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The issue of motivators has been studied by a number of researchers and practitioners in education, sociology, and psychology. Many of these studies have linked motivators to behavior (Coffey, 1987; Coleman, 1987; Gellerman, 1963; Gould & Sigall, 1977). Questions remain, however, as to which motivators are viewed by actors themselves as the most preferred influencers of behavior. The primary objective of the research was to compare the rank order of the most frequently cited motivators identified in research studies and the rank order of the most preferred motivators as perceived by previously incarcerated criminal respondents. A secondary objective was to determine which motivators were considered most preferred motivators by those same respondents. The frequently cited motivators were extrapolated from the literature, then ranked by frequency of citation. A survey instrument to rank these motivators for individual respondents was designed based on the list of extrapolated motivators. Data were collected from 60 people who were previously incarcerated criminals. Subjects, adult volunteer clients enrolled with Project Start, a corrections agency in Detroit, Michigan, were tested and retested after a 2-week period in an effort to determine the rank order of their perceived most preferred motivators. A statistical comparison was made among the study
measures. The comparison failed to indicate a correlation between the rank order of the frequently cited motivators in the literature and the rank order of perceived preferred motivators for previously incarcerated criminals. Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are included.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

During the 1980s criminal behavior increased in the United States (United States Department of Justice [USDJ], 1988). Three million adults were under some form of correctional supervision at the end of 1987. This was 2% of the adult population in the United States. The figure represented an increase of 6.8% over 1986 and was 40% higher than 1983 (USDJ, 1988). More violent than in the past, a higher proportion of the population was sent to prison than ever before (Schlesinger, 1986).

Influencing factors have been linked to criminal behavior. Historically, some theorists linked behavior to various sociological influencers; Plato, for example, and Aristotle wrote about the importance of the education of children for their actions in life (McCord, 1979). Much later, theorists went further to assume that criminal behavior was linked to other factors also, such as parental care. Some theorists over the years have critiqued others who have postulated that criminal behavior could be genetically transmitted from parents to children (Rafter, 1990). Into the 20th century, sociologists continued to explore influencers on criminal behavior. Peer influence was finally linked to criminal behavior according to some sociologists, while psychologists in the 20th century focused on personality traits that, theoretically, influenced criminal
behavior (McCord, 1979).

Criminal justice reports generally link the increase of criminal behavior to socioeconomic influencing factors. For example, the highest incarceration rate among U.S. males, age 16-64, was among those who were unemployed prior to arrest. The average inmate was at the poverty level before entering jail (USDJ, 1988). While these influencing factors may be significant, focusing on socioeconomic influencing factors alone does not explain enough. According to MacGillis (1983), figures on the sex, age, and race or ethnic group of criminals gave us a rough picture of American criminals and where they operate, but they do not say much about what happened in their lives before they became statistics in the FBI Uniform Crime Report. The report continued by noting that factors in a person's background like poverty, failure in school, and a disrupted home life are not, as such, causes of crime, although they may correlate strongly with criminal behavior (MacGillis, 1983).

In an attempt to widen the scope in explaining criminal behavior, some theorists explain crime by focusing on human motivation.

The social patterns of power, or of institutions which are held to be determinative of human action, are seen as having been in existence before any particular actor came on the scene. They are external to him in the sense that they will persist with or without him. In lay language, sociological explanations of crime place the blame on something social that is prior to, external to and compelling of any particular person. Sociological explanations do not deny the importance of human motivation. However, they locate the source of motives outside the individual and in the cultural climate in which he lives. By contrast, sociopsychological explanations of criminality place most of the causal emphasis upon the individual actor. (Gottfredson, 1980, p. 36)
The influence that motivators have on behavior has been extensive (Gellerman, 1963; Gould & Sigall, 1977). However, the extent to which criminal behavior hinges on motivators, whether socially, economically, or educationally based is unclear. For example, while there are data to support money as a motivator for criminal behavior (USDJ, 1988), this linkage is not based on formal survey data (Simmons, 1975). The extent to which money is perceived to be an influencer on behavior is still unclear.

Organization

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I is concerned with the statement of the problem, conceptual basis, and importance of the study. The second chapter provides a synopsis of previous research and studies. Chapter II begins with a review of literature, which includes an extensive definition of motivators, clarification of the differentiation between motivators and motivation, motivators in the work environment, motivators in education, and personal motivators. Discussed in Chapter III are the research method, research design, subjects, instrumentation, and procedures. Statistical methods used to analyze data are also included in this chapter.

Data analysis and discussion of results are presented in Chapter IV. Conclusions drawn from the research questions are presented and summarized. Chapter V, which contains an overall summary and interpretation of major findings, is the final chapter. Limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are also included in Chapter V.
Conceptual Basis of the Study

There have been several studies regarding environmental and behavioral influencers (Jenkins, Brodsky, LeLandgren, Kahn, & Sekulski, 1986). Some studies have specifically focused on influencers regarding criminal behavior. The Maladaptive Behavior Record measures specific maladaptive behaviors that constitute law violations and criminal behavior (M. C. Barton & Jenkins, 1974). Other studies have reported relationships between behavior and influencers relative to noncriminal subjects (Coffey, 1987; Coleman, 1987; Gould & Sigall, 1977; Moore, 1987; Murphy, 1987; Roser, 1986). These writers distinguished between motivators and behavior and have shown that there are motivators that influence behavior (Coffey, 1987; Moore, 1987).

The conceptual assumption is that there are preferred motivators that influence individual behavior.

There are many different motivators that influence behavior (Moore, 1987). These different motivators have been the focus of several studies and theoretical postulates (Stahl, 1986; Torrence, 1967, Von Kaas & Lindemann, 1971). Some motivators have been cited or studied more frequently than others.

Scope of Study

In the present study, motivators were extrapolated from research and theoretical postulates which focused on the areas of work, education, and sociology. The goal of the study was to determine how the preponderance of literature on motivators correlated with previously
incarcerated criminals' perceived use of motivators. Findings are based on perceptual data. Perceptual data have several limitations. For example, respondents' perceptions can change over time, events in an individual's life can influence the manner in which a subject responds, and individuals may respond in a manner in which they think they should respond. In the present study, respondents were given a test to measure the importance they ranked to each of the motivators.

Considering the scope of this study, two assumptions are evident. The first assumption is that there is a need to influence behavior of some individuals (Lincoln, 1951; Rowntree, 1974). The second basic assumption is that previously incarcerated criminals have a perception of what motivators most influence their behavior.

In this study, it was hypothesized that a correlation exists between the list of motivators derived from research in literature, and the list of motivators perceived to be important by the respondents.

Importance of the Study

Findings from the present study could be useful to criminal justice practitioners, behaviorists, and sociologists. If more were known about the importance of various motivators, as perceived by criminals themselves, then researchers and behaviorists might more closely focus on those motivators most relevant to criminals. Further, researchers will have additional data to support the need for more research. Lastly, this study will provide useful insight into what respondent groups, such as previously incarcerated criminals, perceive to be influential factors relative to their behavior.
Collecting, sorting, and classifying motivators contained in the literature will benefit researchers by providing information about which motivators are most frequently referred to in the literature. As a result of providing this information, areas which have been overstudied, or understudied, can be more precisely identified and will indicate the level of need for additional research. With this, unnecessary expenditures related to motivators can be curtailed; and accordingly, undeveloped areas of research on motivators can be augmented.

The present study also provides useful insight into what previously incarcerated criminals perceive to be influencers of their behavior. Criminal justice constituents, behaviorists, and interested others can build from this study in an effort to further investigate perceived influencers of criminal behavior. Clearly, these perceived influencers can be further researched in an effort to investigate the correlation between perceived motivators and behavior.

Researchers who are investigating the influencers on criminal behavior will have an organized listing of influencers to ascertain which of those influencers are more popular than others and, thereby, more frequently cited. The value of knowing the most frequently cited influencers is that ranking these motivators provides a foundation for future research to better focus on criminal behavior. The data from the study provide a basis for developing an instrument to measure the relevancy and applicability of these influencers to specific groups.

Specifically, researchers can replicate the instrument developed for this study, in whole or part, for similar purposes. The ability of the instrument to yield the same results will speak to the issue of reliability.
As the instrument gains in reliability, criminologists will have yet another device to delve deeper into the behavior of criminals based on the criminals' perceptions about the importance of certain influencers on their behavior.

Additional perception based information linking motivators to criminal behavior would be useful to researchers seeking additional data-supported clues, or to those influencers on criminal behavior as perceived by the criminals themselves. Additional data linking criminal behavior to certain influencers will certainly add to the existing body of research about influencers on criminal behavior. With this, the emphasis of this study is on the perception of the extent to which perceived motivators influence the behavior of criminals.

The present study will add to the findings of previous studies (Dagan, 1987; Dwivedi, 1984; Falusne, 1985; Hyatt, 1949; Merrett & White, 1968; Yenney, 1986) by being the first study to collect, sort, and classify motivators to determine the frequency of reference in the literature, and by being the first study to rank order preferred motivators for previously incarcerated criminals. Clearly, criminal justice experts, behaviorists, and sociologists have an interest in understanding motivation of criminal behavior. This study will provide information and a genesis for eventually controlling criminal behavior with the use of influencers.

In summation, information regarding the most preferred motivators, as based on the most frequently cited motivators, will add to the existing general body of knowledge about motivators and the other determinants of behavior. The issue of crime, for example, and the
subsequent increase in criminal behavior (USDJ, 1988), reflects the need for greater and more specific information regarding the variables that influence behavior.

Criminal Behavior: The Need for Continued Probing

The increase in crime reflects continued probing into those issues that impact on criminal behavior. For example, by the end of 1987, there were 3 million adults under some form of correctional supervision. This means that prisons, jails, boot camps, and criminal justice organizations accounted for 2% of the adult population in the United States. This figure represented an increase of 6.8% over 1986 and was 40% higher than 1983 (USDJ, 1988; "Study finds," 1989). Male and female correctional facilities were bulging with young and old persons convicted of criminal behavior. Along with the increase, criminal behavior in the late 1980s was more violent than in the past (Schlesinger, 1986).

The growing increase of criminal behavior has generated reports about criminal profiles drawn from rather conclusive data ("Study finds," 1989). For example, the highest incarceration rate among males in the United States, age 16-64, was among those who were unemployed prior to arrest. The average inmate was at the poverty level before entering jail (USDJ, 1988). Although the average criminal offender was at the poverty level, many had income from nontraditional sources, such as income from drug sales, for example, before entering jail (Bourgois, 1989). Reports indicate that it was not unusual for men and women with poor education and social skills to earn $200 or $300 per day (USDJ, 1988). Despite the point that the increase of criminal behavior
has stimulated conclusive profiles, these profiles do not yield insight into
the perceived motivators of criminal behavior reported directly by crimi-
nal respondents.

