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ABSTRACT

Possible selves research has focused primarily on academic achievement and student learning, for at-risk, adolescent or college aged students. The research has not examined an occupation possible self, nor the implications of how time is considered by incarcerated populations. This study was designed to expand the Possible Selves Questionnaire (PSQ) designed by Oyserman for an occupational achievement code and explore any unique codes present for incarcerated young adult males, aged 18-22. Additionally, this study was designed to compare two distinct time horizons for incarcerated young adults, a more proximal one-year event which would represent continued incarceration and a post-release distal time horizon.

A pilot study was conducted to establish the occupation and population codes, coding system, member checks and review processes that were then applied to interview 126 incarcerated young adult males between the ages of 18 and 22 in Arizona correctional facilities. The study produced not only an occupational achievement code, but also refined codes for interpersonal relationships requiring the addition of a spiritual/social code to account for church activities, religion, and spiritual groups, while narrowing the existing interpersonal relationships code to focus on family, children, a spouse or partner. Analysis demonstrated that incarcerated young adults create fewer identified strategies and have fewer aligned strategies to achieve post-release goals. Time served and expected sentences were determined to be significantly associated with the identification of goals, strategies, and development of aligned strategies. The impact of the different time horizon events of during and post incarceration were significant as
well, participants identified five times as many goals one year from now in comparison to post-release, and on average 1.5 more strategies to achieve identified goals.

The study demonstrated that the participants expected sentence was a significantly associated covariate to the number of Future Possible Selves’ (FPS) defined, number of strategies defined to achieve those FPS goals, and number of aligned strategies to FPS goals across time horizons of 1 year and post release. However, time served was only found to be a statistically significant covariate for both goal identification and strategy identification, not strategy alignment.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Individuals who are incarcerated are immersed in a world where they are constantly asked to engage in a future time perspective and consider future possible selves’ processes of thought. They are routinely asked to think about their futures, to define who, what, and where they will be in the future. Often these questions take the form of “what are you going to do when you get out?” or “what are you going to do differently when you are released?” This engagement in future talk and these questions come from all aspects of an inmate’s life; attorneys, family, friends, court judges, law enforcement personnel, counselors, parole review/release panels, and facility staff throughout the judicial process and during their incarceration. Often it is the answers to these questions that are used to determine if and when an individual is ready for release and a return to society (Cicourel 1995; Cornish & Clarke 2014, Gardner 2010, Wieder 1974). Recent research has shown that many adolescents, and young or emerging adults are able to identify the reasons they are incarcerated, the contributing factors, and the things they want to be, things they want to avoid; however, few are able to articulate strategies to get from A to B. Despite being able to identify causes, reasons, and factors, incarcerated individuals are unable to define clear and effective strategies for how to get where they want to go for the future. (Abrams & Aguilar, 2005).

As I spent time working with incarcerated adolescents and young adults in southern Arizona, I saw first-hand the constant barrage of questions regarding their futures, and future planning, but also the lack of depth, the superficial or simplistic nature of their goals and strategies to achieve or avoid those futures. The reality I experienced
was inmates rarely identified any strategies at all to avoid or achieve post release goals. Responses like “I want to have a job,” “I want to have a car,” “I want to be a good husband” or “I want to never come back here” were common, but the lack of detail if any to the follow-up questions of how will you get there? How will you do that? How will you prevent that? remained constantly evident. Additionally, there were often few questions about the present; What are you doing now to get there? What can you work on, do, read, study now, to get there? Who can you talk to now to be ready later? What steps can you take to get there?

Beyond this, I also looked at the abysmal recidivism rates we have not only in Arizona but across the United States. The staggering facts that over 76% of inmates are re-arrested within 5 years of release, and nearly 50% are still unemployed within 12 months of release. Strikingly the post release outcome data further shows that within 3 years over half of those released are re-incarcerated. (Durose, et al, 2014) In 2009, across the United States over 1/3 of individuals in prison were incarcerated for violation of the conditional terms of parole (West, 2011). In the United States we have developed and are maintaining what can only be thought of or described as “a prison to prison pipeline.”

I came to the understanding that the recidivism rates are not only high but increasing, because incarcerated populations fail to plan, prepare or build effective strategies to achieve or avoid their future possible selves when they end their status as an inmate. When they enter a post-release world they are un-prepared, and often have few additional positive or effective skills or abilities to succeed. Discussions with colleagues and personnel in the field of corrections affirmed the suspicion and allowed a general consensus of belief that inmates think about their futures in two distinct time points
“inside” during incarceration and “on the outs” or post-release. I believed that it is this split perspective of time and more specifically focusing on a post-release future but taking few to no steps to prepare or plan for it, leads to the high rates of recidivism. Given the fact that over 95% of incarcerated individuals in the United States will be released, understanding future planning of the incarcerated and exploring how to stem the tide of recidivism is vital. (Hughes, 2002)

Though inmates can define post-release futures, they are not engaging in strategies or taking steps to achieve those post release futures now. Furthermore, that their short-term goals or possible selves, strategies and plans while “inside” are not aligned to those post-release selves. Abrams and Aguilar (2005) found that it was critical to recidivism and post release success that individuals be able to define goals and align strategies, but noted that even the most program conforming participants in the treatment center were ineffective at doing so.

These ideas and belief’s led me Oyserman’s future possible selves work with at-risk adolescents and Future Time Perspective. This work and these ideas were similar to my thoughts but focused on academic achievement and futures of school aged participants in educational settings, my focus was incarcerated young adults, preparing enter future focused on employment. For incarcerated emerging or young adults, the logical emphasis would be employment or occupational achievement as many will need to support themselves upon release. It was this realization that drove me to base my research off Oyserman’s 2004 open-ended future possible selves measures, but with the intent to expand that work and focus on or allow for occupational achievement in addition to academic achievement. I also wanted to explore the idea of time horizons and
how an “inside” and “post-release” view of the future impacts future possible selves, strategy development, and planning. With the ultimate goal or hope of understanding how can we change this prison to prison pipeline that is continuing to grow.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research focusing on strategy development, alignment and determination in incarcerated populations is relatively non-existent. Current research has identified that incarcerated youth and adolescents engage in future thought, future talk, and even devise future possible selves. This same research has also found that participants engaging in these processes have few strategies, and the strategies that are developed are vague, inappropriate and ineffective but little research has been done to examine strategy development, with emerging or young adults (Abrams & Aguilar, 2005). Specifically, how do incarcerated young adults develop, devise, and determine strategies for meeting, achieving and accessing their goals?

The Problem of Recidivism

Recidivism rates amongst youth and adults in Arizona and nationally are striking. In Arizona, 41,040 youth or 1 out of every 25 youth aged 8-17 were referred to the Arizona Court system in the fiscal year 2011. Reviewing adults incarcerated in Arizona shows a slightly skewed picture due to private prisons and correction corporations that incarcerate and house inmates from other states as well as federal prisoners. However, over 2.3 Million people were incarcerated in the United States in 2010 and the US leads the world for incarceration rates. (Wright, 2010)

Looking to Arizona recidivism rates, a 2005 Arizona Department of Corrections (AZDOC) study reviewing inmates released from 1990 to 1999 found 42.4% of the just over 54,000 adult inmate files reviewed, returned to correctional custody (AZDOC, 2005). According to Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections (ADJC) recidivism
reports, 31.9% of juveniles released in 2011 re-offended within 12 months. A similar report found that 51.3% of those released in the prior 36 months 2007-2009 re-offended. (ADJC, 2011). The reports reported documented that though in 2010 though there was a decrease in recidivism from 2009 to 2010, the 36-month recidivism rates increased.

When comparing Arizona to US Department of Justice national statistics, though elevated, Arizona’s recidivism rates are not atypical for the United States. The US Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, conducted a 15 State study and found that over two-thirds of released prisoners were rearrested within three years of release and over 75% within 5 years (USDOJ-BJS, 2007). Research has also found that programs aimed at reducing recidivism and helping juvenile offenders become useful law-abiding citizens remain ineffective, and the rates of recidivism continue to not only be high but be increasing (Evans, Brown, Killian, 2002). Almost no research regarding the critical role of decision making skills and what role they play in post release success and recidivism rates for incarcerated youth exists (Evans, Brown, & Killian, 2002).

The Measurement of Time

We have the ability to think of time in a myriad of ways. Short term plans of tomorrow, next week, and this afternoon as well as long-term, next year, two years, or 10 years from now. We can even have several plans with different time lines simultaneously. Non-incarcerated adolescents and young adults also experience a variety of age-related milestones in their lives that we link in society to privileges and expectations that incarcerated populations do not experience these include turning 21 and legally consuming alcohol, entering your “30’s” to settle down, have children, or buy a home. Additionally, we experience milestones related to anniversaries with employment,
promotions, that are often related to time that incarcerated populations do not experience or at least define differently. These are common and typical cultural and societal time points that exist in addition to the ones we experience through anniversaries, graduations, holidays, and personal planning (Berk, 2010). Research on how incarcerated individuals measure and consider time is sparse. Void of these natural societal and cultural cues, do incarcerated youth measure time the same? With the absence of milestones does time, simply become the passing days, months, and years of a sentence, and how does this impact future thought? Is it a “count down” until “life” begins, or simply the passing of one more day inside? Does a difference exist between planning and time measurement for time in and out of a correctional setting? Do incarcerated populations instead put planning “on hold” while incarcerated?

