the program and are influenced by the satisfaction of participants and graduates. Although some individual prospects might be targeted by family service programs, there was no lack of available participants at any of the sites.

The evaluation by interviewed participants of program material, facilitators, and the overall experience was overwhelmingly positive. In relation to suggested improvements, several concerns were identified that might link to practical changes. For instance, the attrition experienced in a few groups was not only important due to “wasted” resources and a position that could have been filled by a potential graduate, but the removal of fathers appeared to actually affect the other members in that group. Therefore, issues that affect one participant might influence the experiences of others based on the relationships that are constructed during the first few weeks of the group. Each of the concerns mentioned by graduates in the interviews should be considered for future implementation.

When asked to look to their future, most of the participants believed that the InsideOut Dad™ program would play a significant role. Although the future employment and familial plans for fathers were quite varied, more than half of respondents saw the program as a positive influence for when they are released from the facility. Whether this influence would be reading the handbook for instruction or remembering back to moments within the group setting, the qualitative portion of this study indicates a lasting effect from the program for, at the very least, some of the graduating participants.

Table 6-1 – InsideOut Dad™ Participant Suggestions for Improvements

Identified Problem	Suggestion/Recommendation
Facilitator Gender	Have a female and male facilitator in each specific group.
Lack of Presence of Children/Family	Allow children to participate in some of the activities to link program material with actual interactions.
Attrition	*Focus on likelihood of completion, especially in facilities with highly transient populations.
Lack of Follow-Up	Arrange alumni groups that meet once or twice a month to discuss experiences after program participation ends.
Limited Availability	Expand scope of program within the present facilities or to other New Jersey Department of Corrections facilities.
Family Doesn't Share Success	Include family members in graduation arrangements to recognize achievement.

* Recommendation not explicitly stated by respondent(s).

Stakeholder Interviews

Background and Training

The education and employment background of facilitators of the InsideOut Dad™ program is diverse. In terms of education, one facilitator holds multiple Master's Degrees, while two others are currently enrolled in Master's programs for family and/or mental health counseling. Two other facilitators had not attended college or taken college-level classes at the time of the interview. In relation to work history, multiple facilitators had extensive employment history in alcohol and drug abuse. Experience at their current facility ranged from short-term internships to over decades of employment. Generally, facilitators can be dichotomized into graduate students or recent graduates who had just obtained work at the facility and facilitators who possess extensive work history in the field.

Facilitators were questioned about the training that they received before participating in the InsideOut Dad™ program. Most of the facilitators received formal training at Community Education Centers' headquarters. However, one of the program facilitators who began working as a facilitator after the program had already been initiated at the site stated that he/she did not receive formal training. Rather, this facilitator was given the curriculum and sat in on multiple groups as a "silent observer" to absorb the atmosphere of the program. In hindsight, the facilitator stated that formal training would have been appropriate in addition to this exposure.

First Impressions

When first familiarized with the materials, content, and goals of the InsideOut Dad™ program, most of the facilitators' initial reactions were that the program was "much needed". One facilitator viewed the program as one that would help with "really important skills and exploration for themselves" and was "very therapeutic to help them explore their experiences and their past." Another facilitator described being extremely "excited looking at the material." They stated, "I knew it would help change." Each interviewed facilitator was optimistic about the program's promise when they learned that it would be implemented at their site.

Opinions on Material

The program facilitators were also asked to evaluate the material contained in the InsideOut Dad™ curriculum. Most of the respondents thought that the material was well structured and featured the majority of necessary topics for the fathers. In evaluating the course curriculum handbook, one facilitator stated, "The book is designed well. I also like the self-esteem/worth sections. It is designed very well and the quotes are inspiring." Another facilitator noted that despite some "typos and grammar issues that the residents don't usually notice" the handbook is well designed. This facilitator did not specifically state whether these issues were in the Facilitator's Manual or the handbook that the residents used, however the comment about residents not noticing the issues indicates that they were referring to the handbook that resident's used.

When asked if there were any important subjects that were not explicitly covered in the curriculum, several facilitators could not think of any specific content that should be added. One facilitator commented that one addition could be a component on “emotional processing, talking about trust, and also more of group therapy.” Nevertheless, the overwhelming feeling from facilitators was that the material covered the array of necessary components to address the wide-ranging needs of the residents.

Opinions on Environment

Each of the facilitators described a group environment that changes drastically between the first and last group meetings. During the first meeting, residents were described as “excited and curious. They are more curious, nervous, and cautious about ‘who can I trust’, ‘am I comfortable’, apprehensive.” Facilitators who spoke about a change in atmosphere were asked when this usually occurs. One of the facilitators said, “the atmosphere always changes, more peace, more humility, gratitude. Behavior changes. Gradually, this happens after about the 5th or 6th session. They begin to trust one another and trust me.” Another facilitator noted a change “around the 7th session for fathering and self-worth. That’s where it changes. There’s a huge change in self-worth.”

Opinions on Challenges

A few particular challenges for stakeholders were noted in the interviews. At one facility with a transient environment, it was stated by multiple stakeholders that it was challenging to be able to predict who would still be at the facility throughout the duration of the program. While relatively few participants left the program due to negative experiences, the majority of the attrition was caused by discharges, sentencing, or other court dates that were not predictable at the outset of that group. One facilitator explained that they tried to do their best to meet and ask why participants might leave, however this unpredictability presented a substantial challenge in keeping groups together across the 6-week period.