A **motivator** is defined as a stimulus that triggers or arouses an
individual to do, or be, or have more.

**Literature** is defined as those theories, articles, and research
studies that have been reviewed for purposes of this study, because
they have made mention of those potential stimuli that trigger or arouse
an individual to do, or be, or have more.

When an indication is made in this study that a motivator was
made mention of, that is an indication that certain motivators, or deriva-
tives thereof, were cited in the literature which was reviewed for the
purposes of this study. Furthermore, the literature contained various
declarative statements of points and facts that have been supported by
the authors in various ways, including empirically, vis-à-vis research
studies.

**Frequently cited motivators** are defined as those motivators that
were cited more than once, to be consolidated to comprise a compre-
hensive listing. Further, this comprehensive list of frequently cited
motivators, once narrowed down to avoid duplication, consists of those
motivators listed five or more times in the various theories, articles, and
research reviewed for this study.

**Preferred motivators** are those motivators, compiled from the
frequently cited motivators list that are perceived to be preferred, or
more influential, as actually reported by the subject respondents when
compared and ranked one against the other.
The final ranked listing of preferred motivators, as with the list of frequently cited motivators, are the ranked motivators cited most often to least-often motivator cited.

*Previously incarcerated criminal* is defined as those adult individuals who have been adjudicated by the criminal justice system in Michigan.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For many years, researchers and behaviorists did not put a great deal of research and emphasis on motivation, motives, and motivators, because, as one theorist postulated, to explore the issue of motivation was to explore too deeply into oneself (Gellerman, 1963). However, with the increased need for employee motivation after the industrial revolution, and the competitiveness, therein, the interest in motivation increased. With this, there have been numerous articles, studies, and theoretical postulates addressing motivation, motives, and motivators as determinants of behavior. As industry and productivity grew larger in popularity, each area (motivation, motives, and motivators) grew in complexity as a result of research and emphasis.

While there exists a complexity of research and emphasis on the issue of behavior determinants, the present study isolated one area in particular to focus upon, namely, motivators. Motivators were selected because there has not been a previous effort to pull the data together to determine which motivator, for example, is the most popularly studied or referred to in articles, studies, or theoretical postulates regarding work, education, or personal areas. Once the most popularly cited motivators have been isolated, researchers have yet another pool of data to apply toward an increased understanding of criminal behavior.
The increase in crime during the decade of the 1980s necessitates this renewed interest and understanding of motivators as they relate to human behavior. Particularly, there is a need to better understand criminal behavior. Primary to understanding criminal behavior, however, is the need to consider the instigators that influence the behavior of not only criminals, but the behavior of all people.

The Behavioral Process

To begin with, all people are influenced by internal and external instigators (Lincoln, 1951; Theodorson, 1969). These instigators are essentially motivators. Motivators urge or arouse desires to do and be and to have more. Internal means those stimuli situated within the limits of the individual. Exterior is defined as those stimuli relating to or outside of the individual. With this, all people, criminals or otherwise, are influenced by instigators. Some individuals are aroused by a certain stimulus, such as recognition, for example. Recognition, and the desire for such, arouses an urge to do things which generate recognition, and/or to be a certain way to receive recognition, and/or to have certain things to receive recognition. The impulse to act, or the urge that is created by the stimulus, which is recognition, is the motive. The energy which maintains this urge is motivation. Because they are interesting to the individual, or otherwise appealing, or because motivators generate a fear of consequences, motivators influence behavior (Lincoln, 1951; Theodorson, 1969).

Other determinants of behavior can derive from motivators. That is, motivators are part of a continuous behavioral process. The
behavioral process begins with a stimulus. The stimulus is the instigator or, for purposes of this study, the motivator. When a stimulus is perceived by an individual, a driving urge may be manifested. This driving urge is the motive. The individual could decide to respond to the driving urge. This process of responding is motivation. Motivation is toward goal attainment.

**Traditional View of the Behavioral Process**

According to the traditional view of the behavioral process, the length of time between a stimulus (such as a warden's call) and a response (such as going to the mess hall) is a measure of the strength of the tendency to display the response. In behavior terminology, this period of time is called response latency (Kagan, 1967).

Generally, it is assumed that the shorter the period of time, the stronger the tendency to move towards the response. Contemporary theories of motivation do not encourage one to think of behavior as a continuous process, with one kind of activity giving way to another, and then another, until the individual dies (Feather, 1961). In the early days of psychology, it was assumed that a specific act was a response to an immediate stimulus. With this approach, behavior consisted of a series of stimulus-response events (see Figure 1).

```
stimulus (s)      driving urge (-> )      response (r)
   sssss        s-> s-> s-> s->         sr-> sr-> sr->
```

Figure 1. Traditional View of the Behavioral Process.
Contemporary View of the Behavioral Process

Later, it became necessary to view a stimulus-response event as just one incident within a sequence of behavior, a sequence that had a beginning (a state of motivation), a middle (goal-directed activity), and an end (attainment of a goal). The anticipated goal, as well as the immediate stimulus, comes to be recognized as influencing the response (Kagan, 1967).

This contemporary view of stimulus-response events has limitations. The view assumes that what a person is doing before the presentation of a stimulus that defines the beginning of a behavioral sequence has no effect on the length of time it takes the person to begin the sequence. The contemporary view assumes that what the person does after a particular sequence has no effect on its duration. The difficulty lies in the failure to acknowledge that a living organism is constantly active, even when activity appears to have ceased. The problem of change from one activity to another is inadequately treated in contemporary concepts of what determines the initiation and persistence of activities. In short, the initiation and the persistence of behavior are two inseparable aspects of a simple phenomenon (Feather, 1961; Kagan, 1967). Figure 2 represents the contemporary view of the behavioral process.

Relative to criminal behavior, for example, money may be a motivator for some individuals. This stimulus may generate a driving urge or motive. Subsequently, the response may be the motivation to commit a robbery.
As experts continue to seek more input that could be helpful in addressing the increase of crime, and subsequent criminal behavior, there is a need to further distinguish the variables potentially involved with behavior. As stated earlier in this study, motivators are an aspect of other determinants of behavior such as motivation, but both are part of the continuous behavioral process. Motivators are the stimuli for behavior. Motivation is the process of maintaining that behavior. While definitions of motivation vary, in education, motivation is the process of arousing, sustaining, and regulating activity (Good, 1961). Motivation is the arousal and maintenance of behavior directed towards a goal (Rowntree, 1974). In sociological terms, motivation is a response to complete or contribute to the stability or modification of the situation (Theodorson, 1969). With this, motivation is need driven (Maslow, 1954). Need driven means that there exists a need and the organism responds to the need or stimuli. The motivator is the stimulus and motivation is the response.
External Influencers

As measures may be sought to control or manipulate human behavior, it is important to know the relevance of external influences as they relate to the environment and oneself. Motivators can be linked to extrinsic or external motivation. Extrinsic motivation is the use of rewards or punishments to control behavior (Good, 1961). Extrinsic motivation is motivation that comes from rewards external to oneself. Extrinsic motivation is the desire to learn or accomplish a task due to a variable other than inner satisfaction derived from the worthiness of the task itself (Shafritz, 1973). Extrinsic motivation is based on the expectation of indirect fulfillment of one’s desires in a situation. The task undertaken has no inherent source of motivation for the individual, but is viewed as instrumental in goal attainment. There is no intrinsic relationship between the goals that are the source of the motivation and the task itself (Theodorson, 1969). Similarly, external motivation is linked to environmental determinants of behavior (Good, 1961). External motivation involves factors that activate or maintain an individual’s behavior (Shafritz, 1973).

Internal Influencers

Motivators differ from intrinsic or internal motivation. Intrinsic motivation involves determination of behavior within an activity; intrinsic motivation sustains the determination with autonomous acts or interests (Good, 1961). Intrinsic motivation develops from the potential for satisfaction of a personal need. Intrinsic motivation is the desire to learn or
accomplish a task based on internal drives and a sense of value or worthiness of the task itself. Intrinsic motivation is based on the expectation of indirect fulfillment of one's desires in a situation. The motivation stems directly from the task undertaken and is inherent in the task itself (Theodorson, 1969). Internal motivation derives from physiological drives and purposes located within the organism (Good, 1961). Internal motivation is linked to internal factors that activate or maintain an individual's behavior (Shafritz, 1973).

Motivators can be linked to motives. Motives involve any impulse, drive, attitude, whether conscious or not, that arouses, sustains or regulates behavior. Motives are acquired dispositions directed by goals (Good, 1961). Motives involve the impulse to act in a specific manner. A motive is more specifically goal directed than a drive or a need (Theodorson, 1969). Motives involve arousal. Motivators involve behavior arousal. More specifically, however, motivators are the instigators for arousal of behavior (Lincoln, 1951). Motivators and motives are stimuli for behavior. Motives are internal. Motivators can be internally or externally caused. Motivators can be intrinsic or extrinsic.

In considering the behavioral process, whether in the traditional view or the contemporary view, there is research that supports that influencers, internal and external, impact the behavioral process. The extent to which any single influencer impacts on behavior is not clear.

Rather, the research supports that there may be more than one variable that influences behavior. Indeed, these variables may be internal, or external to the individual, or both.
Social Background and Intelligence

Social background and intelligence are two examples of external and internal variables that relate to behavior. These phenomena refer to the structure of opportunities to which individuals are exposed and their capacity to take advantage of these opportunities. With this, opportunity and capacity relate to motivation or drive (Heller, 1969). Consistent with this, the process of motivating children to achieve, for example, plays a determining role in the behavior of those children. In particular, when children are exposed to opportunity in the family, and when children have the capacity to take advantage of opportunities, behavior relative to achievement will be influenced by these opportunities. Moreover, there is evidence that achievement motivation is related to behavior among students. In a study of New Haven high school students, researchers found that within both upper and lower social strata, students with high achievement motivation scores received high grades. Researchers summarized that the high achievers worked harder, learned faster, and did better (Rosen, 1959).

Parental Influence

Further studies support that the higher the education of the parents, the more likely they would be to instill motivation for upward movement in their children (Heller, 1969). A number of studies support the comparison. In Boston, 40% of working class high school pupils with high IQs whose fathers graduated from high school were motivated to go to college, compared to 25% of those children with high
IQ's whose fathers had less education. Similarly, in Denmark, when fathers had more education than the class mean, sons were motivated to be upwardly mobile. In England, working class children who were influenced to reach grammar school likely had parents with higher education than average for their class. Reports on Belgian studies support that the cultural levels of lower status families influenced the behavior toward upward mobility (Floud & Halsey, 1957; Stouffer, 1958; Svalastoga, 1957).