**Future Time Perspective**

Future Time Perspective (FTP) has been defined as the present anticipation of future goals (Husman & Lens, 1999). FTP conceptually can be understood to be an individuals’ mental representation of their future. Along this line of thinking, Time is not a shared physical characteristic like dates on a calendar, or set events like birthdays, anniversaries, or holidays, but it is instead a highly individualized perception and understanding of time (Husman & Shell, 2008). Simons et al, 2004, Van Calster et., al 1987) suggested that an individual can typically grasp how their current behavior is directly related to their desired future goal and that the current behavior directly plays a role in the attainment of their future goal. When an individual thinks about, considers their future, or a specific time in the future, that mental engagement has a strong impact.

Not everyone wants to consider their future, or plan for the future, there are those that rather “live in the moment” or “live in the now.” These individuals instead focus on proximal or near future goals and do not concern themselves with the consequences of the future (Husman & Lens 1999, Seginer, 2009). An example of this would be a student studying their physics book to pass the test and earn the credit instead of considering how the content will be relevant to or necessary to their future career. The ability an individual possesses or is willing to look towards their future, and consider the utility or usefulness of their present behavior varies across individuals. An individual can have short term goals sub goals or steps (proximal goals) as well as longer term goals (distal goals) each with different consequences and value (Simons et al., 2004). An individuals’ understanding of this value, the utility or usefulness of a behavior or action to achieve or motivate action towards a desired future goal is in theory known as perceived instrumentality.

**Perceived Instrumentality:** Perceived Instrumentality is the value we place on an action or activity for futures, it influences self-regulation, cognitive engagement, and educational achievement (Brickman et al, 1997; Creten et al., 2001, Husman & Lens, 1999). Perceived Instrumentality also impacts motivation, engagement, and ultimately achievement. A young adult may do well in college to get good grades, but also to prepare themselves to be successful in their desired future career path. The present activities, tasks, or responsibilities an individual has, are components of their future time perspective because they lead to achievement or completion of future goals. These
present tasks or activities possess instrumentality for goal achievement (DeVolder & Lens; 1982; Simmons et al, 2004). How does incarceration impact an individual’s ability to plan for the future or perceived instrumentality of resources that exist inside? Perceived Instrumentality is problematic because an individual who does not develop, or consider future goals, might not value, consider, or plan current actions.

Engagement is tasks to achieve future goals is not only impacted by perceived instrumentality or utility. Individuals engage in tasks to achieve goals or avoid outcomes motivated by interest, personal conviction, age, life experiences, guilt and shame as well (Bilde et al, 2011; Lens & Gailey 1980). Despite the fact that schooling and education in the United States is future-oriented with content, grades and systems building on one another. It also has larger distal goals driven by society and legislation, like No Child Left Behind (NCLB), or now Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). At times children are not even aware of these over-arching policies and legislation, it is not in their minds. However, with incarcerated populations though we may have a societal goal of reducing crime, we have not been successful, nor do we have any real legislation or society driven goals and expectations.

**Time Orientation**

Thinking about the future and specific points in time for our future is a time orientation. The process of thinking about our future and what it will look like is a truly human characteristic and trait. We think about what will happen, what the future will be like, and how it aligns with our personal beliefs, aspirations, hopes, fears, and goals. Future orientation includes several cognitive, affective, and motivational processes. The cognitive include knowledge acquisition, planning, estimation, and judgment; the
motivational include interest, value, instrumentality, and drive, as well as fear, doubt and concern. Our affective processes include our attitudes, emotions, hope, optimism, despair, fear, pessimism, and perceptions, that all work together to influence, guide and impact decision making. Motivation, interest, value, goal attainment, drive, and self-regulation are all impacted and influenced by our beliefs regarding our future (Nurmi, 1991; Nurmi, 2005; Trommsdorff et al., 1982). Through thinking about the future one develops the foundation, courses of action, and trajectories for the future. The prioritization of goals towards one specific future impacts planning, resource management, utility, and self-efficacy (Nurmi, 2005; Nurmi 1993). Little research exists on how adults think about their future, instead the bulk of research lies with youth, adolescents and emerging or young adults.

Adolescents and emerging adults view their futures similarly, clear changes between adolescents’ and emerging adults' future time perspective and time orientation only become evident during middle adulthood 25 to 34 years of age, where an individual’s focus changes. During adolescence and early adulthood periods the focus is personal, family and education, in middle adulthood it changes to self, family and property. Across all three groups the focus of “occupation-related goals” remains relatively consistent. (Nurmi 2005; Nurmi 1992).

For emerging adults, a positive future orientation increases motivation by offering desired and anticipated affective emotions and experiences associated with attainment of goals. The ability to envision the future promotes hope, planning and self-regulation (Adamson et. al., 2007; Oyserman, et al., 2004). The ability to plan, execute that plan, and achieve steps towards that FPS also creates motivation and positive affective
experiences. It reinforces engagement and the commitment of resources to continue to complete other tasks and work towards reaching that future goal.

Future time orientation, perspective and planning requires active thinking and consideration of time, both proximal and distal. It requires an essential linking of short-term and long-term factors, strategies and processes to achieve goals both simple and complex. For emerging adults and adolescents, a lack of future orientation or holding negative beliefs about one’s future and future potential has been related to adjustment problems. The ability to successfully bridge the developmental time and space that exists between adolescence and adulthood may in part rely on one’s ability to integrate past experiences and events and connect them with one’s vision of the future (Adamson, et al., 2007). Time orientation and Future Time Perspective allows for the clear development and definition of possible selves.

Possible Selves

Markus and Nurius first defined the idea of ‘possible selves’ as being representations of the self based on the past and including representations of the self into the future (Markus & Nurius, 1986). They further explained future possible selves as not just any possible selves but specifically of individualized hopes, fears, and fantasies. The definition today still focuses on the idea of Future Possible Selves being our hoped for and hoped to avoid representations of our ‘selves’ at points in our future and are based on experience, perception, and personal/cultural customs and beliefs.

More recently, Possible selves has been defined to refer to an individual’s defined temporal goals for a future or future point in time, their vision of the what is possible in the future (Oyserman & Fryberg, 2006; Oyserman & James, 2008). Research has
effectively demonstrated that adolescents can and do differentiate between positive future possible selves. Specifically answering the questions of: what they expect to become next year, and negative possible selves, what they want to avoid having next year (Oyserman, Terry, & Bybee, 2002; Oyserman, Bybee, & Terry, 2006).

Additional research in the area of future possible selves has further argued that adolescents can achieve their positive possible selves and prevent their identified negative (feared) possible selves through engaging in self-regulation governed by and associated with these possible selves (Oyserman & James, 2008). Possible selves create motivation, regulation and can provide a framework for self-efficacy. All of which allows an individual to set goals, create plans and to attain their idealized possible selves. (Markus & Nurius, 1986; Oyserman, Bybee, Terry and Hart-Johnson, 2003; Oyserman, Bybee, and Terry, 2006; Oyserman & Markus, 1990).

**Negative Trends and Behavior Change**

The work of Abrams and Aguilar 2005, was drawn from the work of Stein and Markus’s (1996) self-concept and behavior change framework research. That framework was applied to a Residential center for incarcerated adolescents who were placed by the courts in treatment in lieu of placement in detention or jail settings. The qualitative study used a “participatory observer” methodology in one residential/therapeutic treatment facility. In their work, the researchers observed group sessions, therapy and conducted narrative interviews with 10 adolescent males aged 15-17. Aguilar and Abrams (2005) further drew upon the 1990 work of Oyserman and Markus as well as the 1996 work of Stein and Markus to define possible selves, and strategies. The researchers set out to
investigate three questions: Do youth offenders identify negative trends while participating in a treatment program? Do offenders develop and internalize hoped for and feared selves through treatment? Does treatment help offenders devise working strategies to move towards hoped for selves and avoid feared selves?

The narratives were chunked and coded, from this Abrams and Aguilar identified trends and reported findings based on the trends. Their findings reported that participants often developed and constructed their hoped and feared possible selves based on views of role models, friends, and family. Additionally, the participants expressed desires to “discard their old selves” that involved criminal and delinquent behaviors (p. 188). Abrams and Aguilar found that when reporting strategies, the participants were varied in their ability to create concrete and attainable strategies. Instead strategies were “mixed, vague, and unrealistic.”. The authors noted that “even the most program conforming participants” were only able to create partially formulated strategies. Furthermore, the participants as a whole were unable to devise realistic or attainable strategies to avoid feared selves (p. 191). Instead of leaving prepared, with a plan, a roadmap, the participants exited the facility “without solid plans or realistic strategies” (p. 190).

Abrams and Aguliar (2005) conclude that the implementation and development of attainable, realistic, and concrete strategies to avoid feared and achieve hoped for selves “seems to be critical to stemming recidivism” (p. 192). This research lays the groundwork for investigating FTP of incarcerated adolescents and young adults. This work focused on observing an existing program to determine effectiveness and did not use measures to assess time, different time horizons, or strategy development. Their research studied 12 youth and reported on 10, from the initial sample, however within 6 months of
the initiation of their research, half of the participants had been released and returned to their homes, leaving the results focused on 5 participants. A study of distal planning and time perspective was not possible given the participant’s brief lengths of stay. Additionally, though the participants were placed due to criminal juvenile offenses, and had been processed through the courts, they were not in a correctional facility, they were in a treatment facility. We know that the overall experience of a treatment facility is vastly different than that of a correctional facility. If we simply consider the over-arching goals of treatment in comparison to punishment.

**Possible Selves as Motivators and Regulating Factors**

Possible selves and future possible selves build from the ideas of self-concept, decision making, and the relation of the future to self-concept. Strong and developed possible selves drive motivation, they can impel action and serve as a self-regulatory agent. (McGuire & Padawe-Singer, 1976; Oyserman, Bybee & Terry, 2006). An individual’s beliefs about their future, or specifically one’s visions of their future possible selves, are essential to post-release success for incarcerated individuals. If an individual cannot see or imagine an alternative way of thinking, they are less likely to successfully change their behavior (Abrams & Aguliar, 2005).

