

African Research Review

International Multidisciplinary Journal, Ethiopia

Vol. 5 (5), Serial No. 22, October, 2011

ISSN 1994-9057 (Print)

ISSN 2070--0083 (Online)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/afrrrev.v5i5.15>

Effectiveness of After-care-services in the Reintegration and Supply of Labour after Incarceration in the Prisons: Lagos and Oyo States Prison Command Experience

(Pp. 185-198)

Ajala E. M. - Department of Social Work, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
+234 8035653135
Email: majekajala@yahoo.com

Oguntuase, A. E. - Controller of Prison, Lagos Command, Nigeria

Abstract

Offenders released from correctional institutions are confronted by social, economic and personal challenges that tend to become obstacles to a crime-free lifestyle. Some of these challenges are as a result of the consequences of incarceration and the difficulty of transiting back into the community. It is along this background that this study investigated the effectiveness of After-Care service in the rehabilitation and supply of labour into the economy by ex-offenders in Oyo and Lagos state commands of the Nigerian prison service. The research adopted the descriptive survey research design. A purposive random sampling method was used to select 450 respondents. The main instrument used for the study is a single questionnaire with five sub-sections, each sub section serving as an independent instrument. Data were analyzed using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Findings showed that space acquisition and supervision programmes had effect on reintegration and supply of labour into the workplace ($F= 76.565$; $p < 0.05$ and $F=29.630$;

p < 0.05 respectively), while provision of tools programme does not have significantly effect on reintegration and supply of labour by ex-offender (*F* = 1.135; *p* > 0.05). It was recommended that the combination of the treatments will solve the problem of recidivism when applied jointly on individual ex-offenders.

Key words: Effectiveness, After-care-service, Reintegration, Labour supply, Prisons

Introduction

In recent years, more emphasis has been placed on designing comprehensive interventions, based on a continuity of care, to provide consistent assistance to offenders within and beyond prison. There is a recognition that preparation for reintegration should commence before the offenders' release. After their release, interventions should support their immediate transition from the prison to the community and reinforce the gains achieved through in prison treatment and continue until a successful reintegration is completed (Fox, 2002). This approach is often referred to as "after-care", a system wide mode of intervention (Borzycki & Makkai, 2007).

All interventions, regardless of their method, are best delivered as part of an integrated program designed to address an individual offender's specific issues and challenges. Renewed attention has been given to "strength-based" approaches to make use of personal and community assets in order to help released offenders face their challenges and successfully reintegrate into the community, including the workplace (Maruna & LeBel, 2002).

According to Harper and Chitty (2004), the primary criminogenic needs that must be addressed by institutional and community based treatment services are related to: education, employment, accommodation, drugs and alcohol, mental health, social networks, cognitive skills, and attitudes. Offenders released from confinement encounter a myriad of challenges with respect to securing employment. This is accounted for by personal factors such as low self-esteem, low motivation, skills deficit, lack of training, mental illness, and substance abuse; a lack of stable accommodation; absence of family support and a poor employment record (Visher, Winterfield & Coggeshall, 2005; Rakis, 2005; Graffam, Shinkfield, Lavelle & McPherson, 2004).

Most successful approach in reducing recidivism among offenders, both immediately upon release into the community and over the long term, is prison based and community-based intervention (MacKenzie, 1997). This

intervention might be in terms of helping them to settle down and be engaged in something productive and beneficial to the general populace. This idea was supported by Visser, et al.(2005), that obtaining legal employment is one of the best predictors of the post-release success of ex-prisoners. More importantly, offenders have identified employment as a key factor in post-release success (Burke, 1997). According to Graffam, Shinkfield, Lavelle, and McPherson (2004),

Employment provides more than the income necessary to support adequate material conditions. It also provides structure and routine, while filling time. It provides opportunities to expand one's social network to include other productive members of society. In addition to all this, employment can contribute to enhanced self-esteem and other psychological health.

It has been suggested however, that the gains of employment with respect to reducing re-offending may be linked to the quality of the job, rather than merely being employed (Uggen, 1999). It has been acknowledged that aftercare and post-release services can achieve multiple ends: reduced reoffending, improved integration with mainstream society (through supply of labour) and, ultimately, enhanced community safety (Travis & Petersilia, 2001). The crime prevention goal of aftercare programs is measured in terms of offender recidivism. To reduce recidivism, re-entry programs are introduced to assist the re-integration of ex-offenders.