Another interesting complication was identified by a facilitator who worked with the Department of Corrections population. Because sex offenders were not eligible to be part of the program, the facilitator expressed concern that this branded some participants who were not in the program as likely sex offenders. Although past criminal offenses are often known within the facility, there was an ongoing effort to restrict knowledge of offense history to other residents. In particular, the facilitator warned that this exclusion from the program as a possible sex offender could result in undesirable outcomes based on this negative label as a sex predator.

One potential issue that did not become a challenge was recruitment for the program. In each of the facilities word of the program spread throughout the resident population. At one facility, facilitators spoke of long waiting lists to participate in the program where residents were being turned away. At another facility, a sheet was posted with 12 lines for potential participants for the next session, yet approximately 18 participants signed up by making their own lines on the sheet of paper.

Opinions on Program Improvements

Each interviewed facilitator was asked to comment on how they thought the program could be improved. Although each of the facilitators viewed the InsideOut Dad™ program as a positive addition to the facility, they believed that there was some room for improvement. One facilitator argued that the program should be conducted on a daily basis, “I would be doing the program every day until the book is done even though I know that is hard for the research study. We would keep it focused with optionals.” This facilitator was concerned that when the program was conducted twice a week, there was a lack of consistency and fluidity that might come from daily meetings. Additionally, if classes met each day, more groups could be held to include more participants overall.

Another issue that was spoken about was group size. When groups were limited to 10 or 12 participants with the possibility of attrition, each facilitator believed that the numbers were manageable. However, some groups reached as high as 25 participants at the starting point. Several facilitators argued that the larger groups lack the intimacy and cohesiveness of the small groups. When facilitators were asked to specify a target range for the ideal number of group participants the responses ranged from five or six to approximately 12.

One facilitator believed that the program was extremely useful but stressed the importance of considering economics. They stated that the program needs to be coupled with other programs that focus on current events and being able to provide or the frustration of not being able to support a family would likely overwhelm anything that was covered in the class.

Echoing the sentiment voiced by several interviewed participants, two of the facilitators at different facilities stated that an alumni group would be beneficial. They believed that the residents needed to understand that graduation did not mean the end of the program and its influence. Additionally, one facilitator noted that, “Alumni would look forward to helping someone else now that they’ve helped themselves.” On a similar note, one of the facilitators argued that family participation in the graduation process would be meaningful to both the participants and the family members. The focus on a larger, more inclusive graduation ceremony and continued participation in alumni groups was discussed in both the participant and stakeholder interviews. Table 6-2 summarizes the recommendations of the interviewed stakeholders.

Summary of Stakeholder Interview Results

Interviews with program facilitators demonstrate that the InsideOut Dad™ program was overwhelmingly welcomed and supported by facility personnel. The facilitators were optimistic about the program’s potential when they were first introduced to the content, and each of the interviewed facilitators stated that the program met their expectations. Several facilitators expressed uneasiness about the potential of the program not continuing at the facilities. For one facilitator the program “gives me hope that we’re doing something for them. Whoever’s behind it – I applaud them.”

Despite the consistently positive feedback from facilitators, there were several important recommendations provided about potential improvements that would make the program more efficient for both the staff and residents. In particular, there was a focus on ensuring that the graduation ceremony did not mean the complete end of participation in the InsideOut Dad™

experience and that participants were recognized for their achievements through symbols as simple as InsideOut Dad™ t-shirts or the presence of family members at graduation.

Table 6-2 – InsideOut Dad™ Stakeholder Suggestions for Improvements

Identified Problem	Suggestions/Recommendations
Survey instrument is too lengthy	Shorten portions of survey where possible
Program attrition	
Labeling non-participants as possible sex offenders	Allow all offenders to participate in the program.
Large program groups	Place limits on group size
Lack of consideration for economic issues	Couple the InsideOut Dad™ program with other programs that incorporate practical skills
Periods of time in between meetings	Conduct classes on a daily basis until handbook is complete

VII – Limitations

The current evaluation uses a multi-method approach to arrive at several important conclusions about the effectiveness of the InsideOut Dad™ program in Newark CEC facilities. Specifically, the current research has included qualitative components that were not present in previous studies of the InsideOut Dad™ program. However, the research contains multiple limitations that should be considered when interpreting these findings including the quasi-experimental research design, reduced size of the control group, measures of behavioral changes, non-graduates, and reported significance levels.

A first limitation of this research is the quasi-experimental design of the research study. Although careful consideration was placed into the design of the research, both ethical and practical concerns eliminated the possibility of using a random experimental design. From an ethical perspective, a randomly assigned program would exclude many individuals from the program who would likely have left the facility by the study's end. Practically, the transient nature of multiple CEC facilities would make a random sample extremely difficult, if not impossible, to gather. The debate surrounding strong quasi-experimental and random experiments in criminological evaluation research has not been fully resolved as some scholars stress the need for experiments (Farrington, 2003; Feder & Boruch, 2000) while others argue that carefully designed quasi-experiments are satisfactory (Eck, 2006). Although some evaluations of parenting program research push for more experimental designs in research, the majority of such studies use strong quasi-experimental designs for the ethical and practical purposes described above.

A limitation relative to the quantitative analysis is the size of the control group. Gathering control participants for the study was especially difficult because of the inherent differences in the four featured facilities. The control group originally included participants only from Logan Hall. However, preliminary analysis of data conducted in December of 2010 identified several differences between the Logan Hall population and program participants. Mainly, Logan Hall residents were found to be older and had a more extensive criminal history. Therefore, the control group was then gathered from the sites where the programs were being operated in addition to Logan Hall. Due to this change, the control group (n=104) was not as large as initially planned. However, the control group still contains many more cases than previous evaluations of InsideOut Dad™ programs.