When the strength of the motivation to achieve is measured, it may be related to other such variables as family structure and cultural based childrearing practices (Heller, 1969). Further, there is support that the achievement motivator is a true personality component that is rooted in early childhood experiences. Training early for independent behavior is related to the high achievement motivator. This is to say that children who are weaned earlier and are forced to take care of many personal functions at an early age are much more motivated to exhibit high achievement behavior (Rosen, 1959).

Opportunities and Capacities to Take Advantage

Opportunities to which individuals are exposed and the capacity to take advantage of these opportunities continue to relate to social influence and intelligence. In turn, these variables are relatable to motivators to the extent that when one or the other is lacking, each has the potential to adversely influence behavior and contribute to delinquency. Indeed, when individuals fail to do well in school, these youths are likely to have more contact with police (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980).
study, researchers looked at the school and court records of 2,000 males in Baltimore, Indianapolis, and Phoenix. The males were also interviewed about school performance, acts of delinquency, and police contacts. Young males with learning disabilities reportedly committed more delinquent acts than the young males who did not have learning disabilities. The learning disabled males also were more likely to have been arrested (Argyle, 1980; Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1963; Buckner & Chesney-Lind, 1983; Duck, 1980; Lillyquist, 1980; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980; Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985).

Delinquency and Poor Social Skills as Influencers

Other studies support that delinquency is related to school failure and the capacity to do well intellectually. Comparisons were made between people in prison and those who were not in prison. The findings supported that those in prison were less intelligent than those who were not in prison (Witken et al., 1976). While there have been a number of attempts to demonstrate correlations between personality types and predispositions toward criminal behavior, many criminologists agree that criminal behavior is learned (Ross & Gendreau, 1980). Being reared with violence does not necessarily lead to a life of crime. However, when children are abused by their parents, it is likely that these children will exhibit criminal behavior (Bandura et al., 1963; Miller & Challas, 1981). There is evidence to support that poor social skills may be correlated to criminal behavior. Social skills cover a variety of behaviors. Generally, social skills refers to the basic knowledge that people need to survive (Danish & D’Augelli, 1980). Individuals who
have poor social skills find many situations difficult or anxiety producing (Argyle, 1980). Individuals with poor social skills often have a hard time making friends. Because they are too timid, or because they overreact to small slights, individuals with poor social skills may be unable to resolve conflicts in their relationships. For example, when one has an inability to make friends, there is a tendency to have disturbed sexual relationships (Duck, 1980). Because they are socially inadequate and shy, some sex offenders have never learned to relate normally to women. Violent offenders often cannot handle normal social situations without blowing up (Watson, 1984).

There is evidence to support that certain negative influential factors contribute to criminal behavior. One noteworthy example of the impact of negative influencers in future antisocial behavior centers on Abbott (1981), the author of *In the Belly of the Beast*.

Negative influential factors summarized Abbott's life. Such negative factors included a violent childhood, peers who were themselves criminals, failure in school, and poor social skills. The unwanted child of a prostitute and raised in a series of detention homes, Abbott, prior to killing a man for stepping on his shoe, spent, between the ages of 12 and 37, only 9½ months out of prison (Abbott, 1981).

**Punishment**

Punishment influences behavior. Punishment can inhibit behavior when certain conditions are met (Baron, 1983). The conditions include not working with criminals when they are too angry, otherwise the individual may become aggressive. A second condition suggests that
people who have a lot to gain from a crime are likely to try to become involved with criminal behavior, even if threatened with punishment. Further, when individuals think that the chances of getting caught are small, they will likely commit the criminal act. The last condition that determines whether or not threatened punishment is influential is that the threatened punishment must be strong (Baron, 1983).

Sometimes the punishment, or the threat thereof, is not enough to influence the behavior in a positive regard for some individuals. These individuals are influenced by a loathing of, and a desire to get back at, or get rid of, authority. Given the nature of criminal behavior, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that, for some people, the urge to commit offenses must be very strong to warrant the potential costs of the punishment involved. Explanations that offenders have offered suggest that punishment is not influential relative to their behavior; but rather, the search for excitement and the taking of risks is the main influencer of their criminal behavior (McGuire & Priestly, 1985).

In a longitudinal study of 389 males in six London schools, when over a quarter of the group had been convicted of offenses, the most common influence for offending was obtaining money or goods; the next largest category was enjoyment, cited by 19.2% of the sample (West, 1973). A number of "hard-core" delinquents in residential institutions were asked reasons why they committed crimes. While 80% of this group cited economic reasons, 62% indicated that trying to overcome boredom was an influencer. The wish for enjoyment and a willingness to run the risk of punishment were influential (Mayers, 1933).
Many people have a conscience strong enough to prevent them from committing a criminal act. People differ in how they calculate these risks, however. Some individuals are influenced by the notion of being caught and would be appalled by any loss of esteem. Other individuals will peek at the cards or grab a ring if they think they can get away with it. Differential association theory emphasizes that criminal behavior, including motivation, is learned from people favorably disposed to violate the law. The theory holds that prosocial behavior, which is learned, acts as a buffer, and that the balance between competing prosocial and antisocial influencers determines whether a person engages in crime (Watson, 1984). Both deterrence theory and labeling theory predict that sanctions influence criminal propensity in opposite directions. Labeling theory suggests that punishment leads to internalization and solidification of a criminal self-concept that results in increased criminal behavior. In contrast, deterrence theory stresses that punishment teaches individuals that crime has negative consequences (Box, 1987).

Intent Influences Behavior

To the extent that motivators are an ingredient of the motivation process, intent has played an important role in the way psychologists have studied motivation historically (McCelland, 1990). Psychological studies have supported that conscious intents in the here and now correlate about .95 with actions taken subsequently in the here and now (Locke, & Bryan, 1978; Ryan, 1970). Subsequently, when an individual intends to get recognition, his behavior is influenced in the direction
towards recognition. Similarly, when money is a motivator, and a
person lacks money and intends to get money, this person’s behavior
will be influenced by the intent to get money (McCelland, 1990). Inter­
estingly, blocked intentions seem to influence behavior also (Lewin,
Dembo, Festinger, & Sears, 1944). Studies support that when inten­
tions are interrupted, a person finds a substitutable way of satisfying the
intent; or if none is available, the person becomes frustrated and en­
gages in disruptive behavior (Watson, 1984). In one study, children
were shown an attractive toy that was eventually covered by a heavy
shield. The children showed their intent to get the toy by attempting to
lift the heavy cover off the toy. When the children did not succeed,
they complained, sat down, cried, and showed signs of maladaptive
behavior (McCelland, 1990).

Psychologists have also studied the influence of unconscious
intent.

Like Freud, Plato identified the major unconscious motivators,
motives, or intents observable in dreams as involving sex and aggres­
sion. He also labeled them as unlawful or disruptive and ready for any
deed of blood (McCelland, 1990). Freud (1927) did not believe that
there were any better intentions or desires, but he did agree that the
instinctual, unlawful motivators that he consigned to the unconscious id had to be controlled, either by society or by reason.

Just as Freud (1927) emphasized primacy of certain motivators, namely, sex and aggression, as rooted in unconscious intents, other theorists isolated certain other motivators as major forces that guided human behavior. While Jung (1961) had little to say about basic human motives, he argued that every individual has a fundamental drive toward individuation or self-realization. Another theorist, Adler (1917), came to see the power motivator as more controlling than the sexual desire. People are motivated primarily by the desire to compensate for weakness. This search for superiority in this form is similar to Jung's self-realization motivator, in that individuals are influenced by their intent to become stronger and more important in the eyes of others. Later, another theorist, Horney (1945), in the psychoanalytic tradition, emphasized the importance of anxiety as an influential motivator. Horney theorized that basic anxiety comes from the feeling that a child has of being isolated and helpless in a hostile world. According to this theory, a basic feeling of anxiety permeates all human behavior. Still another theorist built on the primacy of anxiety as a motivator also. With this, individual behavior is riddled with a basic anxiety that stems from tension transmitted from mother to child. Theoretically, individuals are influenced by this state of anxiety because they fear loneliness (Sullivan, 1953).

Generally, individuals want, desire, and like those things that provide satisfaction. Individuals turn away from those things, such as punishment, that are offensive and cause displeasure or resentment.
These impulses to do this or that, whether they are called wants, wishes, or desires, are all motives (Atkinson, 1974). People have motives to excel, to affiliate with friends, to dominate others, to gain social approval, and so on. Each of these motives refer to certain behaviors that can be seen and counted instead of viewing a motive, for example, as a tendency to behave in a certain way. A motive is a wish—a mental idea of what one wants. Some motives will lead to behavior, others will not. Moreover, identical behavior can result from different motives. The seeking of close relationships, for example, might gratify the desire for power, as opposed to satisfying the desire for friendships. Similarly, burning a building down can also serve a sexual motive as opposed to a hostile motive. Human behavior is unclear with regard to the motives it serves. With this, psychologists should devise ways of measuring motives in their pure form and, specifically, as wishes.

Measurement of Motivators

There are a multiplicity of theories, articles, and research about motivators to go with every field of human studies. People do various things frequently and it is inferred that they must want to do them. Some people commit crimes; therefore, they must want to commit crimes. Some people peek at cards in a deck of playing cards; therefore, they must want to cheat. Indeed, why people behave the way that they do has been the subject matter of considerable theories, research, and articles. Some theorists have explored behavioral influencers in the work environment, considering the profit motive. Others have written about economics as an influencer (Galbraith, 1967). As cited earlier, Abbott
(1981) detailed various behavioral influencers in his novel, *In the Belly of the Beast*, that contribute to criminal behavior. Needless to say, all of these theoretical postulates are influenced by particular areas of interests and cultural applicability (McCelland, 1990). While two theorists, Murray (1938) and McDougall (1932) attempted to list those motivators common to all human behavior, others have postulated that there are no simple sovereign motives common to all men (Allport, 1937). Personality theorist, Maslow (1954) concluded that, "we should give up the attempt once and for all to make atomistic lists of drives or needs. . . . If we wished, we could have such a list of drives containing anywhere from one to one million drives" (p. 142).