**Possible Selves Questionnaire**

In 2004 Oyserman created the Possible Selves Questionnaire (PSQ) to assess adolescent’s views of their hoped for selves, their feared selves and the strategies they develop in alignment with these ideas (Appendix A). The PSQ has 2 components, the
first prompts “next year I expect to be...” and asks the respondent to provide 4 ideas or goals, determine if they are doing anything now to obtain that goal and define it. The second component prompts the respondent to identify up to four avoided FPS with the prompt of: “next year I want to avoid...” Again the respondent is asked if they are doing anything to avoid these and if so, to identify what those strategies are.

Osyerman (2005), then defined categories in conjunction with these hope for and avoided selves. For positive possible selves, the categories include achievement, interpersonal relations, personality traits, physical/health, material/property, negative. For avoided possible selves, negative is replaced by non-normative/risky behaviors. Utilization of the PSQ has focused on academic possible selves and adolescent populations, not emerging adults or individuals in correctional settings. By defining possible selves and having clear ideas and strategies individuals are able to create plans or “road maps” to attain their possible selves (Oyserman, Bybee, Terry, & Hart-Johnson, 2004). To date the work regarding this measure and possible selves has focused on “academic” possible selves, or those related to education and school (Oyserman, Bybee, Terry & Hart-Johnson, 2004; Oyserman, Bybee & Terry, 2002, 2003, 2006). The PSQ can be used and revised to focus on occupational possible selves as well as code for other areas of focus.

Given time perspective and orientation between emerging adults and adolescence remaining relatively similar; tools designed to assess possible selves, and time orientation for adolescence should remain appropriate for emerging or young adults (Nurmi, 2005). Due to the fact that emerging adults have a future time orientation that includes a focus
related to occupational goals and selves over educational, it is important to utilize and revise the PSQ to allow for such categorization.

**Justification for an Occupational Achievement Measure**

Oyserman’s future possible selves work and tool focused on school aged populations and research samples were typically drawn from educational settings. It was only natural that for these settings and populations that an academic achievement focus emerged. Incarcerated settings are not schools nor are they therapeutic environments like the setting used by Abrams and Aguilar 2005. Correctional facilities are unpleasant, they are punishment, they often have punitive or punishment based philosophies (Benson, 2003)

Cross and Markus (1991) found that individuals “hoped-for” possible selves for emerging or young adults through the late 30’s most often had a focus on occupational and family goals. Emerging adults are preparing to support themselves, their families, possibly children and significant others, the ability to obtain a job is essential. Additionally, fueled by the persistent questions of ‘what are you going to do when you get out?’ that incarcerated populations are routinely presented with, occupation and career choices are often specifically questions by judges, lawyers and parole boards (Cicourel, 1995; Gardner 2010; Wieder, 1974).

In Abrams and Aguilar 2005 work, despite the adolescent ages of the participants and that none had completed high school, earned GEDs or diplomas, 8 of the 10 participants cited a hoped for self that were related to employment. Specifically, an employed future self that allowed for supporting themselves and their family.
Furthermore, less than half identified an educational or an academic achievement related hoped for selves. Given this result a focal shift from an academic achievement possible selves to one that at least includes an occupational possible self seems more appropriate when studying incarcerated young adults.

**Time Horizons Relevance to Incarcerated Young Adults**

A time horizon is a temporal measure of distance related to time or a mental construal of time as discussed by Lockenhoff 2011. An individual’s Time horizon is greatly impacted by the proximal or distal nature of the considered time point. Specifically, shorter intervals of time or more proximal time horizon points allow for, and involve actual perceptions or estimates of time. This is in contrast to longer or more distal time horizon points which often draw on mental representations of time. (Lockenhoff, 2011). The greater the length or distant nature of the distal future, the less likely an individual will represent that future accurately or with detail. Instead the view of that future is representing the perceived view of that future, the ideal, the possible, represented often by a few abstract details (Trope & Liberman 2003). A person’s time horizon or “vision of the future” tends to place a strong emphasis on the immediate future or proximal future, the relative present, and shows a decreasing emphasis or sensitivity to a more distant time horizon (Lockenhoff, 2011). When we consider incarcerated populations, we can see that temporal distance could greatly influence Future Time Perspective and the development of Future Possible Selves. This becomes important and relevant to consider when a shorter, proximal time horizon or sense of time involves an incarcerated future, a time in prison, where a distal time horizon is often of post release or after incarceration (Carstensen 2006; Lockenhoff, 2011). Carstensen (2006) found the
importance of the sense of time, or role of time as a motivator in relation to age, and that specific events like war, illness, geographical relocation also changes motivation and how one considers time in decision making. How does time horizon impact an incarcerated young adults’ Future Possible Selves identification? especially when a considered time horizon involves incarceration or not?

**Time Orientation and Possible Selves of the Incarcerated**

It requires fast decision making and a consideration of the future to be an effective criminal. Criminal behavior requires opportunistic thinking as well as the manipulation of time, situation, and quick decision making skills (Andrews and Bonta 2010; Presson, 1981). An incorrect line of thought follows that often “time” is considered in the same manner for everyone, due to this fact, criminologists link criminal behavior to “present thinking.” Criminals however, are often aware of the future consequences of their actions or the plausible and possible future consequences of their actions (Andrews & Bonta 2010; Horton 1977; Presson 1981). Incarcerated young adults can identify the reasons they are incarcerated, the negative trends and decisions that lead to their current incarceration. They are able to describe a desire to escape from and “discard” their old lives, even identify role models in their lives and community in which they want to follow and emulate. What incarcerated youth and adolescents have not been able to identify are concrete strategies to obtain their hoped-for selves, avoid their ‘feared’ selves (Abrams & Aguilar, 2005). Additionally, research has not been conducted to explore how incarcerated young adults select, define, create, or identity strategies for their possible selves. Research does not exist to determine if incarcerated young adults consider or develop short-term strategies and plans during incarceration that lead to and support post-
release future possible selves or how considering different time points impacts this process.

For incarcerated young adults re-entering the world or thinking about re-entering the world post-incarceration presents a barrage of factors to consider, and contemplate in relation to their possible selves. Many of these individuals re-enter the world in new roles, this role includes the titles of “parent” and “adult” often with the expectation to not only be self-supportive, but possibly support the needs of others (Arnett, 2004). In addition, to concerns about their future, they have to consider the future of their child and what role they will play in that child’s life, how will they provide for that child (Arnett, 2004; Nurse 2002; Sullivan 2004; Inderbitzin, 2009). There are concerns about where to live, whom to live with, and gainful employment for the future. Additionally, there are concerns about re-entering the world, environment or neighborhood that will be filled with the precursors, triggers, setting events and challenges that most likely fueled the initial incarceration (Fitzpatrick, McGuire, Dickson, 2005). These include gangs, avoiding drugs, violence, poverty, as well as concerns and fear over personal safety, or well-being. These are all factors that are often in the minds of emerging adults facing release and entering a post incarceration life (Inderbitzin, 2009; Bortner & Williams, 1997).

Strategies for hoped for selves and avoiding feared selves maybe the most important factor in helping achieve behavior change and better outcomes for incarcerated young adults. However, these individuals struggle, and have little support, training or help to devise realistic and attainable strategies for the future (Abrams & Aguilar, 2005). Despite with the work of Abrams and Aguilar, clear questions remain: Are incarcerated
young adults able to develop effective strategies and possible selves when considering different future time events, or time horizons? How does considering different time horizons influence, effect, or impact strategy engagement and identification?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate how incarcerated young adult males aged 18-22 think about their future selves, define goals and strategies to achieve or avoid those futures. Specifically, do incarcerated youth set proximal and distal hoped for and feared possible selves? Do they develop strategies to achieve/avoid these possible selves, and do their strategies align with the goal? Despite the ever present questioning regarding the future by facility staff, judges, family members and friends that incarcerated young adults experience, do they focus on the reality of incarceration, getting through day to day and then “living” post-release or do they consider strategies for how to achieve their future post release selves or goals? How do their future possible selves change and flux as they approach or consider release? Specifically, this study examined how incarcerated young adults think and plan about future time perspective, their future possible selves, defined strategies, and plans considering the different time horizons of one year from now and post-release. Additionally, this study investigated how incarcerated young adults define and relate strategies to these possible selves. This study sought to discover any relation or correlation between strategy engagement, selection, when considering an incarcerated one-year time horizon or a post release time horizon for incarcerated young adults.

**Research Questions**

The study was designed to examine of three areas; 1) How do incarcerated young adults view and plan for proximal incarcerated compared to their distal post release futures? 2)
How does this measurement of time or different time horizons impact their determination of future possible selves, strategy development/identification, and engagement in working on that strategy? 3) When students engage in future thought, how do they define strategies? Do they define strategies that are proximal (during incarceration) or post incarceration only? Finally, do they define strategies that are aligned to their future possible selves?
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PILOT STUDY

Setting Protocols, Instrument Assessment, Establishing and Testing Codes

A pilot study was conducted to serve several purposes. First to operationalize the study to be appropriate with a secure setting, align with facility protocols regarding access, recruitment, and methodology. Additionally, the pilot was used to refine Oyserman’s instrument, test the use of the Occupational Achievement code, examining the appropriateness of using the established codes within this population as well as refining, creating new codes, and the use of multiple time horizon measurements.

Conducting research in a secure, lock down facility required adaptation of methods, materials and practices to adhere to facility rules, polices, and regulations. The challenges were not limited to how research could be conducted but also how inmates were accessed, recruited, what materials could enter/exit a facility, the protocols for notification of facility staff, movement or access of inmates, and involvement of facility administration. Additionally, questions regarding confidentiality and the use of incentives had to be established.