Another limitation is the measure of change in behavior utilized in this research. In this study, behavioral changes were measured by institutional infractions in addition to some survey questions. However, the standards for infractions are likely to differ across sites. One consideration with the institutional data is the discretionary nature of personnel decisions on commendations and infractions. Both positive comments and some less serious infractions are subject to individual decisions by institutional personnel. Additionally, any long-term changes in behavior or attitude were not measured beyond the 12-week post-graduation period.

One other limitation that should be considered in this evaluation is the focus on graduates and the control group. The evaluation did not focus on the population that did not finish the group. According to interviews with participants and stakeholders, nearly all participants who left the group did so because of dismissals from the facility, court dates, etc. The majority of this

attrition took place at Delaney Hall because of the heavy county jail population at this facility. This population of non-graduates should be considered when interpreting results.

In the quantitative analysis, it should be mentioned that results are reported in this document when they meet 90 percent significance. However, many researchers prefer to use, at least, a 95 percent confidence interval when interpreting social science research. Close attention should be paid to the significance levels reported in this study (90, 95, and 99 percent confidence levels).

VIII - Conclusion

The current study used several forms of data collection to evaluate the effectiveness of the InsideOut Dad™ program in Newark, New Jersey Community Education Centers Residential Reentry Centers. The study aimed to build upon previous smaller-scale evaluations of the InsideOut Dad™ by expanding the scope of the program and using qualitative techniques for data collection. Overall, several of the main findings indicate that the InsideOut Dad™ program was welcomed by the residents and staff. Additionally, the quantitative and qualitative analyses lead to the conclusion that the program has been successful in achieving many of its goals.

The quantitative portion of the study identified improvements in many of the primary categories as identified in Loper and Tuerk's (2006) review of the literature: confidence/self-esteem, knowledge, behavior, and attitudes. When the populations were compared at pre-test surveys, there were very few significant differences across sites and between the experimental and control groups. The primary difference was the age difference between the mean experimental participants and control participants.

Confidence and self-esteem changes were tested using nonparametric measures of significance. Although only three of the 10 statements experienced significant changes at any of the sites or for the total experimental population, the lack of changes for the control group indicate that there was a rise in self-esteem on some measures. Further, the consistency in significant results across sites for statements about analyzing problems and getting assistance from CEC staff clearly identifies strengths of the program and curriculum.

Changes in parenting knowledge were measured through two scales: a 26-question test from the InsideOut Dad™ survey and 8 statements from the PARI. Many significant positive changes were identified through two-tailed t-tests between the pre- and post-surveys at each site. The fact that none of these significant changes occurred for the control group provides strong supporting evidence that material from throughout the curriculum positively affected parenting knowledge for the participating fathers. Although Delaney Hall participants showed the most improvement in this section, there were large improvements at each of the three sites. Conversely, there were no significant changes found for the 8 PARI statements analyzed with the Mann Whitney U test. However, some of the statements did move in a positive direction without statistical significance. The improvements that were found in this study add to previous findings (Smith, 2008; Spain, 2009) of knowledge changes after exposure to the program.

Self-reported parenting behavior was measured through calling, writing, and visiting. Statistically significant changes were identified in writing behavior from pre-test to post-test. When the sites were analyzed individually, only Delaney Hall showed significant differences. There were no significant changes for calling or visiting, although there were non-significant positive changes in the reduction of participants who reported no calling or visitation. This finding is likely influenced by institutional and social restrictions that inherently limit the amount of calls and visits that take place regardless of the intentions of the resident. The mixed findings in behavioral changes are reflective of previous evaluations (Smith, 2008; Spain, 2009).

Statistically significant attitudinal changes were found for the experimental group. Specifically, statements relating to spirituality, self-worth, and fathering within the prison improved between pre-test and post-test for the experimental group. Again, the control group did not experience many changes apart from a statistically significant improvement for one statement. The previous evaluations in Maryland and Ohio also found moderate support for attitudinal changes (Smith, 2008; Spain, 2009).

One of the important results from the quantitative study using surveys was the differences in results across sites. Some individual questions and statements experienced significant changes at some sites, while showing no changes at others. Although there were no sites that consistently performed better than other sites, Delaney Hall and Tully House had more significant changes in attitudes compared to the Harbor, while Delaney Hall had the most positive results in changes in fathering knowledge. The findings, when compared across sites, indicate that the program's effects are slightly different.

Comparisons between the experimental and control group yielded useful findings, as well. Very few changes occurred in the control group between the pre- and post-tests on any portions of the survey. Although there were some small demographic differences between the experimental and control group, the two populations were quite similar. Therefore, the statistically significant changes that occurred within the experimental groups were strengthened by the lack of significant changes in confidence, knowledge, and attitude for the control group fathers.

The qualitative portion of the study also yielded rich findings. Graduating participants overwhelmingly supported the program. Many of the interviewed subjects talked about the long-term effects that they believed the program would have on their lives. The interviews with graduates identified similar themes across sites including close relationships with facilitators, the strength of the InsideOut Dad™ curriculum, and the overall positive feeling about the program throughout the facility.