Despite the potential size of the task of listing and measuring motivators, Murray (1938) devised a special instrument, called the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT). Since Murray believed that motives expressed themselves in a variety of ways, he stressed that the motive manifestations were expressed through autobiographies, behavior in laboratory experiments, music, dreams, and through questionnaires about sentiments and attitudes. The Thematic Apperception Test was Murray's systematic method of measuring motives. With the TAT, subjects were asked to tell imaginative stories after viewing pictures of key emotional complexes in the lives of individuals. In a set of 20 pictures presented, initially with the first 10 pictures, subjects were shown pictures representing typical dramas from normal life, such as father to son, or mother to daughter. The next set of pictures represented more fantastic scenes to elicit more deeply repressed motives. Subjects in Murray's study were highly intelligent college students, who were
studied over a period of 4 years. To measure the motives properly, Murray gathered together a council of experts representing a variety of motivational traditions to decide what the main motives were, and how they should be defined and measured (Murray, 1938). Similarly, McDougall (1932), a psychologist, attempted to separate motives. McDougall's contention was that there are certain behavioral influences, or propensities, that were instinctual and common to all men, regardless of race or age. Although he called them instincts, or propensities, McDougall held that certain actions innately give rise to emotional excitement. Thus, the criteria were what motivators instinctively gave rise to emotional excitement. These goal-directed activities are motives. Emphasizing the instinctual basis of motives, McDougall developed a list of 18 motivators that instinctively generated emotional excitement in individuals.

Drawing on the earlier attempts of Murray (1938) and McDougall (1932) to list and measure motivators that may be common to all men; and in spite of Allport's (1937) contention that developing such a list is difficult because all men are unique and are, therefore, devoid of such broad classification; and further, despite Maslow's (1954) position that such a list of motivators could be quite extensive, the basis of this study focused on such a listing of motivators. There were two major data collection efforts. The first effort concentrated on literature analysis, while the second effort centered on a preference survey. The literature analysis drew on the listing of those behavioral influencers cited in the various theories, articles, and research studies. On the other hand, the preference survey relied on data elicited from subject respondents.
relative to the degree of importance assigned to those motivators contained in the literature.

Prior Methods of Measurement

Measurement of criminal behavior is a substantial undertaking because perspective and retrospective data on the incidence, timing, seriousness, and circumstances of detected and undetected offenses must be collected. Active criminals present special problems in collecting data because of the amount of data to be collected and because their criminal behavior is continuous and, in many instances, unreported. Since the basis of retrospective and perspective studies rely primarily on collecting data from arrest and court records, background reports and documents, researchers can incorporate interviews with offenders, which would better enhance cooperation and recall. Documenting the chronology and nature of a variety of official actions involving arrest, prosecution, sentencing, community supervision, and incarceration, coupled with interviews with offenders, often provides the details of criminal behavior.

With this, interview data provide useful information when supported by retrospective and perspective data collection efforts.

Self-report instruments, on the other hand, often lack specific details about criminal behavior, although a variety of self-report instruments have been developed. Existing instruments, such as the National Youth Survey, provide an attractive option for measuring criminal behavior, because they allow researchers to capitalize on work that has already been done in developing these instruments. Generally, in spite
of the potential for "off the shelf" instruments, often these surveys fall short. Similarly, esoteric or exotic instruments that might raise questions about the reliability and validity of findings are also unattractive (Shepard, cited in Buros, 1978).

To better address the issue of collecting the substantial data relative to measuring aspects of criminal behavior, an important pool of variables involving psychological attributes, including temperament, attachment, personality traits, and emotional disorders, can be measured with the use of various psychometric tests, such as a standardized psychiatric diagnostic test, and intelligence test. These instruments broaden the appeal of the research by including mental health issues relative to criminal behavior measurements.

Aside from efforts to specifically measure criminal behavior, prior researchers have measured motivators, utilizing instruments similar to those used for measuring criminal behavior. The Motivation Analysis Test (MAT, cited in Buros, 1978), for example, is designed to measure motivational traits. With this instrument, motivational traits are assessed by means of a forced choice test, wherein respondents indicate for which of two goals they would use a given resource. Further, respondents are expected to associate relevant words to gratify the sentiment or drive in question (Buros, 1978). This psychometric test has not fared well with regards to the criteria of an acceptable test. However, although the authors indicate that careless, hurried, or thoughtless responding can be detected on this test, there appears to be concern as to whether or not the scales are measuring what their names would suggest they are measuring. Aside from this validity concern, the test
appears further to be sensitive to changes in temperament. Whether this creates a reliability issue is still unclear. Indications reflect low reliability. Overall, however, since the scales on the MAT are empirically derived and have real structured existence as an experimental device, the MAT has much promise (Mazer, cited in Buros, 1978).

Similarly, self-report measurements, such as the Self-Concept and Motivation Inventory (cited in Buros, 1978), have been used in previous research also. This instrument focuses on the respondents' self-concept and motivation. Yielding largely perceptional data, the greatest asset appears to be an attractive and straightforward response format. The authors created a matrix of the four main scales, which is commendable and usually would enhance validity. However, the authors try to derive too many scores from a single test. The authors do not caution the user that the validity of all the scores rests on the strength of their conceptualization (Shepard, cited in Buros, 1978). With this, the validity of the inventory has not been established. The issue of reliability is similar, as reliability has not been either. Reportedly, reliabilities are adequate for group data, but the shorter tests lack customary reliabilities for individual interpretation.

Overall, the concerns relative to such report measures like the Self-Concept and Motivation Inventory evolves primarily around validity. Whether the scales measure what is intended to be measured is frequently an issue. With the Survey of Personal Values (SPV), for example, which is another self-report measurement, there is no formal validity of the measure. Although the SPV has had many validity and reliability studies, there are problems with contemporary use. Although it seems
to measure its constructs reliably, there is an ambiguous pattern to the validity data, and there is evidence that the test is measuring something different from what it purports to.

Additionally, there is another concern about self-report measurements which could bias measurement. Intentional bias on the part of the respondents or the ability of subjects to contemplate scores creates a transparency concern. Such transparency arouses defensiveness of self-characterization for respondents. Indeed, subjects in testing situations may believe that they can provide the responses that will characterize them in differing manners.

In summation, there is support for the use of adequately standardized measurements in motivation, as evidenced by the Motivation Analysis Test. The issue of transparency is dealt with, as the authors were able to devise the items to avoid intentional bias. While validity and reliability issues remain, the measurement reportedly has promise, and current use of the measurement has not been relegated to research only status. Relegation to research only status suggests that researchers ought to continue to investigate the tool measurement and review reliability and validity data regarding the instrument. The status suggests that researchers should be cautious in drawing conclusions based on the findings, when the particular measurement is used.

On the other hand, self-report measurements tend to be relegated to use in research settings because of the shortage of empirical validity frequently assigned to such measures. It is not always clear that these measures are measuring what one thinks they are. Although some
self-report measurements tend to yield similar results in retesting, reliability also tends to be borderline in many instances.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

The purpose of this study was to compare the most frequently cited motivators in the literature with the most preferred motivators cited by criminal respondents. The methods consisted of: (a) an exhaustive review of the literature to identify the most frequently mentioned motivators referred to in various books, articles, and research and (b) a survey of the most preferred motivators isolated by previously incarcerated criminals and considered to be the most important influencers on their behavior, a comparative analysis of the rank orders of the most frequently cited motivators in the literature, and the rank order of the most preferred motivators isolated by the respondent group.

This chapter contains a detailed explanation of the study methodology, method for analyzing the literature, data collection and analysis, instrument reliability, and the hypothesis.

Setting

The survey was administered at the community corrections agency, Project Start, located at 1035 St. Antoine, in Wayne County, Michigan. The test and retest sessions were conducted in a large classroom setting located in the corrections agency.
Recruitment of Subjects

The method for recruiting subjects was follows: Two hundred subjects were enrolled into the Project Start program for previously incarcerated individuals. The recruiting process consisted of canvassing Project Start program enrollees during the first day of the agency's orientation classes. New program enrollees were advised about the opportunities available to them with the agency, including the opportunity to participate in a study about motivators that are thought to be important to previously incarcerated criminals. Subjects were advised about the purpose of the study. Subjects were advised that they were considered for the survey because they had been previously incarcerated. They were advised that the survey results were confidential and that their identities would remain anonymous and, further, that the survey would have no bearing on their criminal status or program involvement. In an effort to counter the possibility that subjects might anticipate loss of benefit, or "face," as a result of participating in the study, subjects were advised that they were not required to participate in the study and, accordingly, were advised that their names and institutions would not be used for purposes of this study. After a brief question and answer period, all of the program enrollees had the opportunity to review the Informed Consent Form (Appendix A). Some of these previously incarcerated adults volunteered to participate in the study. This recruiting process was repeated six times during six different orientation sessions. The recruitment period, wherein 60 volunteer adult subjects volunteered to participate in the study, spanned an 8-week period.
Subjects

Each of the 60 individuals included in the study completed the informed consent prior to the administration of the survey. Of these subjects, 46 were male (77%) and 14 were female (23%). Forty-nine (82%) were Black, 7 (12%) were White, and 4 (6%) subjects were Hispanic. All of the volunteer subjects were unemployed.

Jurors

Five language experts were recruited by the primary researcher to assist with the classifying and collapsing of the motivator terms extrapolated from the exhaustive review of the literature. These juror experts, consisting of two English teachers, two college English students, and one self-proclaimed avid reader, were recruited from various program components of the Project Start corrections agency. After being advised about the purpose of the study, jurors were requested to participate in this study by the primary researcher.

In a group led by the primary researcher, the jurors were advised that (a) the motivators needed to be sorted and collapsed together based on similarity and sameness and (b) the motivators should be sorted into classifications. Classifications were based on the context that the term was used in the literature. The context included motivators cited in the area of work, in the area of education, and personal motivators. Jurors were also advised that they had to agree on a uniform set of definitions for the list of frequently used terms. Jurors were further advised that they must agree on all final decisions about the collapsing, classifying,
and defining process.

As a group, the jurors met and combined similar variables and classified the motivators into one of the following groups: motivators in education, motivators in work, and personal motivators.

Prior to developing an instrument to measure the most preferred motivators, the researcher advised each volunteer juror that their purpose was to work together as a group to define each frequently cited motivator into groups according to their perceptions of the common definition of each variable. After each frequently cited motivator was defined, jurors were instructed to combine the similar terms with the purpose of collapsing these terms into groups. Once the frequently cited motivators were defined and collapsed, jurors were instructed to classify the motivators as either work related, educationally related, or related to personal areas of concern. Jurors were given standard dictionaries to utilize in an effort to clarify certain terms.

Once the terms were defined, collapsed, and classified, jurors listed the approved and agreed upon terms in an ordinal ranking based on the most frequently cited term to the least frequently cited term.