The Oyserman 2003 measure was adapted and adjusted to ask participants to think about 2 different time horizons, one-year from now (while incarcerated) and then again post-release. Coder training was developed and conducted to assure continuity and validity of scoring throughout the pilot and full study. A member checks process was also conducted to verify coded responses. Additionally, coder training was used to establish Inter-rater reliability protocol and processes to further assure valid coding and analysis.
Participants

The revised Osyerman tool was piloted with a convenience sample of 10 incarcerated young adults in a local correctional facility. All participants 18-22-year-old males, who identified English as their first language.

Procedure

Participants were recruited directly by the researcher and through facility staff recommendations. Interviews were conducted individually and the participants were provided with a copy of the instrument and a facility approved writing instrument to fill out the instrument.

After receiving an explanation of the study both in writing and verbally, the participants were also provided a written and verbal explanation a study consent form. The participants were provided the questionnaires in two phases, each “phase” represented a different time horizon point (1 year, post release). As a distraction activity was provided between each phase which consisted of a set of jumbled words; chair, blanket, apple, water, and socks (see appendix D). Participants were given a maximum of 7 minutes to complete the jumble or were encouraged to stop if they became frustrated. The researcher also completed the demographic questionnaire data (see appendix C) verbally with the participants between the questionnaires. At the conclusion of the questionnaires, participants were asked for feedback on the process, instructions and ability to think differently for each time point. Participants were encouraged to provide feedback on how to adjust the process and materials to improve understanding and ease of use.
Measures

The revised FPS questionnaire originally designed by Oyserman, adjusted and expanded to question 1 year, and post release. (see appendix B)

Possible Selves Questionnaire

The Possible Selves Questionnaire (Oyserman 2004) focusing on academic possible selves within the next year (see appendix A), was adapted for this study. Two variations of the measure were developed to prompt participants to consider the questions within “1 year from now,” and “post-release” (see Appendix B). Participants were asked to think about what they expect to be at a specific point in the future (1 year, post release) and asked to define four desired future selves and four future selves they hope to avoid for each time point. For each defined possible self, desired or avoided, participants would then answer if they are doing anything now to obtain/avoid that self and if so define their strategy for that Future Possible Self.

Oyserman defined six category labels to assess the original PSQ for positive and possible selves. The desired categories were defined as:

1. **Achievement**- relates to school and school interactions with teachers, achievement-related activities
2. **Interpersonal Relationships**- involves family, friends, relationships, and social interactions except with teachers
3. **Personality Traits**- relates to personality characteristics, self-descriptions of traits
4. **Physical/Health-Related**- relates to physical health, weight, height
5. **Material/Lifestyles**- relates to material possessions and living situation, including moving
6. **Negative**- includes all negatively worded responses

Oyserman also defined six category labels to assess the original PSQ for negative possible selves. The avoided categories were defined as:
1. **Achievement**- relates to school and school interactions with teachers, achievement-related activities
2. **Interpersonal Relationships**- involves family, friends, relationships, and social interactions except with teachers
3. **Personality Traits**- relates to personality characteristics, self-descriptions of traits
4. **Physical/Health-Related**- relates to physical health, weight, height
5. **Material/Lifestyles**- relates to material possessions and living situation, including moving
6. **Non-normative /Risky Behaviors**- includes negative and illegal behaviors such as smoking, drinking, involved in fights, gangs, etc.

For the purposes of this research, category labels 2-6 for each group were planned to remain un-changed. Category 1 or achievement for each group was adapted to better fit the population studied and to explore occupational possible selves. Occupational Achievement was developed in additional to Academic Achievement with Occupational Achievement relating to having, seeking, interviewing, or applying for employment. Oyserman has historically focused on adolescents where academic possible selves are still appropriate and desired, incarcerated young adults aged 18-22 may have completed their diplomas, or GEDs and being more focused on employment. Additionally, given their age participants who did not finish school may have been employed prior to incarceration or are focused on occupational outcomes over academic ones.

Responses on the measures were double hand coded into the set categories above by trained coders. The two coders used to assist in pilot were also maintained through the dissertation study, one was political science undergraduate student and the other was a student pursuing their Juris Doctorate. Both coders were trained in coding. The use of two blind coders for every subject allowed for greater reliability and validity to coding. This sampling was verified for Inter-rater reliability; IRR measure target was 90% or
greater. These first 10 participants were also re-interviewed to verify and explore coding accuracy.

Definitions

For coding of responses a set of operational definitions for what constituted a goal, strategy and an aligned strategy were established. A “goal” was defined broadly to be a situation, circumstance, place, item or action to be possessed, in place, or avoided at a time point. Examples included “having my college degree,” “not being addicted to pain killers,” “living in my own place” or “being a good parent.” A participant that was able to describe a clear, discernable vision or idea was often able to have that coded as a goal. A possible self (hoped for or feared) goal had to have specificity to be coded and set as a goal. For example, “I want to be better” has no clear specificity, as “be better” could be related to parenting, health, criminal behavior, academics, or a myriad of other things. If no further detail was provided, this would not be coded as a goal or possible self, because it was too vague and lacked specificity allowing the assignment of a code. All goals were coded using the working codes established through the pilot study.

A strategy was simply defined as an action, for strategy identification there was no requirement for alignment or even relatedness to the goal. A goal was coded as “having a strategy” if the participant defined an “action” or set of actions. Key words or verbs were often the defining characteristic of a strategy, examples included “finishing, applying, buying, saving, trying, asking, avoiding, or working.” All strategies were coded using the same working codes established through the pilot study that were also used to code the goals.
In strategy alignment the focus became relatedness between the goal and strategy. Though the goals were coded it was not required that both a goal and strategy have the same code like “academic achievement” though it was common place. For strategy alignment to exist both blind coders, or in a case of disagreement 2/3 of the coders had to agree on a goal/strategy set being aligned or not. Examples of alignment were: goal: “I want to have my own place” (a material/lifestyle goal) and the strategy: “I will get a good paying job” (an occupation achievement strategy). Though these were not “coded” the same there is clear alignment and a logical trajectory of thought, in this instance the pair was coded as aligned. Another example was “I want to work in my family business” (an occupational goal) and the strategy was described as “I need to fix the relationship with my father so he will trust me.” Again a clear logical line of thought and trajectory can be seen, so this pair would be coded as aligned.

A non-aligned goal/strategy pairing would occur when a strategy was defined but 2/3 coders could not see a clear linkage or line of thought on relatedness. An example would be goal: “I want to not get more charges” (a material life/style code) and the strategy was defined as “I will take the GED test” (an academic achievement goal. In this instance there is no clear linkage or understanding that can be gleaned on how taking the GED test could avoid additional criminal charges, so this pairing would be determined to be “not aligned.”

Analysis and results

Working with the facility administrators it was concluded that neither audio recording interviews nor incentives would be permissible though originally considered. The facility administrators were reluctant to allow electronics into secure areas of the facility and
reported that the possibility of an incentive could lead to manipulation, bullying, and abuse between inmates. For these reasons audio recording and participant incentives were not used for any aspect of the pilot or full study. It was also established that notification to the inmates had to be clear that participation, withdrawal, or refusal would have no bearing on their status as an inmate, any pending charges, plea agreements, judgements, or privileges/standings within the facility. Additionally, it was required that participants further be notified that any statements of threat, threatening nature, implied or direct that were identified during the course of participation in the study would be reported to facility administration and investigated in alignment with facility protocols.

It was originally projected to have participants answer the questions in writing, however it became clear that to writing skills, penmanship, and time constraints having participants share their answers verbally to be recorded by the researcher was necessary. Additionally, 4/10 pilot participants provided feedback related to the writing being difficult, too much to do, or having other challenges with spelling, sentence formation. The first 10 interviews averaged 46 minutes each in duration, with a total time of approximately 57 minutes each on average for the entire process accounting for escorting them to/from the researcher.

Coding was completed by the researcher and a third year undergrad based on Oyserman’s work, the additional occupational achievement code, as well as identifying items that did not fit these codes. Each coder rated the responses independently and discussion was conducted for items where disagreement was found as well as those items that did not seem to fit any codes for goal or strategy. Through this process the occupational code was verified, additionally Oyserman’s Interpersonal Relationship code
was broken down into two different codes. Specifically, Interpersonal Relationships remained in name, but focused on family, parents, children, spouse, partner, fiancé, talking with family, connecting/re-connecting with family. The new code created was Spiritual/Social, this focused outside of direct family but still represented interpersonal relationships, this code related to church, religion, as well as making, having, or finding friends.

It was hypothesized that the factors Oyserman defined as risky behaviors maybe typical and unavoidable within a secure setting, these included gangs, violence and drug use/exposure. This proved evident and required that the Oyserman’s codes for delinquent/non-normative had to be expanded and adjusted given the age and circumstances of an incarcerated population. The Delinquent/non-normative code was further expanded to include “risk to safety” which related to getting more charges, a change in level of incarceration (minimum to medium, or placement in an administrative segregation unit), a longer sentence, associating with gangs. Finally, The Health code was expanded to include feeling safe, not being injured, complying with medical directions, stopping drinking, no using drugs, stop smoking, as well as avoiding assault, attack, or rape (See Appendix E).

Inter-rater reliability between the two coders for the first 10 participants was 91% initially and increased to 94% following reassessment of the non-coded items after discussion and development of the additional and expanded codes. Member checks were conducted for all 10 participants in the pilot to verify coding methods. Participants were provided an explanation of all codes, the participants original responses were reviewed as well as the coder identified code. Non-normative/delinquent/risk to safety required more
explanation for the participants to understand meaning. Participants were asked on a 1-10 Likert scale to rate their agreement with the accuracy of the codes assigned. Member checks showed an average score of 9.4/10 for all participants with no item/coding score below an 8/10. Coding instructions were developed and conducted based on these results, and used throughout the duration of the study.