When considering previous evaluations of other parenting programs, several of the problems identified in the literature (Loper and Tuerk, 2006) such as high staff turnover, a lack of coordination, and low comprehension levels did not appear to hinder the implementation of the program (Herman-Stahl, 2008). However, interviews with stakeholders identified several areas for possible improvement, yet none of the interviewed facilitators or other personnel mentioned problems with staff turnover or coordination. Additionally, Loper and Tuerk (2006) cite practical problems that have emerged in some programs, such as interruptions during classes and a lack of respect from some correctional personnel. These issues were not found in this evaluation. Although some studies have found a lack of consideration for varying educational abilities to be a problem, there was no evidence from the surveys or interviews that reading comprehension was an issue during the program despite a wide range in educational background of participants.

Particular attention should be given to the recommendations made by interviewed participants and stakeholders. Each of these suggestions, found in Tables 6-1 and 6-2, were proposed by one or more of the subjects. However, as noted by Loper and Tuerk (2006), institutional practical and ethical limitations might restrict some participant and stakeholder recommendations such as direct involvement of family members and the timing of program classes. A careful analysis of these suggestions is integral for making future improvements to the program.

In conclusion, the qualitative portion of this study yielded nearly unanimous support from participants, facilitators, and other stakeholders. Very few of the interviewed subjects criticized the program, and most of the participants believe that being part of the program met and exceeded their preliminary expectations. The quantitative results revealed several statistically significant changes in fathering confidence, knowledge, behavior, and analysis. The results from this study, combined with previous evaluations of InsideOut Dad™ in Maryland and Ohio,

support the continued implementation of this evidence-based program at CEC facilities and a consideration of further expansion to other locations.

IX – Recommendations

Based on the quantitative and qualitative results from this study, a series of recommendations are provided regarding the future of the InsideOut Dad™ program and its implementation. Specifically, these recommendations are based on feedback from participants and stakeholders about possible program improvements in addition to the survey results.

1. Facilitators should focus closely on expected release dates when forming groups. Some interviewed participants expressed disappointment about the number of participants who left the group during the 6-week program period. Depending on the nature of the correctional facility, attrition should be viewed as a possible concern. On the positive side, very few participants voluntarily left the program. Normally, departures from the program were caused by court dates, transfers, etc.

2. National Fatherhood Initiative should work closely with participating institutions to incorporate components that directly involve participant’s children and/or other family members. Several interviewed participants expressed concern that their family could not directly share their excitement in graduating from the program. Stakeholders also commented on this issue during interviews. A major priority should be a working partnership between National Fatherhood Initiative and program sites to address formal and informal policies which restrict prisoner-family contact.

3. An alumni program should be formed to allow for continued participation, mentoring, and guidance beyond the program period. The desire to continue with the program was voiced by several of the participants during post-test interviews. An alumni group would allow graduates to have a beneficial effect on current program participants. The group would also facilitate the continuation of relationships formed in the group.

4. Any future InsideOut Dad™ curriculum changes should consider fathering knowledge questions that scored relatively low on post-test surveys. Although many questions experienced statistically significant improvements, there were still some questions that had low correct response rates at the post-test survey. Facilitators in future groups should be aware of previous survey results to better understand what areas participants have struggled to understand.

5. Future evaluation research on the InsideOut Dad™ program should include long-term follow-up surveys and/or interviews with participants. The current study did not include a lengthy follow-up period based on the short duration of the study period. However, future studies should aim to incorporate a longer follow-up period and include data on recidivism for program participants.

6. The InsideOut Dad™ program should be implemented as a standard, evidence-based program at the Community Education Centers sites. Additionally, the New Jersey Department of Corrections should consider the program for other state

facilities. This recommendation is based on changes in quantitative outcomes and qualitative results from participant interviews, and its efficacy as shown in this and the other two independent evaluations.

X – References

- Allen, I.E. & Seamon, C.A. (2007). Likert scales and data analyses. *Quality Progress*, 40(7), 64-65.
- Bronte-Tinkew, J., Burkhauser, M., Ericson, S., & Metz, A. (2008) “What Works” in Programs Serving Fathers Involved in the Criminal Justice System? Lessons from Evidence-Based Evaluations. NRFC Practice Briefs. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Administration for Children and Families. Office of Family Assistance.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. Department of Justice. (2004). *Survey of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities*.
- Bushfield, S. (2004). Fathers in prison: Impact of parenting education. *The Journal of Correctional Education*, 55(2), 104-116.
- Buston, K.M. (2010). Experiences of, and attitudes towards, pregnancy and incarcerated young male offenders: Findings from a qualitative study, *Social Science & Medicine*, 71, 2212-2218.
- Carlson, J.R. (2001). Prison nursery 2000: A five-year review of the prison nursery at the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 33, 75-97.
- Chesney, M., A., Neilands, T. A., Chambers, D. B., Taylor, J. M., & Folkman, S. (2006). A validity and reliability study of the Coping Self-Efficacy Scale, *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 11(3), 421-437.
- Clarke, L., O’Brien, M., Godwin, H., Hemmings, J., Day, R. D., Connolly, J., & Van Leeson, T. (2005). Fathering behind bars in English prisons: Imprisoned fathers’ identity and contact with their children. *Fathering*, 3(3), 221-241.
- Clason, D.L. & Dormody, T.J. (1994). Analyzing data measured by individual Likert-type items. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 35(4), 31-35.
- Community Education Centers Facilities (n.d.) Retrieved May 21, 2011, from http://www.cecintl.com/facilities_facilities_b.html
- Dyer, W.J. (2005). Prison, fathers and identity: A theory of how incarceration affects men’s paternal identity. *Fathering*, 3(3), 201-219.
- Eck, J. (2006). When is a bologna sandwich better than sex? A defense of small-n case study evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 2, 345-362.
- Farrington, D. (2003). A short history of randomized experiments in criminology: A meager feast. *Evaluation Review*, 27, 218-227.