This volunteer jury decided, as a group, which motivators to collapse with other motivators. The jurists, further, decided at what point a motivator was considered frequently cited. The decision of the jurists was that motivators that were cited at least five times in the literature were considered frequently cited. The third decision on which the volunteer jurists decided was the method of defining the terms and the source from which the definition of the motivators was derived. The purpose of having volunteer jurists classifying, collapsing, and defining the
motivators was to avoid discipline specific definitions of the terms. Discipline specific definitions would limit the manner in which the terms were utilized. Instead, jurists made the decision rule to use generic definitions that could be applied across disciplines. Discipline specific definitions, for example, would entail defining rewards in a sociological context or defining advancement in an educational context. Since respondents could be multicultural and multidisciplinarian, or neither, a generic approach to classifying and defining the terms would enable subjects to respond with a similar premise. For example, subjects understand that when the term "reward" is referred to, the response should be based on general terminology.

After reviewing 335 articles, studies, and theoretical postulates, 187 motivators were tallied to determine the frequency of reference for each motivator. Some motivators were reviewed in the context of the work environment, while others were cited in the context of education. Personal motivators were those motivators which were not referenced in either work or education. That is to say that all motivators outside of work and education were considered personal motivators.

Method for Analyzing Literature

The longer list of motivators from the literature analysis was reduced to the 18 motivators identified as being frequently cited. The method for analyzing the literature included surveying and reviewing all studies on motivators, articles, and theoretical positions and determining the frequency. The motivators were entered into categories, then ranked by frequency of citations.
The method of measuring and determining what constitutes a motivator centered on those influences that trigger or arouse individuals to do, or to have, or to be more. When these influencers were evident in the literature, they were considered as citations for purposes of this study. Subsequently, motivators were classified into three categories: (1) motivators in the work environment; (2) the educational environment, and (3) personal areas. These areas emerged as the most prevalent areas of concentration for information regarding motivators.

As indicated earlier, the method for analyzing the literature to determine the extent to which each motivator was the subject of a study or theoretical postulate included sorting and categorizing individual motivators into categories and subgroups. Motivators were initially separated into three major categories: (1) motivators in the work environment, (2) motivators in education, and (3) personal motivators, to establish a rank order of motivators for each category.

Rank order was determined by tallying the number of times each motivator was the subject of a study or theoretical postulate in each category. The subgroups were collapsed and combined to establish a general listing and general rank order of all motivators extrapolated from the literature. After a general listing of motivators was comprised (see Table 1 for general listing of literature with frequencies of citations), the listing was narrowed by combining terms with similar definitions. For example, bonus was combined with the more generic term reward, and advancement was combined with recognition. The decision regarding which motivator to collapse and combine with other individual motivators was made by the group of five volunteer jurors.
Table 1
Most Frequently Cited Motivators Ranked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivator</th>
<th>Number of citations</th>
<th>Percentage of times motivators were cited in articles, theories, in research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonuses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 represents the 18 most frequently cited motivators which were mentioned at least five times in the various theories, articles, and research reviewed for this study. The frequency representation in the literature is also presented in percentages. This alphabetical listing represents the motivators that were given to the jurists for collapsing and classification.

Definitions of Frequently Cited Motivators

When the jurists met to define, classify, and collapse the list of motivators, each was given standardized unabridged dictionaries (Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983) to assist with the defining of the terms. After 3 hours of review, the jurists agreed on the following definitions:

**Achievement:** A result brought about by effort. Accomplishment.

**Activity:** A procedure designed to stimulate learning by firsthand experience.

**Advancement:** Promotion or elevation to a higher rank or position.

**Attractiveness:** Arousing interest or pleasure.

**Bonuses:** Something in addition to what is expected or strictly due.

**Cost:** The amount or equivalent paid or charged for something.

**Goals:** The ends toward which efforts are directed.

**Money:** Something generally accepted as a medium of exchange, a measure of value, or means of payment.

**Power:** Possession of control, authority, or influence over others.
Program: A plan or a system under which action may be taken toward a goal. Curriculum, prospectus, or syllabus.

Promotion: The act or fact of being raised in position or rank.

Recognition: Formal acknowledgment. Special notice or attention.

Responsibility: Moral, legal, or mental accountability.

Reward: Something that is given in return for good or evil done or received and, especially, that is offered or given for some service or attainment.

Salary: Fixed compensation paid regularly for services.

Security: Freedom from fear or anxiety. Freedom from want or deprivation.

Self-esteem: A confidence or satisfaction in oneself.

Sex: Sexually motivated phenomena or behavior.

Bonuses, cost, reward, and salary were collapsed into the motivator, money. Each was seen basically as subsets of money. The rationale evolved around the issue that bonuses and rewards are given in exchange for something extra than expected, while cost and salary are pay that is due for services rendered. Each, basically, is relative to something that is expected or due as a result of an action done by an individual.

Program and attractiveness were folded into the activity motivator. To the extent that program is a plan toward an action; and since attractiveness arouses or stimulates action to participate, both were similarly linked to activity which is something designed to stimulate.
Achievement, advancement, and promotion were subgrouped into the motivator, recognition. Jurists agreed that the common denominator for each was "result brought by effort." With each term, "formal acknowledgment" further linked all terms.

The remaining six motivators were considered primary and exclusive of the other terms and were thereby left as key terms. (Table 2 represents the final nine terms used in this study.)

Table 2
Nine Remaining Frequently Cited Motivators in the Literature and Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivator</th>
<th>Number of citations</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Money</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Activity</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recognition</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Security</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-esteem</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Power</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sex</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 lists the nine remaining frequently cited motivators which the jurists agreed were separate and distinctive from one another. Each of these motivators was listed at least five times in theories, articles,
and research studies reviewed for this study. These terms formed the basis for the preference survey which was developed and administered to the subject respondents. The frequency column shows the percentage of entries relative to the total.

Motivators in the Work Environment

During the process of canvassing the research studies, articles, and theories for motivators, certain motivators related to the work environment. This is to say that some research studies were surveying job-related attitudes, while some articles and theories reviewed influencers that related to productivity or economics (Bowey & Thorpe, 1986; Galbraith, 1967). With this, research concentrated on motivators in the work environment has been extensive. Nineteen sources focusing on the work environment cited money as a motivator (Baehler, 1983; Clay, 1984; Dunwell, 1986; Falusne, 1985; Greenhill, 1988; Land, 1986; LeBoeuf, 1985; Lincoln, 1951; Merrett & White, 1968; Moore, 1987; Murphy, 1987; Newcombe, 1981; Nowlin, 1982; Rossenbaum, 1982; Sinha & Prasad, 1985; Torrence, 1967; Von Kaas & Lindemann, 1971; Wheeless, 1982; Yenney, 1986).

Promotion was cited as a motivator in 13 studies and theories. Advancement in the work environment is synonymous to promotion (Bowey & Thorpe, 1986; Cherrington & Wixom, 1983; Falusne, 1985; Gould & Sigall, 1977; LaBuda, 1932; LeBoeuf, 1985; Lincoln, 1951; Merrett & White, 1968; Moore, 1987; Rossenbaum, 1982; Santhamani, 1983; Sinha & Prasad, 1985; Torrence, 1967).
Rewards or bonuses in the work environment were found to be motivators in 13 sources (Baehler, 1983; Bowey & Thorpe, 1986; Cherrington & Wixom, 1983; Clay, 1984; Dunwell, 1986; Greenhill, 1988; LeBoeuf, 1985; Lincoln, 1951; Mernit, 1987; Merrett & White, 1968; Nalbantian, 1987; Rossenbaum, 1982; Torrence, 1967). Recognition in the work environment was mentioned as a motivator more than five times (Bowey & Thorpe, 1986; Cherrington & Wixom, 1983; Dunning & Hochstedler, 1983; Gould & Sigall, 1977; Hamshari, 1985; Jakubowitch, 1988; LeBoeuf, 1985; Lincoln, 1951; Merrett & White, 1968; Moore, 1987; Rossenbaum, 1982; Santhamani, 1983).

Security was cited as a motivator in the work environment. Activity as related to a particular project or assignment in the work environment was mentioned in the literature. Attractiveness of tasks and environment were cited more than five times as work-related motivators. Goals in the work environment, as well as power, were mentioned as motivators (Baehler, 1983; Bowey & Thorpe, 1986; Cherrington & Wixom, 1983; Clay, 1984; Falusne, 1985; Frase, 1982; Gould & Sigall, 1977; Greenhill, 1988; LaBuda, 1932; LeBoeuf, 1985; Lees & Quinn, 1984; Lincoln, 1951; Moore, 1987; Nowlin, 1982; Pareek & Keshote, 1981; Reiter, 1985; Rossenbaum, 1982; Sinha & Prasad, 1985; Stahl, 1986; Torrence, 1967; Yenney, 1986).

Cost related to work was cited as a motivator. Cost of a particular operation, project, or task in the work environment could arouse increased performance by employees. Subsidies to reflect higher living costs were found to be motivators (Baehler, 1983; Coffey, 1987; Globerson, 1985; Greenhill, 1988; Rossenbaum, 1982; Von Kaas &
Less frequently cited motivators in the work environment were self-esteem or attitude and responsibility. How individuals feel about themselves is a motivator which will influence or fail to arouse goal attainment in the work environment (Rossenbaum, 1982; Santhamani, 1983).

Degree of responsibility related to a task is cited as a motivator for employees in a work environment. The degree to which a person is held accountable to specific tasks will arouse or fail to arouse goal directed behavior (Gould & Sigall, 1977; Hamshari, 1985; Lincoln, 1951; Nowlin, 1982; Pareek & Keshote, 1981).

Table 3 lists the most frequent motivators cited in the literature that related to the work environment. The corresponding frequencies are shown in percentages.

Motivators in the Education Environment

Another pervasive area that yielded information for this study concentrated on motivators in the educational environment. A listing of motivators in education was made by a group of five volunteers. In the literature, there were 41 articles and studies that related to information about motivators in education. (See Table 4 for the listing of the most frequently cited motivators that are of, or related to, the education environment.) The most frequently cited motivator in the area of education focused on programs. The type of program that educators use can arouse or fail to arouse goal directed behavior (Association of California School Administrators, 1983; Caouette & Reid, 1985; Case, Anderson,
Table 3
Motivators in Work Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivator</th>
<th>Raw number</th>
<th>Percentage of times motivators were cited in the articles, studies, and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money (salary)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion (advancement)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards (bonuses)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*  $n = 124.$

Table 4
Motivators in Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivator</th>
<th>Raw number</th>
<th>Percentage of times motivators were cited in the articles, studies, and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 34.

Rewards in education ranked second highest as a motivator. Educators can instigate certain goal directed behavior by using a reward system (Butler, 1987; Richards, 1986; Stoyanoff, 1982; Thompson et al., 1980; Zhuk, 1983). A specific activity and the attractiveness of the activity are also motivators that can be used by educators to influence student behavior (Church, 1983; Croll & Drummond, 1983; Eschenmann, 1988; Hobbs, 1984; Janger, 1988; Koch, 1986; Murphey,

Goals set by students ranked fourth highest as motivators of behavior in education. Followers set goals in the area of education and the goals became motivators that arouse goal directed behavior (Anderson & Palmer, 1988; Thompson et al., 1980).