From the pilot study an additional requirement on the participants was added; a participant’s expected release had to be greater than 1 year from the time of interview. This was added to assure that the post-release time horizon occurred after the one-year time horizon as well as assuring that the two time events were not too similar or possibly equal. Additionally, during the interviews the question was presented how much longer is your expected sentence from today, this revision was necessary to further assure that the post-release time horizon ratings represented an event after year one, as well as to assure that the events were not closely related (if expected sentence remaining was 1 year).
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DISSERTATION STUDY METHOD

Participants

Participation in the study consisted of 126 incarcerated young adult males, aged 18 to 22 years old, who were at the time of the study residing in a correctional facility in either Maricopa or Pima Counties. The data from the 10 participants who were used in the pilot study was pulled into the overall data and participant pool as well. The total participant population consisted of 37.5% Hispanic, 23.4% Caucasian, 23.4% African American, and 14.1% identifying as “other” or “Mixed-race.” The average age of the participant was 19.5 years old. The demographic questionnaire provided the following details on the participants:

- 91.2% reporting having attended some High School, 4.0% had not attended any HS, and 4.8% had graduated HS
- 98.4% of the population was unemployed currently (while incarcerated)
- 84.1% had a juvenile history and 9.4% had a prior adult history of detention/incarceration
- 47.6% of the population identified as being supported at some time in school by Special Education
- 10.3% of the population was currently in school (HS or GED)
- 25.4% identified being in a program, specifically 18.3% going to church, and 7.1% Alcohol or drug support
- 40.5% reported having children
• The average amount of time served was 8.5 months, 45.3% having served 6 months or less, 33.9% having served 7-12 months, and 20.8% having served 12 months+

• 35.7% were expecting to serve less than 3 years, 26.2% were expecting to serve 4 to 6 years, and 38.1% were expecting to serve 7 years or greater.

Participants were included or excluded on the factors of age, primary or first language of English, and the balance of their expected sentence exceeding one year. Only participants whom reported their age to be 18-22 and that their primary language to be English, who had a balance of expected sentence greater than one year were included, all others were excluded. The goal was to be able to interview and recruit a significant sample of female incarcerated young adults but this proved to be unattainable during the study. The reduced number of females incarcerated overall as well as the age and language restriction made access to a significant female population impossible. The decision was made at participant 78 to focus on males only, at that point only 4 females had been successfully interviewed. Participants were recruited through postings, staff recommendations, and direct researcher contact.

Procedure

The procedures and protocols established in the pilot study were continued for the remaining 116 participants. The two developed time horizon Future Time Perspective questionnaires were provided to the participants in two phases, focusing time perspective for two different time horizons, one-year from now and post-release. Questionnaires were
completed via direct interview with participants verbally answering the questions and the researcher recording their responses. Participant responses were read back to them to assure there were correctly recorded. Participants were repeatedly assured that participation in the study was totally and completely voluntary. Furthermore, it was clearly conveyed that participation, non-participation or withdrawal had no impact whatsoever on current judicial status, any legal proceedings, findings, or judgments and that all answers, information and responses were coded to a unique participant number for the study. It was clearly communicated however that any stated or implied threats, statements or plans of a threatening nature, would be reported to facility administration per facility protocols.

Participants were interviewed directly in a one on one setting. The location of the interview included un-used offices, empty community spaces, and program classrooms. The interviews averaged 34 minutes in length for all participants with a range of 25 to 47 minutes. Participants were interviewed following full explanations of the study and obtaining consent. The participants first answered basic demographics assuring they met the requirements of the population to be studied, then the one-year time horizon questionnaire was administered. Once completed the distraction activity was used as well as collection of the remainder of the demographic information prior to completed the post release questionnaire. All items were administered verbally with the researcher writing down participant responses.

‘The demographic questionnaire and the distraction activity were used between the two different time horizon points. This was done to reduce the impact of carry over and latency effect.
Coding and Member Checks

Using the protocols established in the pilot study coders were trained and participant interviews were conducted in blocks of 20-25 individuals. Coders consisted of 1 undergraduate student, 1 law student, and the researcher. Each questionnaire was blind coded by two individuals, and then compared and discussed for any variances in coding. If agreement could not be made between the first two code reviewers, the third coder would review and code the participant responses as well. All three of the coder’s ratings would be reviewed and a majority vote 2/3 would determine coding if any item with disagreement could be clearly coded. During the entire coding process for both the pilot and full study, there was no instance of disagreement that could not be corrected for using this 2/3 majority code approach.

A second member check was conducted for calibration and verification. This was done for participants 47-50 of the full study which represented the relative middle of the entire study population. These four participant responses were selected because they represented two individuals from each facility, two different incarceration levels (minimum and medium) at each facility site as well as a wide range of time served (2 to 34 months) and wide range of expected sentences (3 to 10 years). The approach used for this member check and calibration process was the same as the one used during the pilot study. The process consisted of a direct discussion with the participant to review their responses, codes and assess the accuracy of the assigned codes through a 1-10 scale Likert rating. This member check demonstrated an average score of 9.6 out of 10, and similar to the pilot study the lowest rating for any single item was an 8/10.
**Measures**

*Possible Selves Questionnaire*

The questionnaire developed and tested in the pilot study was used. It asks subjects to consider two-time horizon points, one-year and post release (Appendix B). Participants were asked to define four hoped for and four feared future possible selves when considering each time horizon, one-year and post release. They were also asked to identify if they were doing anything currently to achieve/avoid this future possible self, and define or explain them if they were working on them. Between the two questionnaires additional demographic data was collected along with participants being asked to complete a word jumble distraction activity (Appendix C and D).

**Demographic Questionnaire**

Participants were asked a series of demographic and background questions to allow for future analysis (Appendix C). Questioned were asked verbally and participant responses were recorded, questions asked included level of education, specifically last grade level completed, are they currently in school or an educational program? Their current ethnicity, age, expected release in years? How long have they been incarcerated? do they have children?

**Distraction Activity**

A distraction activity was used between the two different time horizon possible selves questionnaires. The activity was 5 jumbled words and participants were asked to un-scramble the words and given up to 7 minutes to complete the task. The jumbled words were chair, blanket, apple, water, and socks. (See Appendix D). These words were selected because they had no relation to time like months, days of the week, holidays, or
possible selves goals like school, home, car, career, degree etc. The words selected for the jumble were picked to allow for a break and reduce a latency effect between the two measures while also preventing the addition of a confounding variable or factor that could influence the post release time horizon questionnaire.

**Timing and Presentation**

A set procedure was used for all administration of instruments. It consisted of obtaining informed consent and a brief explanation following by verification of age and expected sentence. The one year time horizon possible selves questionnaire was administered following these steps via direct interview with the research recording field notes. The first questionnaire averaged 12 minutes to complete with a range of 8-19 minutes for completion. This was followed by completing the demographic questionnaire and then administration of the distraction activity.

For the distraction activity participants were asked to work on it for a few minutes so that the researcher could finish taking notes before moving on. The participants were provided with a copy of the activity (Appendix D), and a golf pencil (short with no eraser per policy regulations). Participants were allowed 5-7 minutes to complete the distraction activity, however if they became visibility frustrated, the distraction task was stopped and the participant was told they could turn the paper over and draw for a minute if they preferred.

Following this 5-7 minute distraction task and the collection of the demographic data which in total averaged 10 minutes the post release time horizon possible selves questionnaire was administered in similar fashion to the one-year with direct interview
and collection of field notes. This final step averaged 10 minutes with a range of 8-17 minutes. In total the interviews averaged 32 minutes with a range of 26 to 48 minutes.

**Data verification**

The value of the corrections officers to help recruit, identify and verify participant’s information was a vital component to increasing the reliability and validity of the data. Corrections officers were able to validate and verify a participant’s age to assure they were not over the age of 22, the length of time served, the level of security, but also provided clarify when a participant listed a range for their expected sentence.
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DISSECTATION STUDY RESULTS

Time Horizons and Goal Setting

Descriptive statistics were gathered to assess whether the data met the assumptions required for the intended data analysis (see Table 1). These results show that the means of participant identified feared and desired Future Possible Selves considering one year and post release time horizons.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Desired FPS</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-5.42</td>
<td>27.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Feared FPS</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-4.77</td>
<td>21.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Release Desired FPS</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Release Feared FPS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Composite FPS</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-4.72</td>
<td>24.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Release Composite FPS</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=126

ANOVA

A series of within subjects’ ANOVA were conducted to explore if defining goals for hoped and feared possible selves was impacted by time horizon, or specifically when subjects considered 1 year from now or post release from their current incarcerated setting. A one-way within subjects’ ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of different time horizons (1 year from now and post release) on the total number of identified Future Possible Selves (hoped for + feared). There was a significant effect of
time horizon, Wilks’ Lambda = 0.92, F (1,125) = 10.57, p = .001. Two paired samples t-tests were used to make post hoc comparisons between the hoped for and feared FPS conditions. A first paired samples t-test indicated that there was a significant difference in the defining hoped for FPS goals for 1 year (M=3.97, SD=0.18) and post release (M=3.64, SD=0.56) conditions; t(125)=6.31, p < .001. A second paired samples t-test indicated that there was a significant difference in the defining feared FPS goals for 1 year (M=3.96, SD=0.95) and post release (M=2.88, SD=0.86) conditions; t(125)=13.74, p < .001. These results suggest that differences in time horizon really do have an effect on defining FPS goals for type as well as a combined score. Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity assumptions were violated due to degrees of freedom, and therefore, a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used. There was a significant effect of the time horizon on setting FPS goals, F(1,125)=10.57, p=.001. These results further suggest that the time horizon really does have an effect on defining FPS goals.