- Feder, L. & Boruch, R.F. (2000). Need for experiments in criminal justice settings. *Crime and Delinquency*, 46(3), 291-294.
- Gat, I. (2000). *Incarcerated mothers: Effects of the Mother/Offspring Life Development Program (MOLD) on recidivism, prosocial moral development, empathy, hope, and parent-child attachment*. Lincoln, NE, University of Nebraska.
- Geller, A., Garfinkel, I., & Western, B. (2011). Paternal incarceration and support for children in fragile families. *Demography*, 48, 25-47.
- Glaze, L.E. & Maruschak, L.M. (2008). Parents in prison and their minor children. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Hairston, C.F. (2002). *Prisoners and families: Parenting issues during incarceration*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Hairston, C.F. (2007). *Focus on children with incarcerated parents: An overview of the research literature*. The Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Hartney, C. (2006). *US rates of incarceration: A global perspective*. Fact Sheet: Research from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Herman-Stahl, M., Kan, M.L., & McKay, T. (2008). *Incarceration and the family: A review of research and promising approaches for serving fathers and families*. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services.
- Jarvis, J., Graham, S., Hamilton, P., & Tyler, D. (2004). The role of parenting classes for young fathers in prison: A case study. *Probation Journal*, 51(1), 21-33.
- Lanier, C.S. (1993). Affective states of fathers in prison. *Justice Quarterly*, 10(1), 49-66.
- Laub, J. H. & Sampson, R. J. (1993). Turning points in the life course: Why change matters to the study of crime. *Criminology*, 31: 301-325.
- Lewis, Jr., C.E., Garfinkel, I., & Gao, Q. (2007). Incarceration and unwed fathers in fragile fathers. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 34(3), 77-94.
- Loper, A. B. & Tuerk, E.H. (2006). Parenting programs for incarcerated parents, *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 17(4), 407-427.
- Maldonado, S. (2006). Recidivism and paternal engagement. *Family Law Quarterly*, 40(2), 191-211.
- Meek, R. (2007). The parenting possible selves of young fathers in prison. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 13(4), 371-382.

Peck, A. & Edwards, M. (1977) Father-children groups in prison settings. *Probation & Parole*, 9, 32-38.

Penn State Erie, The Behrend College's Center for Organizational Research & Evaluation (2001). *Final report of the process evaluation of the Long Distance Dads program*.

Penn State Erie, The Behrend College's Center for Organizational Research & Evaluation (2003). *Outcomes evaluation of the Long Distance Dads program*.

Schaefer, E. & Bell, R.Q. (1958). Development of a Parental Attitude Research Instrument. *Child Development*, 29(3), 339-361.

Smith, K. (2003). *Freed to be Fathers: Lessons from men doing time*. Pilgrim Press: Cleveland, OH.

Smith, L. (2008). *InsideOut Dad™: Evaluation report*. National Fatherhood Initiative.

Spain, S.K. (2009). *InsideOut Dad™ program in Maryland and Ohio prisons: Evaluation report*. National Fatherhood Initiative.

Swisher, R.R. & Waller, M.R. (2008). Confining fatherhood: Incarceration and paternal involvement among nonresident white, African American, and Latino fathers. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29(8), 1067-1088.

Tripp, B. (2009). Fathers in Jail: Managing dual identities. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, 5(1), 26-56.

Turner, R. & Peck, J. (2002). Long-distance dads: Restoring incarcerated fathers to their children. *Corrections Today*, 72-75.

West, H.C. & Sabol, W.I. (2010). *Prisoners in 2009*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin. U.S. Department of Justice: Office of Justice Programs.

Wilczak, G.L. & Markstron, C.A. (1999). The effects of parent education on parental locus of control and satisfaction of incarcerated fathers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 43(1), 90-102.

XI - Appendix

Appendix A – Pre- and Post- Survey Instrument

INSIDEOUT DAD™ PRE AND POST-SURVEY

Name (or unique ID): _____ Date: _____

Facility: _____ Group Facilitator: _____

Circle one: **Pre** / **Post**

Please circle, check, mark, or write your answers. If a question does not pertain to you, circle Not Applicable. Your answers are completely confidential and will not be shared with others.

PART A – ABOUT YOU AND YOUR FAMILY

1. What is your age? _____
2. Are you a father?
 - Yes
 - No
3. What is your marital status? **(Circle one)**
 - Married
 - Single
 - Divorced
 - Separated
 - Living with partner prior to incarceration
 - Widow(er)
 - Other _____
4. What is your race? **Check all that apply.**
 - White
 - Black
 - Hispanic/Latino
 - Asian
 - Native American
 - Other
5. Circle the highest grade you completed in school: **(Circle one)**
 - Grade school 1 2 3 4 5
 - Junior High/Middle 6 7 8
 - High School 9 10 11 12
 - College 13 14 15 16
 - Post-college
6. Who raised you as a child? **(Circle all that apply)**
 - Mother and father
 - Mother only
 - Father only
 - Stepparent
 - Grandparent(s)
 - Relatives
 - Foster parents
 - Adoptive parents
 - Other _____
7. Who lived in your household as a child, including those that raised you? **(Check all that apply)**
 - Mother
 - Father
 - Sibling(s)
 - Stepmother
 - Stepfather
 - Step-siblings
 - Grandparent(s)
 - Foster parents
 - Foster siblings
 - Relatives
 - Friends
 - Other _____

8. What is (was) the marital status of your biological parents?

- Not sure
 Married
 Single
 Divorced
 Separated
 Widow(er)
 Other _____

9. What is (was) the marital status of your caregivers - the family members that raised you if not your biological parents?