Promotion, security, and self-esteem were equally ranked as motivators in education. Students and followers in education can be aroused by the prospect of promotion and security. Teachers and leaders can stimulate certain goal directed behavior by using promotion as a motivator. Similarly, security is equally as important (Croll & Drummond, 1983).

Table 4 shows the most frequently cited motivators and corresponding percentages that relate to the educational environment as extrapolated from the research studies, articles, and theories canvassed for this study. The higher the raw score and percentage, the more frequent the influencer was cited.

Personal Motivators

For purposes of this study, motivators that were neither discussed, surveyed, nor referred to work or education were combined into a personal motivator category. Motivators that arouse behavior in individuals are considered personal motivators. Personal motivators stimulate behavior in various contexts. Attractiveness is the highest ranking motivator for individuals according to the number of times cited.
in the review of literature. (See Table 5 for the list of most frequently cited personal motivators and proportional frequencies.) The attractiveness of another person, project, or program can arouse goal directed behavior for a person (Evans, 1989; Hobbs, 1984; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986; Roser, 1986; Severn, 1988; Wade, Thompson, Tashakkor, & Valente, 1989; Weitzman, 1986).

Table 5
Personal Motivators for Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivator</th>
<th>Raw number</th>
<th>Percentage of times motivators were cited in the articles, studies, and research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 36.
Rewards and self-esteem were equally cited in the review of literature. Persons can be stimulated towards certain goal directed behavior with the anticipation of a particular reward (Dismuke, 1987; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986). Further, goal directed behavior for some people is influenced by the person's self-esteem. Positive or negative self-esteem can be motivators for certain behavior. When individuals feel good about themselves in a situation or, on the other hand, when they feel inadequate, the goal is influenced by the self-esteem personal motivator (Barth, 1988; J. Barton, 1982; Elliott, 1984; Radich, 1985; Tompkins, 1981; Tzuriel & Haywood, 1985; Weitzman, 1986).

Sex ranked fourth highest on the list of personal motivators. Individuals can be influenced by sex as a motivator. With this, leaders and managers can use sex or sex appeal to generate specific behavior from followers (Evans, 1989; Severn, 1988; Wade et al., 1989; Weitzman, 1986).

Power, goals, activity, and recognition were ranked equally in the literature as possible motivators for specific goal achievement for individuals. The desire to have power, or the desire to reach a specific goal, or to participate in a certain activity can be the motivator that stimulates an individual towards a particular direction (Brody, 1983; Hakmiller & Hammerssla, 1982; Hamilton, 1983; Kasch, 1985; Kircher, 1984; Maehr & Braskamp, 1986; Rice & Nelson, 1988; Severn, 1988; Tompkins, 1981; Wade et al., 1989; Weitzman, 1986).

The least frequently cited personal motivators in the literature were money, security, program, and achievement. Each were cited equally as motivators toward behavior for individuals outside of the work

Table 5 shows the frequencies of citations in the literature of personal motivations and the associating percentiles. The list of personal motivators derives from the sources that were neither work nor educationally related. Instead, the remaining books, articles, and research efforts, which were not of or related to, work or education, comprised this list. Some of the areas include sources that highlighted motivators in religion, social, family, and politics.

Research Instrument

The construction of the research instrument was based on the 18 frequently cited motivators which were collapsed and classified by five volunteer jurists. After collapsing and classifying the motivators to eliminate redundancy, nine motivators were the basis for the 36-item survey. As stated earlier, to avoid redundancy and confusion of terms, similar or like motivators were collapsed and combined, formatted as a closed end survey instrument (see Appendix B for survey questionnaire).

Items were designed based on the following nine motivators: (1) recognition, (2) money, (3) responsibility, (4) activity, (5) power, (6) self-esteem, (7) security, (8) goals, and (9) sex. The questionnaire used a paired response format (Kerlinger, 1986), and asked respondents to compare the motivators with one another. Items asked were, for example, "Which is most important to you, recognition or money?" Which is most important to you, responsibility or goals?" "Which is
most important to you, power or goals?" Respondents were to check which of the paired motivators was most important to them.

Each motivator was contained in eight different item statements compared to all other individual motivators. For example, the motivator, sex, was compared in the following eight item statements: (1) "Which is most important to you, recognition or sex?" (2) "Which is most important to you, money or sex?" (3) "Which is most important to you, responsibility or sex?" (4) "Which is most important to you, activity or sex?" (5) "Which is most important to you, power or sex?" (6) "Which is most important to you, self-esteem or sex?" (7) "Which is most important to you, security or sex?" (8) "Which is most important to you, goals or sex?"

Survey Presenters

Two monitors jointly administered the survey questionnaire. Both monitors had more than 16 years of experience combined in working with previously incarcerated criminals, and both monitors had experience in the area of testing.

Each of these two monitors, prior to administering the survey questionnaire, met with the researcher to discuss procedures to deliver the survey.

Survey Sessions

When the group of subjects came into the classroom, they were advised by the researcher that they would hear a brief discussion about the survey they were about to take. After the brief discussion, the
research monitors distributed envelopes with the survey questionnaires contained. After the survey monitors were introduced, subjects were asked to sign the consent forms to indicate their agreement to participate in the study.

In the survey session, the monitors introduced themselves to the subject group of previously incarcerated criminals, who served as subjects in the present study. Then, one monitor asked subjects in the group to sign the consent for their agreement to participate in the study. The consent form was paper clipped to the envelope containing the instrument. Afterwards, the monitors advised the subjects to begin the questionnaire.

After approximately 1 hour and 45 minutes, all subjects had completed their responses to the survey. Subjects who required additional time were allowed time to complete the questionnaire. They placed the completed instruments into the unmarked envelope they received when each arrived for the survey.

Data Collection and Analysis

The survey was administered twice: the initial session and again 2 weeks later, using the same procedures and the same subjects. After the survey sessions, the subjects placed the completed questionnaires into unmarked envelopes. The response data remained sealed and confidential.

The analysis of the data began with tallying the number of times each motivator was indicated as being most important when paired with a corresponding motivator. Data from the test and the retest scores
were kept separate until each set of data was completely analyzed. Further analysis included tabulating the responses to delineate scores for comparisons between test and retest data. Scores were also charted on a graph to observe the linear relationship between the two groups of test scores. After the test scores were analyzed, the combined set of scores were compared with the literature citation scores to assess the strength of the relationship.

Instrument Reliability

Reliability in this study was assessed using the test-retest design. The test-retest design allows for calculating the average relationship between items within the test. A high internal correlation between test and retest means that there is strength in the relationship to the extent that subjects tend to respond to both surveys similarly. Table 6 shows the test-retest scores with the estimate product-moment correlation (sample size) and two-tailed p value.

The correlation coefficient measures the strength of the linear relationship between two variables on a scale of -1 to +1. The p value is used to test whether the coefficient is significantly different from zero.

The following pairs of variables are significantly correlated at the 5% level: (a) test with retest--correlation = .9822, p = .0000; (b) test with total--correlation = .9956, p = .0000; and (c) retest with total--correlation = .9955, p = .0000.

There were 157 possible pairs of correlations between the test-retest scores. Seven pairs of correlations could have happened by chance. However, there were 17 pairs of correlations at the 5% level.
Table 6
Test-Retest Product-Moment Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Retest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>0.9822</td>
<td>0.9956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( 9)</td>
<td>( 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>0.9822</td>
<td>0.9955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>( 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.9956</td>
<td>0.9955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( 9)</td>
<td>( 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this, the instrument is reliable in that it yields approximately the same values for the test and retest. Although some individuals changed rankings noticeably between test and retest, the overall result was that the previously incarcerated criminals' rankings of motivators were unchanged.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis stated that the ranked mean scores on the frequent motivators and the preferred motivators were the same. Pearson product-moment correlations were used to test the hypothesis. Means and standard deviation scores for each variable were analyzed, using a
one-tailed test at an alpha level of .05.

The operational hypothesis stated that there is a correlation between the rank order of frequently cited motivators and the rank order of preferred motivators cited on a survey response instrument.

This hypothesis is based on the premise that throughout the entire research of articles, studies, and theoretical postulates, there was no evidence to support that the motivators perceived by criminals are any different from those motivators that determine the behavior of others (Baehler, 1983; Dunwell, 1986; Greenhill, 1988; Land, 1986).
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this chapter, findings are described as follows: (a) survey returns, (b) survey results, (c) frequently cited motivators, and (d) testing of the hypothesis.

Survey Return

Sixty people completed the informed consent and the survey questionnaire during the test and retest survey sessions, for a total of 120 questionnaires completed and included in the analysis.

Survey Results

The most preferred motivator, as indicated by analysis of subject responses, was security. That is, security was selected by the respondent group as the most preferred motivator 735 times when compared with other items on the questionnaire, representing 16% of the total percentile scores. Self-esteem and goals ranked next below security. Self-esteem was most preferred in 722 instances, while goals was preferred 719 times. These figures represent 15.7% and 15.6% of the total scores, respectively. Subjects selected responsibility 631 times, money 449 times, and power 447 times. These scores represent the following percentages: 13.7%, 9.77%, and 9.72%, respectively. The least preferred motivators, representative of the lowest percentiles, were
activity (351 for 7.6%), recognition (284 for 6.18%), and sex (258 times, or 5.6% of scores).

Table 7 shows the rank order of most preferred motivators for the subject group of previously incarcerated criminals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivator</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Security</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-esteem</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>15.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goals</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>15.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Responsibility</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Money</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>9.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Power</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Activity</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Recognition</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sex</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequently Cited Motivators in Literature

The most frequently cited motivator contained in studies, articles, and theoretical postulates was money. That is, money was cited 56 times and represents 28% of the total pool of motivators contained in the literature. The second most frequently cited motivator in studies and articles was activity. Activity was cited 51 times, which reflects a 25.75 percentile. Recognition was cited in 35 instances, and goals was
cited to a lesser degree at a frequency of 12 times. These figures repre-
sent 17.67% and 6.06% of the total group of motivators. Security,
self-esteem, and power were in the lower percentile range with 11
citations jointly for security and self-esteem. This figure represents
5.5% of the items represented in the literature. Power, sex, and
responsibility were cited least in the literature with percentile scores
below 4%.