**ANCOVA**

Two repeated measures ANCOVA tests were conducted to determine a statistically significant difference between the time horizons of year one and post release on FPS goals identification controlling for expected years to be served. One as time to be served as a continuous variable with a range of 1 year to 25 years, and a second as time expected split into 3 groups, 1-3 years, 4-6 years or 7+ years. The first ANCOVA with time as continuous variable did not produce a statistically significant result p=.64, however time expected when grouped produced a significant result F(1,124)=7.42, p=.007. Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity assumptions were violated and therefore, a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used. There was a significant effect of the time
horizon on setting FPS goals, F(1,124)=7.42, p=.007. These results suggest that expected sentence and time horizon events, have a significant effect on goal setting for incarcerated young adults.

An additional ANCOVA was run controlling for months served with participants being broken into groups as follows, 0-6 months served, 7-12 months served, 12+ months served F(1,124)=8.76, p=.02. Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity assumptions were violated and therefore, a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used. There was a significant effect of the time horizon on setting FPS goals, F(1,124)=8.76, p=.02. These results suggest that time served and time horizon events, have a significant effect on goal setting for incarcerated young adults.

**Strategy Development**

**Descriptive Statistics**

Strategy development for FPS goals when considering a time horizon was explored to see if Incarcerated Young Adults identify a similar number of strategies for their future possible selves between the proximal and distal time horizons. Descriptive statistics were gathered to assess whether the data met the assumptions required for the intended data analysis (see Table 3). These results show that the means of participant identified strategies for desired and feared FPS goals at both time horizon points.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Desired Goals</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Feared Goals</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Release Desired</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Release Feared</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Composite goals</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Release Composite</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals w/strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=126

ANOVA

A series of within subjects’ ANOVA were conducted to determine if Incarcerated Young Adults develop a similar number of strategies for the distal time horizon in comparison to a proximal one. A one-way within subjects’ ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of time horizon (1 year from now and post release) on the total number of identified strategies for FPS goals. There was a significant effect of the two different time horizons, Wilks’ Lambda = 0.13, F (1,125) = 845.82, p < .001. Two paired samples t-tests were used to make post hoc comparisons between hoped for and fear FPS conditions across the time horizon events. A first paired samples t-test indicated that there was a significant difference in the goals with defined strategies considering hoped for FPS goals for 1 year (M=3.05, SD=0.96) and post release (M=0.64, SD=0.85) conditions; t(125)=19.83, p < .001.

A second paired samples t-test indicated that there was a significant difference in the goals with defined strategies considering feared FPS outcomes for 1 year (M=3.14,
SD=0.94) and post release (M=0.36, SD=0.59) conditions; \( t(125)=27.41, p < .001 \). These results suggest that the different time horizons do have an effect on the number of defined strategies for FPS goals. Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity assumptions were violated due to degrees of freedom, and therefore, a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used. There was a significant effect of the time horizon on setting FPS goals, \( F(1,125)=845.82, p<.001 \).

**ANCOVA**

Two repeated measures ANCOVA were conducted to determine a statistically significant difference between the time horizons of year one and post release on developing strategies for FPS goals setting controlling for expected years to be served. One as time to be served as a continuous variable with a range of 1 year to 25 years, and a second as time expected split into 3 groups, 1-3 years, 4-6 years or 7+ years. The first ANCOVA with time as continuous variable did not produce a statistically significant result \( p=.81 \), however time expected grouped produced a significant result \( F(1,123)=63.91, p<.001 \). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity assumptions were violated and therefore, a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used. There was a significant effect of the time horizon on strategy identification for FPS goals, \( F(1,123)=63.91, p<.001 \). These results suggest that expected sentence and time horizon events, have a significant effect on strategy identification as it relates to future possible selves for incarcerated young adults.

An additional ANCOVA was run controlling for months served with participants being broken into groups as follows, 0-6 months served, 7-12 months served, 12+ months served \( F(1,124)=5.08, p=.03 \). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity assumptions were violated and therefore, a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used. There was a significant effect
of the time horizon on identifying strategies for FPS goals, F(1,124)=5.08, p=.03. These results additionally suggest that time served and time horizon events, have a significant effect on future possible selves strategy identification for incarcerated young adults.

**Strategy Alignment**

A final question was related to alignment of an identified strategy to the associated future possible self or FPS goal. Specifically, the hypothesis that incarcerated young adults create more aligned strategies for goals with a proximal time horizon of 1 year from now, than they do a distal time horizon of post release for hoped for and feared possible selves.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Strategy Alignment for FPS goals when considering a time horizon was explored to see if Incarcerated Young Adults develop a greater number of aligned strategies for proximal than distal goals. Descriptive statistics were gathered to assess whether the data met the assumptions required for the intended data analysis (see Table 4). These results show that the means of participant identified strategy alignment for desired and feared FPS goals at both time horizon points. All the proper assumptions for analysis were met.
Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics Strategy Alignment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Desired Strategy Alignment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Feared Strategy Alignment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Release Desired Strategy Alignment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Release Feared Strategy Alignment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Composite Strategy Alignment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Release Composite Strategy Alignment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N=126*

**ANOVA**

A series of within subjects’ ANOVA were conducted to determine if Incarcerated Young Adults create more aligned strategies for FPS goals at proximal the 1-year time horizon than they do a proximal time horizon of post release. A one-way within subjects’ ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of time horizon (1 year from now and post release) on the total number of aligned strategies for FPS goals. There was a significant effect of the two different time horizons, Wilks’ Lambda = 0.21, F (1,125) = 472.43, p < .001.

Two paired samples t-tests were used to make post hoc comparisons of alignment between hoped for and fear FPS conditions across the time horizon events. A first paired samples t-test indicated that there was a significant difference in the strategy alignment considering hoped for FPS goals for 1 year (M=2.37, SD=1.04) and post release (M=0.40, SD=0.63) conditions; t(125)=16.87, p < .001. A second paired samples t-test indicated that there was a significant difference in the alignment with defined strategies considering
feared FPS outcomes for 1 year (\(M=2.40, \text{SD}=1.17\)) and post release (\(M=0.23, \text{SD}=0.48\)) conditions; \(t(125)=18.29, p < .001\). These results suggest that elapsed time really does have an effect on defining FPS goals. Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity assumptions were violated due to degrees of freedom, and therefore, a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used. There was a significant effect of the time horizon on setting FPS goals, \(F(1,125)=472.43, p<.001\).

**ANCOVA**

Two repeated measures ANCOVA were conducted to determine a statistically significant difference between the time horizons of year one and post release on strategy alignment for FPS goals setting controlling for expected years to be served. One ANCOVA was time to be served as a continuous variable with a range of 1 year to 25 years, and a second as time expected split into 3 groups, 1-3 years, 4-6 years or 7+ years. The first ANCOVA with time as continuous variable did not produce a statistically significant result \(p=.24\), however time expected grouped produced a significant result \(F(1,123)=76.99, p<.001\). Mauchly’s Test of Sphericity assumptions were violated and therefore, a Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used. There was a significant effect of the time horizon on strategy alignment for FPS goals, \(F(1,123)=76.99, p<.001\). These results suggest that expected sentence and time horizon events, have a significant effect on strategy alignment for incarcerated young adults.

An additional ANCOVA was run controlling for months served with participants being broken into groups as follows, 0-6 months served, 7-12 months served, 12+ months however no statistically significant result was found \(p=0.26\). This result shows that though time served is a statistically significant covariate for both future possible selves
identification, and strategy identification, it is not statistically significant for the alignment of the strategy.
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between proximal and distal time horizons on Future Possible Selves goal development, strategy identification for future possible selves, and strategy alignment to defined positive or feared FPS for incarcerated young adults. The study shows that, incarcerated young adults do think about strategies and goals differently between a proximal incarcerated time horizon and a distal post release time horizon.

The study demonstrated that the participants expected sentence was a significantly associated covariate to the number of Future Possible Selves’ defined, number of strategies defined to achieve those FPS goals, and number of aligned strategies to FPS goals across time horizons of 1 year and post release. This relationship indicates that a longer expected sentences produced fewer identified goals, fewer identified goal strategies, and fewer aligned strategies to the goals than a shorter sentence for incarcerated young adults.

Additionally, time served was found to be a statistically significant covariate for both goal identification and strategy identification but not strategy alignment. This relationship demonstrates that time served impacts how incarcerated young adults set future goals, develop and align strategies to achieve or avoid those future possible selves.

As Hypothesized the study showed that participants did not define as many strategies for goals at the post release time horizon or aligned strategies as compared to the 1-year time horizon, interestingly though this difference existed despite participants identifying a similar number of goals at each time horizon. For the 1-year time horizon
incarcerated young adults identified a similar number of goals for hoped for selves $M=3.97$ and feared selves $M=3.96$, at the post release time horizon fewer feared possible selves $M=2.64$ were identified compared to hope for future selves $M=3.64$, however for the one-year time horizon strategy development was significantly higher than post release, $M=6.13$ and $M=.36$ respectively. It seems that as inmates get further into their sentence or similarly further removed from their experience with life “on the outside” they are less able to think about a life outside of prison to define Future Possible Selves, strategies to achieve or avoid those Future Possible Selves.

It was also hypothesized that Incarcerated Young Adults do not identify or work on strategies in the present to attain post release Future Possible Selves, through comparing means, it is seen comparing goal identification 1 year from now to post release goal identification was different by a factor of 5 goals with the 1-year Mean being 6.01 goals and the post release Mean being 1.01. Additionally, composite totals of feared and hoped for identified strategies that were aligned to FPS goals was significantly lower between post release and 1-year time horizons with mean scores being $M=0.58$ and $M=4.77$ aligned strategies.