- Not sure
 Married
 Single
 Divorced
 Separated
 Widow(er)
 I was raised by my biological parent(s)
 Not applicable
 Other _____

10. On a scale of 1 – 5, with 1 being very bad and 5 being very good, please rate the quality of the relationship you have (or had) with you **mother (or mother figure)**. (Circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Very Bad	Bad	Okay	Good	Very Good	Not Applicable

11. On a scale of 1 – 5, with 1 being very bad and 5 being very good, please rate the quality of the relationship you have (or had) with you **father (or father figure)**. (Circle one)

1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Very Bad	Bad	Okay	Good	Very Good	Not Applicable

12. For each of your children, starting with the oldest child, please provide the following information: **Child's sex, age, child's relationship to their current caregiver, and indicate your relationship with the child's mother –**

Married to, Spouse to but not mamed, Divorced from, Separated from, Lived with child's mother prior to incarceration, Child's mother is deceased, or other.

EXAMPLE:

Child 1 X Male ___ Female 14 Age Maternal grandmother Child Caregiver
Spouse to child's mother or my girlfriend Mother Relationship Status

Not applicable, I do not have any children.

Child 1 ____Male ____Female ____Age ____Child Caregiver

____Mother Relationship Status

Child 2 ____Male ____Female ____Age ____Child Caregiver

____Mother Relationship Status

Child 3 ____Male ____Female ____Age ____Child Caregiver

____Mother Relationship Status

Child 4 ____Male ____Female ____Age ____Child Caregiver

____Mother Relationship Status

Child 5 ____Male ____Female ____Age ____Child Caregiver

____Mother Relationship Status

Child 6 ____Male ____Female ____Age ____Child Caregiver

____Mother Relationship Status

Child 7 ____Male ____Female ____Age ____Child Caregiver

____Mother Relationship Status

Child 8 ____Male ____Female ____Age ____Child Caregiver

____Mother Relationship Status

Child 9 ____Male ____Female ____Age ____Child Caregiver

____Mother Relationship Status

Child 10 _____ Male _____ Female _____ Age _____ Child Caregiver
_____ Mother Relationship Status

13. What is your current sentence length? Please be specific. _____

14. Have you completed any jail time prior to your current incarceration?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

15. Have you completed any state or federal prison time prior to your current incarceration?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

16. If you answered "yes" that you have been previously incarcerated in jail and/or prison, how many times have you been previously incarcerated in,

_____ Jail

_____ Prison

17. How long have you resided at this Community Education Reentry Center? _____

18. Prior to your current stay, have you previously resided in a Community Education Reentry Center?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

PART B – ABOUT BEING A FATHER AND YOUR RELATIONSHIPS

Please rate the quality of the relationship you have with your children, starting with your oldest child. Use the table below and mark an X in the column that best describes your relationship with that child – very bad, bad, okay, good, very good, or not applicable.

	Very Bad	Bad	Okay	Good	Very Good	N/A Not applicable
Child 1						
Child 2						
Child 3						
Child 4						
Child 5						
Child 6						
Child 7						
Child 8						
Child 9						
Child 10						

Please answer the following questions by marking an X in the column that you most agree with – very bad, bad, okay, good, very good, or not applicable.

	Very Bad	Bad	Okay	Good	Very Good	N/A Not applicable
1. What is the degree of happiness you feel about being a parent?						
2. What is the quality of the relationship you have with the mother(s) of your child(ren)?						

3. Knowing what you know now about being a parent, would you still be a parent if you could do it all over again?
 (Circle one)
- Yes
 - No
 - Don't know
 - Not applicable

Please answer the following questions by marking an X in the column that you most agree that you cannot do at all, moderately certain can do, or certain can do when things are not going well for you.

4. <i>When things are not going well for you, how confident are you that you can:</i>	Cannot do at all	Moderately certain can do	Certain can do
Talk positively to yourself.			
Sort out what can be changed, and what cannot be changed.			
Leave options open when things get stressful.			
Make a plan of action and follow it when confronted with a problem.			
Look for something good in a negative situation.			
See things from the other person's point of view during a heated argument.			
Do something positive for yourself when you are feeling discouraged.			
Think about one part of the problem at a time.			
Pray or meditate.			
Get needed support from Newark CEC Residential Reentry Center support staff.			

PART C – ABOUT YOUR FATHERING KNOWLEDGE

In this section, circle the answer you think best completes the statement. Select only one answer for each statement.