Table 8 compares the rank order of motivators frequently cited in
books, articles, and theoretical postulates, and the rank order of most
preferred motivators as chosen by previously incarcerated criminals on
the survey. Scores represent the number of times each item was select-
ed by respondents in the survey questionnaire. Citations represent the
number of times each motivator was cited in various books, articles, and
theoretical postulates. Percentages indicate the proportion of frequency
that each motivator was cited either in the literature or by the respond-
ent group.

Testing of Hypothesis

The hypothesis for this study stated that the rank order of fre-
quently cited motivators, and the rank order of the perceived most pre-
ferred motivators for previously incarcerated criminals were the same.

The statistical analysis included calculating the Pearson product-
moment correlations and determining the estimated \( p \) values for scores.
The correlation coefficient measured the strength of the linear relation-
ship between the two rank orders. The \( p \) value was used to determine
Table 8
Comparison of Survey and Citation Scores With Percentiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined test-retest</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recognition</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Money</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Responsibility</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Activity</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Power</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-esteem</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Security</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Goals</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sex</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Test-retest: N = 4,596, mean = 510. Citation: N = 198, mean = 22.

whether the coefficient is significantly different from zero. Table 9 illustrates the Pearson product-moment estimated. Table 10 shows the estimated Spearman rank correlation.

The findings failed to support a relationship between the variables. There was a difference between the rank order of citations and the rank order of perceived most preferred motivators for previously incarcerated criminals. With this, the hypothesis was rejected, meaning that the rank orders were significantly different from one another. The ranking of motivators of the subject group was not the same as the ranking.
Table 9
Estimated Product-Moment Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Retest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>0.9822</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r = (9) )</td>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>Two-tailed ( p ) value</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>0.9822</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( r = (9) )</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.9956</td>
<td>0.9955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

predicted in the previous literature.

Table 9 shows estimated product moment correlation coefficients for compared test-retest survey scores. This means that Table 9 shows the information supporting a correlation between test scores and retest scores. Since the correlation coefficient measures the strength of the linear relationship between two variables on a scale of -1 to +1, a correlation coefficient within this range is significant. Test scores show a correlation with retest scores (0.9822). With a sample size (9), the two-tailed \( p \) value is zero. This means that there is a linear relationship
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Retest</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Spearman rank correlation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size 9</td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td>0.9167</td>
<td>-0.1042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-tailed p value</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>0.7683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9167 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0095 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9167 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7683 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

between the two scores. Further, the data show a relationship with the test scores and the total, which is the combined test-retest scores (0.9956). Since the score falls between the scales -1 to +1, a linear relationship is reflected with an estimated product moment of 0.9956. Similarly, retest scores correlated with the total (0.9955). All of this translates into meaning that there is a degree of instrument reliability as measured by the significant correlation between test-retest scores.
Findings from one set of scores (test) significantly parallels scores from the retest, indicating that respondents did not change the way in which they rated motivators from the first test administration to the second.

The following pairs of variables are significantly correlated at the 5% level: (a) test with retest--correlation = 0.9822, p value = 0.0000; (b) test with total--correlation = 0.9956, p value = 0.0000; and (c) retest with total--correlation = 0.9955, p value = 0.0000.

Table 10 shows all score comparisons. In this instance, the estimate Spearman rank correlation provides a closer analysis of the relationship between test and total scores (0.9167), with retest and total score (1.0000). The associated two-tailed p value scores are shown also. The p value shows the significance of the coefficient relative to zero. With this, three pairs of variables were significantly correlated at the 5% level.

On the other hand, when test scores were tested for a possible linear relationship with literature citation scores, no correlation was shown (-0.1042). With the sample size (9), the estimated p value was not significant (0.7683). This means that with the appropriate analysis, using the estimated Spearman rank correlation, the data do not support a linear relationship between the test scores and the citation scores. The same is true for retest scores when a correlation analysis was conducted to measure a possible linear relationship with citation scores, none were found (-0.0542). When combined test and retest scores (total) were tested for a relationship, again, no relationship was supported (-0.0542).
The following pairs of variables are significantly correlated at the 5% level: (a) test with retest--correlation = 0.9167, \( p \) value = 0.0095; (b) test with total--correlation = 0.9167, \( p \) value = 0.0095; and (c) retest with total--correlation = 1.0000, \( p \) value = 0.0047.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the rank order of frequently cited motivators contained in studies, articles, and theoretical postulates, and the rank order of perceived most preferred motivators for previously incarcerated criminals. This chapter includes a discussion of the results of the study, the limitations, and suggestions for further research.

The basis for the study stemmed from the vastly unsorted and unclassified preponderance of literature on motivators, and the issue of whether the research represented in those books and articles should apply any differently in studies of previously incarcerated criminals. Studies that considered information on motivators tend to focus on various socioeconomic influencers, personality variables (such as the unrestrained tendencies to seek pleasure and avoid pain), and genetics (Gottfredson, 1980; McCord, 1979; Rafter, 1990; Schlueter, 1989). While some articles and research incorporated informal interviews to gather perceptual data, many articles and research designs relied on formal questionnaires. There have been no previous studies that have sorted and classified motivators cited in the available literature. The basis for this study provides the groundwork for future researchers to continue to tally motivators in books, articles, and research in an effort
to measure trends in the emphasis placed upon certain motivators. With this continued system of tallying references to motivators by various authors and researchers, other researchers can periodically measure and compare what is frequently cited in the literature with what is, indeed, perceived to be important motivators to various targeted populations, such as criminals.

Comparing what authors and researchers favor when considering motivators, with what previously incarcerated criminals cite as most important influencers on behavior, provides a useful basis for other researchers to determine whether a parallel in emphasis on motivators exists during a certain period of time. If a parallel exists between what both groups consider to be important influencers on behavior, then researchers and authors can consider themselves addressing a major issue in a timely manner. Further, when, for example, a group of sampled criminals indicate that self-esteem is an important motivator, then researchers can attempt to manipulate self-esteem in criminals with the aim of influencing criminal behavior. With the added support that the information on specific motivators is timely, then researchers can substantiate their continued emphasis on these motivators. Furthermore, when a parallel exists between the popularity of certain motivators and the importance of those motivators, for one, but not for another targeted group, then researchers will have a basis for investigating why their information applies to some groups and not to others.

The premise of the hypothesis was based on the theory that there was no indication in the literature that motivations cited in the literature were more influential to one group than another. While there was
support that a series of contributing factors were often associated with delinquency or criminal behavior, there was no indication that these factors influenced everyone who experienced them to become involved with criminal behavior. Indeed, some individuals may be influenced by certain motivators; however, there was no indication that the presence of a particular motivator made a person more likely to exhibit criminal behavior. For example, social background, intelligence, or the capacity to take advantage of opportunities relate to achievement (Heller, 1969; Rosen, 1959). Moreover, the lack of capacity and the lack of achievement do not necessarily instigate individuals to exhibit criminal behavior. Indeed, there was no information to support such a relationship. Instead, the information supported that while motivators instigate behavior for all people, other factors, not necessarily motivators, are associated with and contribute to criminal behavior. There is clarity that while motivators influence the behavior of both criminals and noncriminals, the extent to which any specific motivator impacts a particular person's behavior is unclear.

Had the research findings for this study supported a correlation between the rank order of frequently cited motivators in the literature and the rank order of preferred motivators chosen by the subject group, researchers would have had another basis for delving into the possibility of manipulating human behavior with the use of motivators. Despite the possibility of identifying key behavior determinants, unfortunately, this study was not designed to measure degree of influence. There is no information substantiating the degree of influence a particular motivator may have on the behavior of a particular person. It is still not known if
individuals can specify the degree to which a particular motivator may impact their behavior. Therefore, even though the findings may have supported a correlation between the variables, researchers should have been cautious, because "influence" is not the same as "importance." When developing a basis for manipulating behavior, subjects must be able to distinguish between the two terms. Just because a person may choose a certain motivator as important, there is no way of knowing whether the individual personally perceives that motivator to be influential in reference to his behavior. Indeed, subjects may perceive certain motivators to be important and, yet, not personally influential. Beyond this, however, had the researchers supported a relationship between the rank order of frequently cited motivators and the rank order of preferred motivators, there would have been support for researchers interested in behavior modification. Researchers may have determined that there was a parallel in the degree of importance assigned to certain motivators for both researchers and previously incarcerated criminals. Future research would have had an early basis for looking at the relationship somewhat closer and, subsequently, could investigate manipulating certain motivators, cited as influential-important, to eventually impact on criminal behavior.

Had the research supported a relationship between the frequently cited and most important motivators, transparency may have biased the findings (Buros, 1978; Kerlinger, 1986). As indicated in Chapter II, transparency occurs when subjects are able to anticipate certain item responses and, subsequently, base their responses on what they perceive to be apparent or appropriate, as opposed to their actual personal
responses. While the test-retest research format may have reduced the impact of item transparency, self-report measurements, as suggested in Chapter II, must also build in controls to reduce transparency bias. Although some controls were built into the design with the pair response format, some degree of transparency bias may have been evident. When building on this research, if the hypothesis had been supported, there would have been a recommendation to explore the feasibility of additional controls for transparency bias.

Still another issue would have been subject to review, had the finding supported a relationship between the variables. This point, as discussed in Chapter II, gives rise to the issue of item validity. This is an issue often raised when considering self-report measures (Shepard, Mazer, as cited in Buros, 1978). Did the instrument measure what was intended? Although a group of jurists, acting as a group of experts, enhanced item validity, there would nevertheless have been some caution in recommending application of the findings. With this, until continued testing could have been completed with this instrument, findings would have been viewed with caution. Transparency and validity concerns would have prohibited use of the findings outside research only settings (see Chapter II on Measurements).

The hypothesis that the rank order of motivators cited in the literature, and the rank order of perceived preferred motivators for previously incarcerated criminals are the same was not supported. One very possible explanation for this finding can be pursued: All of the respondents were unemployed at the time the survey was administered. The issue of unemployment may have been an uncontrolled underlying factor in the
response of the subjects in that security was the most preferred motivator for the respondent group.

The study included 60 volunteer adult previously incarcerated criminals who were enrolled into the Project Start Community Corrections Program. The nature of Project Start's programming for previously incarcerated criminals is rooted in employment placement. With this, enrollees are all unemployed. The unemployment status of survey respondents was an uncontrolled variable, which was not designed into the study, that could have influenced the perceptions of respondents.

A second possible explanation for the failure to support the hypothesis is rooted in the research design. For the present study, as noted earlier, there was no control group to neutralize the bias that was inherent in the research design. The findings indicated that the degree of emphasis that authors and researchers placed on motivators is different from the emphasis that the sampled population perceive to be influential. The lack of a correlation between the variables, as reflected by the variance between the rank order of literature citations and the rank order of perceived influential motivators, suggests that there may be two perspectives. This finding is not conclusive, however.