**Implications of the Study**

The present findings have several implications within the area of programming for incarcerated young adults post release outcomes which can be extrapolated to recidivism rates. These results suggest that incarcerated young adults do not plan for their post release futures effectively. This trend exists even when incarcerated young adults identify post release goals, they do not or cannot identify strategies that they can work on while “inside” to achieve them.
This study suggests that parole boards and probation offices, officers and units should engage inmates in planning for a post-release life throughout their sentence at a level deeper than simple questioning. We need to engage inmates in concrete discussions where goals are set and plans can be created that will allow for a more effective and successful post release outcome. Inmates also need to be made aware of and reminded of the different programs and services available in many facilities including GED classes, parenting classes, drug/alcohol support, and counseling.

Current statistics show that within 36 months 67.8% of released inmates are re-arrested and that jumps to 77% with 60 months of release (USIJ, 2015). If inmates cannot or do not plan effectively for their futures, create plans, and aligned strategies for both desired and feared future possible selves, they are re-entering society with no direction. Recidivism rates, this study and similar findings would suggest that supporting inmates throughout their sentence to plan for their return to society could change the revolving door of incarceration we currently see in the United States.

Oyserman (2002) developed and implemented a 9-week intervention program to change the possible selves identified by adolescents in an academic setting. The study demonstrated that in comparison to the control group, study participants who received the intervention were significantly different as measured on a series of academic performance variables at the end of the study. This response to intervention did not require a change to social groups or environment/setting. Though the focus on academics is not the focus with incarcerated young adults, developing an intervention based on Oyserman’s (2002) work that can be implemented in an incarcerated setting, where social group and environment cannot be changed that could positively impact future possible
selves identification as it relates to occupational achievement, inter-personal relationships, or avoiding risks to safety, could have a significant effect on both post release success, and reducing recidivism.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

The sample for the current study consisted of only male incarcerated young adults, female participants were recruited however access to them was limited as most systems house male and female inmates in separate facilities. This prevents the findings from being applicable to females as they were not represented in the study and could have had significantly different responses or scores. The current sample consisted of 126 males all in Arizona, this state specific distribution may make it difficult to generalize the current findings to older male inmates, as well as inmates in other States which may have different availability of programs, sentencing guidelines, and services behind the wall. Additionally, both facilities were “traditional” incarceration settings where limited opportunities exist for school, employment or job skills while “inside” for many inmates.

The sample was monitored to assure that no participants were expected to serve less than 1 year, this was done to verify that the post release measure was a time horizon beyond the 1-year measure. Future studies should examine the effect of different time horizons on planning, specifically a shorter proximal time point, as well as possibly a medial time point in addition to the post release measure. It would also be interesting to study inmates as they approach release to explore if pending release increasing planning, strategy development and alignment.

Due to the nature of the facilities accessed during this study and the sample, none of the participants were employed while incarcerated. Future research should include
facilities that use different approaches to incarceration, employment, or that incorporate rehabilitative and community based forms of systems. It is possible that having a job impacts the consideration of occupational goals, similarly future research could explore any relationship between academic goals or strategies for participants in school or learning programs.

Also, all of the participants were between the ages of 18 and 22, this could have implications on the ability generalize findings to older inmates as well as inmates. The participants were predominantly from minimum and medium levels of security and over 65% were expected to 7 years or less, and the findings may not be representative of inmates facing longer sentences as well as those housed in maximum security or administrative segregation units.

The participants in the present study were interviewed directly and even though a distractor activity was used between the two interviews, it is possible that the discussion and thinking about the first questionnaire, impacted the results of the second questionnaire.

As stated earlier, a significant relationship for defining goals, identifying strategies, and defining aligned strategies for goals was found as well as a significant effect of time served and expected sentence as covariates, however both covariates due to sample size were grouped by a range of time for each respective covariate. Future studies aimed at examining these factors as covariates or the direction of their effect should use larger samples to assure a more diverse distribution and a stronger level of power.

This study focused on defining goals, strategies and alignment, and though all results were coded to establish alignment, the types of goals and strategies defined at
each time horizon, as well as simply analyzing those defined by the population overall was not examined, this should be studied. Future studies of a similar nature should also examine the types of goals and strategies identified and defined by the participants. What types of goals are incarcerated young adults defining, or neglecting to consider? This will enable justice system, counselors and recidivism researchers, parole and probation boards to better prepare and coach inmates on the areas they struggle to think about for their futures as well as identify trends in what inmates are considering regarding their future selves at different time horizons.

This study expanded the work of Oyserman (2004) and divided the achievement code into academic achievement and occupational achievement based on the responses and reliability checks with participants. Also Oyserman (2004)’s Interpersonal Relationship code was further divided to create spiritual/social, this additional code was used to capture goals and strategies related to religion, faith, and the church as well as non-family social relationships, the Interpersonal Relationship label was focused on family relations (spouse, parents, children). Further research should be conducted to apply these codes to populations that are not incarcerated as well as older participants.

Conclusion

The present study provides researchers with an examination of future time perspective and future possible selves of incarcerated young adults, in relation to goal setting, strategy development and alignment, which had not previously been studied. Time served and expected sentences were determined to be significantly associated with the identification of goals, strategies, and development of aligned strategies. The impact of time or different time horizons of during and post incarceration were significant as
well. The study expanded on the previous research in the field and was able to refine goal and strategy codes to allow for more specificity.

Future studies can continue the investigation into incarcerated young adults goal and strategy development at varying time horizons, as well as analyzing the codes and types of goals identified. The statistics regarding recidivism and post-incarceration success are abysmal, further study and research has the potential to stem the tide and change the course of post release planning, and justice programming.
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Possible Selves Questionnaire

Who will you be next year? Each of us has some image or picture of what we will be like and what we want to avoid being like in the future. Think about next year -- imagine what you’ll be like, and what you’ll be doing next year.

- In the lines below, write what you expect you will be like and what you expect to be doing next year.
- In the space next to each expected goal, mark NO (X) if you are not currently working on that goal or doing something about that expectation and mark YES (X) if you are currently doing something to get to that expectation or goal.
- For each expected goal that you marked YES, use the space to the right to write what you are doing this year to attain that goal. Use the first space for the first expected goal, the second space for the second expected goal and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next year, I expect to be</th>
<th>Am I am doing something to be that way</th>
<th>If yes, What I am doing now to be that way next year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to expectations and expected goals, we all have images or pictures of what we don’t want to be like; what we don’t want to do or want to avoid being. First, think a minute about ways you would not like to be next year -- things you are concerned about or want to avoid being like.

- Write those concerns or selves to-be-avoided in the lines below.
- In the space next to each concern or to-be-avoidsel self, mark NO (X) if you are not currently working on avoiding that concern or to-be-avoided self and mark YES (X) if you are currently doing something so this will not happen next year.
- For each concern or to-be-avoided self that you marked YES, use the space at the end of each line to write what you are doing this year to reduce the chances that this will describe you next year. Use the first space for the first concern, the second space for the second concern and so on.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next year, I want to avoid</th>
<th>Am I doing something to avoid this</th>
<th>If yes, What I am doing now to avoid being that way next year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P5) _________________</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>(s5) _________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P6) _________________</td>
<td></td>
<td>(s6) _________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P7) _________________</td>
<td></td>
<td>(s7) _________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P8) _________________</td>
<td></td>
<td>(s8) _________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

POSSIBLE SELVES QUESTIONNAIRES
Study ID#

Possible Selves Questionnaire One Year

Who will you be next year? Each of us has some image or picture of what we will be like and what we want to avoid being like in the future. Think about next year -- imagine what you’ll be like, and what you’ll be doing next year.

- In the lines below, write what you expect you will be like and what you expect to be doing next year.
- In the space next to each expected goal, mark NO (X) if you are not currently working on that goal or doing something about that expectation and mark YES (X) if you are currently doing something to get to that expectation or goal.
- For each expected goal that you marked YES, use the space to the right to write what you are doing this year to attain that goal. Use the first space for the first expected goal, the second space for the second expected goal and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next year, I expect to be</th>
<th>Am I am doing something to be that way</th>
<th>If yes, What I am doing now to be that way next year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P1) _____________________</td>
<td>(s1)_______________________________</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P2) _____________________</td>
<td>(s2)_______________________________</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P3) _____________________</td>
<td>(s3)_______________________________</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P4) _____________________</td>
<td>(s4)_______________________________</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to expectations and expected goals, we all have images or pictures of what we don’t want to be like; what we don’t want to do or want to avoid being. First, think a minute about ways you would not like to be next year -- things you are concerned about or want to avoid being like.

- Write those concerns or selves to-be-avoided in the lines below.
- In the space next to each concern or to-be-avoided self, mark NO (X) if you are not currently working on avoiding that concern or to-be-avoided self and mark YES (X) if you are currently doing something so this will not happen next year.
- For each concern or to-be-avoided self that you marked YES, use the space at the end of each line to write what you are doing this year to reduce the chances that this will describe you next year. Use the first space for the first concern, the second space for the second concern and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next year, I want to avoid</th>
<th>Am I doing something to avoid this</th>
<th>If yes, What I am doing now to avoid being that way next year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P5) _____________________</td>
<td>(s5)_______________________________</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P6) _____________________</td>
<td>(s6)_______________________________</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P7) _____________________</td>
<td>(s7)_______________________________</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P8) _____________________</td>
<td>(s8)_______________________________</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63
Study ID#

**Possible Selves Questionnaire Post Release**

Who will you be after you are released (get out of prison)? Each of us has some image or picture of what we will be like and what we want to avoid being like in the future. Think about after your release -- imagine what you’ll be like, and what you’ll be doing after release.