1. Self-worth is a term used to describe:
 - How a person feels about himself
 - What a person thinks about himself
 - Both the feelings and thoughts a person has about himself
 - Don't know
2. One way to break a 'habit thought' is to:
 - Clear your mind of everything, and don't think at all
 - Think an opposite thought
 - Believe whatever you are thinking, even if it is bad
 - Don't know
3. What is not one of the four goals in managing your anger:
 - Be aware of all your feelings and learn how to show them in proper ways
 - Be aware of when you feel angry, so you can show your anger in a calm, healthy way
 - Teach your children how to show their anger in the right way by being a good role model
 - Let your anger take control of you and act any way you want
 - Don't know
4. Which is a good way to build self-worth:
 - Know what you are good at doing, and try to do more of it
 - Be there for others (listen to what others have to say and value their opinion, even if you disagree)
 - Praise yourself and others for being and doing every day
 - All of the above
 - Don't know
5. There is nothing I can do to be involved with my child while locked-up.
 - True
 - False
 - Don't know
6. After disciplining or punishing your child you should:
 - Ignore your child
 - Tell your child you love him or her no matter what
 - Wait for your child to repeat the mistake.
 - Don't know
7. The more a man knows about his own good and bad traits, the more control he has over his own behavior.
 - True
 - False
 - Don't know
8. When we talk about 'Nature versus Nurture', 'Nature' means what a person is born with, and 'Nurture' means how a person is raised:
 - True
 - False
 - Don't know
9. I can learn new things about my child even while locked up.
 - True
 - False
 - Don't know
10. Men often find it easier to show feelings of hurt than do women.
 - True
 - False
 - Don't know
11. The adult that a child becomes has nothing to do with his or her nature, but everything to do with how the child was raised.
 - True
 - False
 - Don't know

12. Boys are taught not to cry, girls are taught it's okay to cry.
- True
 - False
 - Don't know
13. The best way to help children develop a sense of positive self-worth is by:
- Praising the child for following family rules
 - Using positive words when referring to them
 - Modeling the way you want children to behave
 - All of the above
 - I'm not sure
14. Good discipline sometimes means making your child feel ashamed for something they did wrong.
- True
 - False
 - Don't know
15. The InsideOut Dad™ has which of the following traits:
- Self-awareness
 - Caring for Self
 - Fathering skills
 - Parenting skills
 - Relationship skills
 - All of the above
 - Don't know
16. Anger can be how a person shows pain or hurt from the past that was never dealt with.
- True
 - False
 - Don't know
17. Discipline means to:
- Punish
 - Teach
 - Abuse
 - Hit
 - Don't know
18. To want to give and receive love is a basic human need.
- True
 - False
 - Don't know
19. All children grow at the same rate.
- True
 - False
 - Don't know
20. Learning from bad relationships in the past can't help you avoid bad relationships in the future.
- True
 - False
 - Don't know
21. People can be religious and spiritual at the same time.
- True
 - False
 - Don't know
22. Some people use religion to show their spirituality.
- True
 - False
 - Don't know
23. What men learn about how to be a man has not changed over time.
- True
 - False
 - Don't know
24. In a spiritual family, members only think about their own problems.
- True
 - False
 - Don't know
25. A father who is self-aware:
- Does not know his strengths and limits
 - Holds others responsible for his behavior
 - Is not aware of his moods and feelings
 - Understands the impact he has on his family
 - Shows little effort to improve his personal growth
 - Don't know
26. Men learn what it means to be a man mostly from:
- Family only
 - Culture only
 - Family and Culture
 - Friends only
 - Media and Friends
 - Don't know

There are 8 statements about fathering and child behavior below. After you read each statement, tell us the degree to which you Agree or Disagree with each statement by marking an X in the box of one of the descriptions:

Strongly Agree – Mark Strongly Agree if you think the statement is true most or all of the time.

Agree – Mark Agree if you think the statement is true some of the time.

Disagree – Mark Disagree if you think the statement is not true some of the time.

Strongly Disagree – Mark Strongly disagree if you think the statement is not true most or all of the time.

Uncertain – Mark Uncertain only when you can't decide if you agree or disagree with the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Uncertain
27. A child's ideas should be seriously considered in making family decisions.					
28. Children should be allowed to disagree with their parents if they feel their own ideas are better.					
29. A child who is not afraid to show his emotions will do well in life.					
30. Parents should teach a child to express his/her feeling as soon as he/she can understand.					
31. A good father lets his child learn the hard way about life.					
32. Children have to face difficult situation on their own.					
33. If a child acts mean, he/she needs understanding rather than punishment.					
34. A child should be taught to fear adults.					

PART D – HOW YOU FATHER TODAY**Circle the answer you think best completes the statement. Select only one answer for each**

1. I call my children:
 - Less than once a month
 - Once a month
 - Once a week
 - More than once a week
 - I don't call at all
 - Not Applicable

2. I write to my children:
 - Less than once a month
 - Once a month
 - Once a week
 - More than once a week
 - I don't write at all
 - Not Applicable

3. I visit with my children:
 - Less than once a month
 - Once a month
 - Once a week
 - More than once a week
 - I don't visit with my children at all
 - Not Applicable

4. I have told my children that I love them:
 - Yes
 - No
 - Not applicable

5. I tell my children that I love them:
 - Less than once a month
 - Once a month
 - Once a week
 - More than once a week
 - I don't tell my children that I love them at all
 - Not Applicable

6. I know how my children do in school:
 - Yes
 - No
 - Not applicable

7. I know who my children spend time with:
 - Yes
 - No
 - Not applicable

PART E – YOUR THOUGHTS ON FATHERING

There are 20 statements about fathering and raising children below. After you read each statement, mark an X in the column of the degree to which you Agree or Disagree with each statement:

Strongly Agree – Mark Strongly Agree if you think the statement is true most or all of the time.

Agree – Mark Agree if you think the statement is true some of the time.

Disagree – Mark Disagree if you think the statement is not true some of the time.

Strongly Disagree – Mark Strongly Disagree if you think the statement is not true most or all of the time.