There should be caution in reference to accepting the design of this research. A control group should have been incorporated into the research design. The control group should have consisted of a nonstratified, randomly selected sample group representative of the entire population of Wayne County. With this design, a comparison between groups would have yielded more information. This design would have offered information about how the rank order of frequently cited motivators in
the literature correlated with, or failed to correlate with, the rank orders for nonpreviously incarcerated criminals and for previously incarcerated criminals. Such a design would have provided insight information relative to how the literature rank order correlated with nonpreviously incarcerated criminals, and how nonpreviously incarcerated criminals rank the most preferred motivators in comparison to the most frequently cited rank order of literature citations. Finally, the responses of the control group could have been measured for correlation with the previously incarcerated criminal ranking of motivators.

Further Limitations of the Study

The sample population consisted of volunteer adult previously incarcerated criminals. Volunteers are a special group of participants with the desire to be involved in a study. Individuals who could have contributed to the study, who did not volunteer, narrowed the potential size of the targeted sample population. This reduces the ability of the findings and makes them less applicable to previously incarcerated criminals who would not volunteer.

The survey instrument and data are based on perceptual information. Perceptual data is limited by subject bias. Individual responses are subject to influence and change as circumstances change for the individual volunteers.

A further limitation of this research investigation is the limited representativeness of the targeted population. The narrowed focus of the targeted population necessitated eliminating certain potential participants, such as those previously incarcerated criminals who did not
volunteer to participate, and those previously incarcerated criminals who
were not enrolled in the test site agency at the time of the study. These
factors limit true representativeness of the targeted population, since the
sample population may not be reflective of the larger population of
previously incarcerated criminals. Therefore, the findings cannot be
representative or generalized to this larger population.

Timing of measurement is an added limitation. Had motivators
been measured before jail or prison, would the rank ordering of the
motivators for previously incarcerated criminals been different? While
unable to know this for certain, there is a possibility that jail or prison
treatment impacted the shift in preferred motivators. Perhaps before jail
time, the respondents' ranking of the preferred motivators may have
been similar to everyone else. As it is, this research was limited by not
including a pre-jail or prison survey of preferred motivators for the re-

The survey instrument designed for this study has not been tested
for reliability. To offset this limitation, a test-retest design procedure
was used for this study.

Another limitation of this survey instrument is in regard to validity.
Content validity is a concern since the instrument is a new design.
There is not empirical evidence that the items on the survey accurately
sample the matter about which conclusions are drawn. With this,
conclusions are limited as adequacy of the definitions have not been
tested.
Future Research

The present study, while contributing to the general body of knowledge regarding behavior and influencers, failed to support the hypothesis. The study did not demonstrate a correlation between motivators frequently cited in the literature and perceived preferred motivators for previously incarcerated criminals. However, several limitations with the selection of subjects and research design were discussed. Given that there were problems with the selection of subjects and the lack of control groups, this study cannot be considered conclusive. Further research should seek to establish the following: (a) randomized selection of subjects, (b) larger sample population, and (c) control groups.

The selection of subjects for future research should include randomly selected subjects. Randomization allows for a more mixed and varied population of subjects. The use of randomization reduces the chance for a cluster of traits that may bias the findings. Accordingly, with randomization, future research would yield greater representation of subject traits.

Representativeness would also be achieved for future research with a larger size sample population. The increased size of the sample population will be more reflective of the universal population and will, thereby, yield a more accurate picture of how the universal group of previously incarcerated criminals perceive motivators. In short, a larger sample population, when coupled with randomization, will yield more powerful findings for future research and will enhance the generalization
of the results.

Control groups in future research will maximize the control of variables and reduce potential error. The use of control groups tends to neutralize biases that may be otherwise inherent in the design, such as undesired clustering, which can yield less powerful findings.

With this, the relationship between the rank order of frequently cited motivators in the literature, and the rank order of perceived preferred motivators for previously incarcerated criminals has yet to be definitively demonstrated. More thorough research is needed.

The rationale for this study held that researchers should pay more attention to the kinds of motivators that people actually perceive to be most important. The conclusion was that the findings did not support a correlation between the rank order of frequently cited motivators in the literature and the rank order of perceived important motivators rated by previously incarcerated criminals. The implication is that the motivators that researchers frequently address in the literature is not where the concentration is for the targeted population as perceived by previously incarcerated criminals. Rather, researchers had not been assigning the same degree of importance to some motivators as did the previously incarcerated criminals. Indeed, the emphasis placed on motivators, as measured by the Pearson product-moment, was not correlated between groups. The lack of a correlation regarding the emphasis placed on motivators between groups suggests an area for further studies.

Emphasis placed on motivators is important because the targeted previously incarcerated criminals are providing information about perceived influencers on their behavior. Based on the findings, behaviorists,
criminal justice theorists, and sociologists have a new body of research to investigate. In the effort to impact on the increase of criminal behavior, this body of potential research begins with the degree of emphasis assigned to motivators by differing groups. In this instance, researchers can explore whether the preferred motivators are correlated to actual behavior. Specifically, criminal justice behaviorists can investigate the possible correlation between perceived influencers and criminal behavior. After a correlation between these variables has been examined, researchers can begin to investigate the feasibility of manipulating the preferred motivators cited by criminals in an effort to eventually control their criminal behavior.

In conclusion, the major question in the present study was to assess whether there was a relationship between what is frequently pursued in the literature relative to motivators and what is actually perceived to be important to survey respondents. While this result was not achieved, the researcher continues to believe that future articles, studies, and research about motivators will be greatly enhanced and better focused with the use of perceptual data garnished from subject respondents.
Appendix A

Informed Consent
INFORMED CONSENT

You are being asked to participate in a study of motivators for previously incarcerated criminals. Be advised that you are not required to participate in this study. Participation carries no loss of benefit or face. There will be no mention of your name or institution. While you are asked to sign an agreement to participate, completion of this survey is anonymous. Your name will not be mentioned in the results of this study.

By signing below, you are agreeing that you are an adult volunteer, that you understand the above and have agreed to participate in this study.

________________________
Signature
Appendix B

Most Preferred Motivators Survey
# MOST PREFERRED MOTIVATORS SURVEY

## DIRECTIONS

The purpose of this survey is to identify most preferred motivators. Review the definitions of terms. Read each question completely. Circle the answer that is most important to you.

Motivators influence behavior. Take a few minutes and think about motivators. Which of the listed motivators apply to you? Ask yourself what influences your behavior the most.

### Common Definitions from Standard Dictionary

*(Webster, 1983)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formal acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a means of payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moral, legal, or mental accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>firsthand experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control, authority, or influence over others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>confidence and satisfaction in oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freedom from fear or wants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the end towards which efforts are directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sexually motivated behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOST PREFERRED MOTIVATORS

1. Which is most important to you RECOGNITION (1) or MONEY (2)?
   Circle 1 or 2

2. Which is most important to you RECOGNITION (1) or RESPONSIBILITY (3)?
   Circle 1 or 3

3. Which is most important to you RECOGNITION (1) or ACTIVITY (4)?
   Circle 1 or 4

4. Which is most important to you RECOGNITION (1) or POWER (5)?
   Circle 1 or 5

5. Which is most important to you RECOGNITION (1) or SELF-ESTEEM (6)?
   Circle 1 or 6

6. Which is most important to you RECOGNITION (1) or SECURITY (7)?
   Circle 1 or 7

7. Which is most important to you RECOGNITION (1) or GOALS (8)?
   Circle 1 or 8

8. Which is most important to you RECOGNITION (1) or SEX (9)?
   Circle 1 or 9

9. Which is most important to you MONEY (2) or RESPONSIBILITY (3)?
   Circle 2 or 3

10. Which is most important to you MONEY (2) or ACTIVITY (4)?
    Circle 2 or 4

11. Which is most important to you MONEY (2) or POWER (5)?
    Circle 2 or 5

12. Which is most important to you MONEY (2) or SELF-ESTEEM (6)?
    Circle 2 or 6
13. Which is most important to you MONEY (2) or SECURITY (7)? Circle 2 or 7
14. Which is most important to you MONEY (2) or GOALS (8)? Circle 2 or 8
15. Which is most important to you MONEY (2) or SEX (9)? Circle 2 or 9
16. Which is most important to you RESPONSIBILITY (3) or ACTIVITY (4)? Circle 3 or 4
17. Which is most important to you RESPONSIBILITY (3) or POWER (5)? Circle 3 or 5
18. Which is most important to you RESPONSIBILITY (3) or SELF-ESTEEM (6)? Circle 3 or 6
19. Which is most important to you RESPONSIBILITY (3) or SECURITY (7)? Circle 3 or 7
20. Which is most important to you RESPONSIBILITY (3) or GOALS (8)? Circle 3 or 8
21. Which is most important to you RESPONSIBILITY (3) or SEX (9)? Circle 3 or 9
22. Which is most important to you ACTIVITY (4) or POWER (5)? Circle 4 or 5
23. Which is most important to you ACTIVITY (4) or SELF-ESTEEM (6)? Circle 4 or 6
24. Which is most important to you ACTIVITY (4) or SECURITY (7)? Circle 4 or 7
25. Which is most important to you *ACTIVITY* (4) or *GOALS* (8)? Circle 4 or 8

26. Which is most important to you *ACTIVITY* (4) or *SEX* (9)? Circle 4 or 9

27. Which is most important to you *POWER* (5) or *SELF-ESTEEM* (6)? Circle 5 or 6

28. Which is most important to you *POWER* (5) or *SECURITY* (7)? Circle 5 or 7

29. Which is most important to you *POWER* (5) or *GOALS* (8)? Circle 5 or 8

30. Which is most important to you *POWER* (5) or *SEX* (9)? Circle 5 or 9

31. Which is most important to you *SELF-ESTEEM* (6) or *SECURITY* (7)? Circle 6 or 7

32. Which is most important to you *SELF-ESTEEM* (6) or *GOALS* (8)? Circle 6 or 8

33. Which is most important to you *SELF-ESTEEM* (6) or *SEX* (9)? Circle 6 or 9

34. Which is most important to you *SECURITY* (7) or *GOALS* (8)? Circle 7 or 8

35. Which is most important to you *SECURITY* (7) or *SEX* (9)? Circle 7 or 9

36. Which is most important to you *GOALS* (8) or *SEX* (9)? Circle 8 or 9
Appendix C

Approval Letter From Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board
Date: February 27, 1991
To: Selma Massey
From: Mary Anne Bunde, Chair
Re: HSIRB Project Number 91-01-10

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "Preferred Motivators for Previously Incarcerated Criminals," has been approved after full review by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any change in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: Edgar Kelley, Educational Leadership

Approval Termination: February 27, 1992
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