- In the lines below, write what you expect you will be like and what you expect to be doing after release.
- In the space next to each expected goal, mark NO (X) if you are not currently working on that goal or doing something about that expectation and mark YES (X) if you are currently doing something to get to that expectation or goal.
- For each expected goal that you marked YES, use the space to the right to write what you are doing to attain that goal after your release. Use the first space for the first expected goal, the second space for the second expected goal and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After release, I expect to be</th>
<th>Am I doing something to be that way</th>
<th>If yes, What I am doing now to be that way after release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO  YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P1) _________________</td>
<td>(s1)______________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P2) _________________</td>
<td>(s2)______________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P3) _________________</td>
<td>(s3)______________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P4) _________________</td>
<td>(s4)______________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to expectations and expected goals, we all have images or pictures of what we don’t want to be like; what we don’t want to do or want to avoid being. First, think a minute about ways you would **not** like to be after your release -- **things you are concerned about or want to avoid being like**.

- Write those concerns or selves to-be-avoided in the lines below.
- In the space next to each concern or to-be-avoided self, mark NO (X) if you are not currently working on avoiding that concern or to-be-avoided self and mark YES (X) if you are currently doing something so this will **not** **happen** after release.
- For each concern or to-be-avoided self that you marked YES, use the space at the end of each line to write what you are doing to reduce the chances that this will describe you after your release. Use the first space for the first concern, the second space for the second concern and so on.
After my release, I want to avoid | Am I doing something to avoid this | If yes, What I am doing now to avoid being that after release
---|---|---
(P5) | (s5) | 
(P6) | (s6) | 
(P7) | (s7) | 
(P8) | (s8) | 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE
Study ID#  

Demographic Interview Questionnaire  

Are you currently enrolled in a school or education program (GRE, AA, Diploma)?  

What was the last grade of school you completed? Was that before or after being incarcerated?  

How long has it been since you attended school (how long have you been out of school?)  

When you were in school did you go to any Special Education classes, have an Individualized Education plan or IEP?  

Do you currently have a job?  

Are you currently in or have you completed any of the following programs in this facility?  
☐ Counseling ☐ parenting classes, ☐ Alcoholic/Drug treatment (like AA)  
☐ Job Corps ☐ Work release ☐ Job training  

Do you have any children?  

When do you expect to be released (months/years)?  

How long have you been incarcerated (months/years)?  

How old are you?  

How would you describe your ethnicity or race?  
☐ Hispanic or Mexican ☐ African American (Black) ☐  
Asian ☐ Caucasian (white/not Hispanic) ☐ Native American  
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APPENDIX D

DISTRACTION ACTIVITY
Unscramble the letters below and write the word on the line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Unscrambled Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hcira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aketlanb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palpe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etrwa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kcsos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

POSSIBLE SELVES GOALS AND STRATEGY CODES
Possible Selves Codes

1) Academic achievement – AA
   a. Enrolled in school, taking classes, being able to read

2) Occupational achievement* - OA
   a. Have a job, want to get a job, be employed

3) Interpersonal relationships - IR
   a. Better relationship with family, spouse, parents, kids, friends
   b. Talk/interact/write family, spouse kids
   c. Have friends, be closer to people, get along, reconnect with family

4) Personality traits – PT
   a. Mature, reliable, trustworthy, honest,

5) Physical/health-related – PH
   a. Healthy, working out, not smoking, not using drugs, taking medications, seeing the doctor, complying with medical instructions.
   b. Be safe, not be injured, hurt, sick
   c. Not being assaulted, attacked or raped

6) Material/possessions & lifestyle ML
   a. Have a car, have a house/apartment, have my own TV, computer
   b. Control over place to live, living on own, living debt free, live in a particular place, be rich

7) Spiritual/Social*
   a. Go to church, find religion, find Jesus
   b. Find a group of friends, make friends

8) Delinquent/non-normative/risk to safety RS
   a. Using drugs, associated with gangs, deadbeat dad, get more charges, fighting, drug dealer, criminal, getting more charges, more time, longer sentence

9) Negative NG
   a. Negatively framed statements “I expect to have no friends” or “I expect to be poor, out of a job, homeless” “still using drugs/still addicted to….”

10) No response given NR
    a. Blank, or no answer at all (when not working on now, NR used for non-response)
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IRB APPROVAL LETTERS
To: Jenefer Husman  
EDB
From: Mark Roosa, Chair  
Soc Beh Full Board
Date: 05/29/2012
Committee Action: Approval

Approval Date 05/18/2012
IRB Protocol # 1112007165
Study Title Future Time Perspective of Incarcerated Emerging Adults
Expiration Date 05/17/2013

The above-referenced protocol has been APPROVED following Full Board Review by the Institutional Review Board.

This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals that may be required. It is the Principal Investigator’s responsibility to obtain review and continued approval before the expiration date noted above. Please allow sufficient time for continued approval. Research activity of any sort may not continue beyond the expiration date without committee approval. Failure to receive approval for continuation before the expiration date will result in the automatic suspension of the approval of this protocol on the expiration date. Information collected following suspension is unapproved research and cannot be reported or published as research data. If you do not wish continued approval, please notify the Committee of the study termination.

Adverse Reactions: If any untoward incidents or severe reactions should develop as a result of this study, you are required to notify the Soc Beh Full Board immediately. If necessary a member of the Committee will be assigned to look into the matter. If the problem is serious, approval may be withdrawn pending IRB review.

Amendments: If you wish to change any aspect of this study, such as the procedures, the consent forms, or the investigators, please communicate your requested changes to the Soc Beh Full Board. The new procedure is not to be initiated until the IRB approval has been given.
The above-referenced protocol was given renewed approval following full board review by the Soc Beh Full Board.

It is the Principal Investigator’s responsibility to obtain review and continued approval before the expiration date. You may not continue any research activity beyond the expiration date without approval by the Committee. Failure to renew your study before the expiration date will result in termination of the study and suspension of related research grants.

Adverse Reactions: If any untoward incidents or severe reactions should develop as a result of this study, you are required to notify the Soc Beh Full Board immediately. If necessary a member of the Committee will be assigned to look into the matter. If the problem is serious, approval may be withdrawn pending IRB review.

Amendments: If you wish to change any aspect of this study, such as the procedures, the consent forms, or the investigators, please communicate your requested changes to the Soc Beh Full Board. The new procedure is not to be initiated until the IRB approval has been given.
Dear Jenefer Husman:

On 7/21/2014 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review:</th>
<th>Continuing Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Future Time Perspective of Incarcerated Emerging Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator:</td>
<td>Jenefer Husman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB ID:</td>
<td>1112007165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of review:</td>
<td>(8)(c) Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Title:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant ID:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IRB approved the protocol from 7/21/2014 to 5/15/2015 inclusive. Three weeks before 5/15/2015 you are to submit a completed Continuing Review application and required attachments to request continuing approval or closure.

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of 5/15/2015 approval of this protocol expires on that date. When consent is appropriate, you must use final, watermarked versions available under the “Documents” tab in ERA-IRB.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator
Jenefer Husman  
Social and Family Dynamics, T. Denny Sanford School of (SSFD)  
480/965-3993  
Jenefer.Husman@asu.edu

Dear Jenefer Husman:

On 8/17/2015 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Continuing Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Future Time Perspective of Incarcerated Emerging Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Jenefer Husman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB ID</td>
<td>1112007165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of review</td>
<td>(8)(c) Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Title</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant ID</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IRB approved the protocol from 8/17/2015 to 5/15/2016 inclusive. Three weeks before 5/15/2016 you are to submit a completed Continuing Review application and required attachments to request continuing approval or closure.

If continuing review approval is not granted before the expiration date of 5/15/2016 approval of this protocol expires on that date. When consent is appropriate, you must use final, watermarked versions available under the “Documents” tab in ERA-IRB.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator
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FACILITY APPROVAL LETTERS
April 11, 2012

To Whom It May Concern:

Mr. Ed O'Neill has been given permission to interview between 25-35 male inmates at the Lower buckeye Jail and 25-35 female inmates at the Estrella Jail, for the purpose of studying how inmates plan for their release. We, the Sheriff’s Office, will facilitate his access at a rate of approximately 5 inmates per week, per facility.

Mr. O’Neill understands that this permission is being granted with the full knowledge that all inmates’ participation is voluntary and any inmate may cease to participate at any time. Participation will be documented by the consent form he has provided to MCSO. The identities of all participating inmates will remain confidential and at no time will the identities of the participating inmates be made known to anyone outside of the Sheriff’s Office, only their responses will be used.

The questioning of the inmates and the scope of the research project will not extend beyond the questions approved in advance by the Sheriff’s Office. If, at any time, the project disrupts the operations of the jail, we reserve the right to discontinue the study for reasons of safety and security.

It is my understanding the results of the study will be shared with MCSO within one month of the completion of the inmate interviews and a final copy of the dissertation will be provided to MCSO within two weeks of its completion.

We appreciate this opportunity to work with Mr. O’Neill. We look forward to considering the results of his work in order to enhance programs and transition services for inmates held in the Maricopa County Jails.

Sincerely,

MaryEllen Sheppard
Deputy Director, Custody Bureau 2
Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office

MS:cc
To whom it may concern:

I would like to inform you that Edward O’Neill, PhD student at ASU, has permission to interview young adult inmates at the Silver Lake Jail Facility regarding future planning and decision making. If you have any further questions, please call me at (520) 740-4724.

Thank you,
Eva Carrillo Dong
Superintendent,
Pima Accommodation District
(520) 740-4724
ecdong1@yahoo.com