Uncertain – Mark Uncertain only when you can't decide if you agree or disagree with the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Uncertain
1. The more a dad knows about himself, the more he can control his own behavior.					
2. A dad can't be a role model to his children while he's locked up.					
3. It is not vital for the well being of your child to respect his/her mother.					
4. Good discipline focuses on the actor not the action.					
5. Children learn about relationships from their parents' relationship.					
6. There are good and bad ways to show your anger.					
7. It is just as vital for a dad to show his daughter what a good man looks like as it is for him to show his son what a good man looks like.					
8. The way a father shows his anger does not affect how his children show their anger.					
9. Religion and spirituality are the same thing.					
10. When you bury your feelings of hurt it only builds up more anger inside of you.					
11. Understanding the past does not help you better prepare for the future.					
12. The self aware man takes responsibility for his own behavior.					

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Uncertain
13. When a dad wants to know if his child is developing the right way, he should compare them to other children of the same age.					
14. The view we have of ourselves comes from our past, even as far back as childhood.					
15. A good father doesn't need to respect the mother of his children.					
16. Fathering is the same as mothering.					
17. When family spirituality is present, family members are more likely to cooperate, love, and respect each other.					
18. Self-worth is how a man values himself.					
19. A good father knows that discipline is used to punish children instead of to teach and guide.					
20. A dad can't help his children take care of their physical health while he is locked up.					

Appendix B – Participant Interview Guide

*****REVIEW OF SURVEY INFORMATION*****

Key Demographic Information

- Age
- Marital status
- Race/Ethnicity
- Educational attainment
- Number of children
- Number of mothers to children
- Age of minor children
- Current child caregiver
- If not child's mother, why does this person care for child
- Parental/custodial status
- Child status (i.e. involved in criminal justice system, DYFS)
- Father's childhood household makeup
- Father's Childhood caregiver
- Household makeup prior to incarceration
- Expected household makeup upon release
- Familial role prior to incarceration
- Father's parental marital status
- Relationship with mother
- Relationship with father
- Number of times incarcerated – prison and jail
- Length of most current incarceration
- Length at Newark CEC Residential Reentry Center
- Participation in DOC and/or Newark CEC Residential Reentry Center programming and/or support services

Questions Related to Fatherhood

1. What was going on in your life when you decided to enroll InsideOut Dad™?
2. What does being a father mean to you? Have your thoughts on fathering changed since participating in InsideOut Dad™? Please explain.
3. How do you define fatherhood? How has fatherhood or your ability to enact “fatherhood” differed since being incarcerated?
4. How have you been able to “father” since your incarceration? What do you do?
5. How has InsideOut Dad™ affected your thoughts on fathering?
6. Tell me about your current relationship with your a) children (be specific), b) spouse, c) child caregiver, d) other family and community members.
7. How often were you contact with your child prior enrolling in InsideOut Dad™ (calls, visits, mail)?
8. What's your take on family and child visits at this facility?
9. Have you faced any institutional and environmental barriers to receiving visits at this facility? Please explain.

10. How often have you been in contact with your child since enrolling in InsideOut Dad™ (calls, visits, mail)? Have there been in changes in how often you've been in contact with your child? What do you attribute the changes to?
11. When your child visits, how do you spend time with him/her?
12. How do you let your child know that you care and love them?
13. How is child doing in school?
14. Does your child have any behavioral or developmental challenges?
15. Have you ever been away from your children for more than 1 year? Please explain.

Goals

1. What do you hope to accomplish through this program?
2. Why did you decide to take part in this program?
3. Were you recruited for this program? By whom?
4. How do you feel about being part of this program?
5. What were your goals prior to enrolling in InsideOut Dad™?
6. What goals have you set since being enrolled InsideOut Dad™? Have you achieved any of these goals?
7. Briefly explain how the InsideOut Dad™ has helped you to define and/or achieve these goals?
8. What are your plans after release? What do hope to have achieved in 6 months? 1 year?

Participants Opinion on Program

1. Participants' levels of satisfaction and/or frustration
2. Participants' contact with facilitators and other participants
3. Participants' degree of difficulty/ease with course
4. Participants' use of and impression of technical support
5. Participants' perception of finishing program
6. Other program participation? Parenting classes? Life Skills? Received any other services?
7. Do you share the information you learn at the Center with other family members?
8. Would you recommend the program to others?

Appendix C – Stakeholder Interview Guide

Key Demographic Information

- Age
- Gender
- Marital status
- Race/Ethnicity
- Educational attainment
- Professional specialization
- Job title and role
- Length of time at Newark CEC Residential Reentry Center

InsideOut Dad™ Programming

- What are your expectations of InsideOut Dad™™?
- How different would you say the program differs from what you expected?
- What do you think are the **strengths** and **weaknesses** of InsideOut Dad™™? How should National Fatherhood Initiative improve the program's weaknesses?
- Do you think that InsideOut Dad™ is meeting its goals? If so, how and why?
- What has been the response of the Newark CEC Residential Reentry Center residents to InsideOut Dad™?
- How has InsideOut Dad™ affected your fathering behaviors?

Program Administration

- Have you encountered obstacles in getting fathers enrolled in InsideOut Dad™™? How have you addressed those obstacles?
- Have you facilitated any programs/curricula similar to InsideOut Dad™™? Please explain.
- What are the regulations on inmate-family contact? (i.e. Permitted frequency of contact)
- Would recommend InsideOut Dad™ to other facilities? What type of facilities would benefit most from the program?
- What other tools or resources would assist you in administering this program?