Re integration is the coming back of the prisoner into the community to continue normal life (including gainful employment) after incarceration. Social reintegration, an intervention which aims at integrating the client into the society through education, is always advocated. Alessandro (2009), identified the successful reintegration of ex-convicts back into the society to include: training in Prisons, job Placement (after release), innovative Programmes (such as After-care programmes), restoring economic supports and rebuilding family networks. Each of these provisions increases the chance that ex-offenders have a chance to make a new life after incarceration. Traditionally, one could identify three main types of offender reintegration programmes, namely, institution-based programmes, surveillance-based transition programmes, and assistance based transition programmes.

Institutional programmes are designed to prepare offenders to re-enter society. This include education, mental health care, substance abuse treatment, job training, counseling, and mentoring. These programmes are more effective when they are centred on a full diagnostic and assessment of offenders (Hirschi, 2002). Some of these programmes are offered prior to the release by community-based agencies which are equipped to provide after-care and follow-up with the offenders following their release from confinement. As these programmes are voluntary, a large number of offenders do not participate and are subsequently released into the community without any pre-release preparation.

Surveillance-based programmes are centered on supervision of offenders in the community following release from confinement. According to Maruna and LeBel (2002), there are four models of parole supervision: risk-based, needs-based, middle-ground and strengths-based. Risk-based strategies operate on the premise that offenders are dangerous and need to be controlled and closely monitored. Needs-based supervision strategies focus on offenders' criminogenic needs, which mean parole supervisors help offenders get appropriate treatment in programmes such as cognitive skills training and addictions counselling (Maruna & LeBel, 2002).

The 'middle-ground' position is a combination of the two models. The amalgamation is supposed to appease supporters of both models. The final (and least-researched) supervision strategy is the 'strengths-based' model which views offenders as "assets to be managed rather than merely liabilities to be supervised" (Maruna & LeBel, 2002). This approach is based on the assumption that prisoners are stigmatized, and that it is this stigma, rather than any inherent dangerousness, that makes them more likely to commit further crime.

Assistance based transition programmes are designed to offer support and assistance to categories of prisoners after incarceration. It includes the following: Assistance for Mentally ill Offenders (Hartwell & Orr, 1999), employment / job market reentry assistance, lodging and financial assistance, family support, substance abuse interventions and programmes for sexual offenders (all these are called after-care services).

In Nigeria, after-care service of the Nigerian Prisons Service had the cardinal objectives to successfully integrate the inmates back to the society (especially getting them employed). According to Olojede (2009), the Nigerian prisons Service has since 2003 renewed its efforts at providing After Care Services

for discharged inmates. Ukueku, (2008), stated that the programme of after-care services involve provision of tools to discharging inmates who are proficient in various fields of occupation and other vocational skills. This, it is believed would enable them to be meaningfully engaged after discharge. Five locations were chosen bases on geopolitical spread. They are Benin-city (South-South), Ibadan (South-West), Nassarawa (North-Central), Abia (South-East), and Lagos.

It should be noted that, apart from the efforts to include both ex-convicts and awaiting trial persons who had stayed for quite a lengthy period, the programme is not the same as the traditionally known “half way homes”. While the concept of After Care is a post - release programme which seeks to reintegrate discharged inmates successfully into the society, “half way homes programme” is a pre-release programme designed to facilitate prisoner's re-entry to society. In deed persons in half way homes may be sent back to prison if found to be of bad behaviour.

Efforts of After-Care Centers was aimed at filling the gap in penal philosophy, reduce recidivism, and provide a safer society. The schemes introduced include: skill acquisition scheme (tailoring, barbing/hairdressing, information technology, literacy/numeracy acquisition, vulcanizing, agriculture); small scale ventures scheme (toilet roll making, soap making, shoe making) so as to assist in the rehabilitation and reintegration of ex-convicts into the society, thereby guaranteeing labour supply into the economy.

Table 1 shows the number of inmates that benefitted from after-care service programme of the Nigeria Prison Service in Oyo and Lagos states between 2005 and 2010.

Offenders released from correctional institutions are confronted by a range of social, economic and personal challenges that tend to become obstacles to a crime-free lifestyle. Some of these challenges are as a result of the offenders’ past experiences and others are more directly associated with the consequences of incarceration and the difficulty of transiting back into the community (Borzycki, 2005). Most of the ex-prisoners had lost touch with friends, relations and their mode of livelihood(employment) as a result of the time spent in prison. This situation forces them back to bad gangs who are ever ready to accept them thus increasing recidivist tendencies in our society. According to Borzycki, (2005); Borzycki and Makkai (2007), the period of incarceration may itself have had several “collateral effects” upon many

offenders: they may have lost their livelihood, their personal belongings, their ability to maintain housing for themselves and their family; they may have lost important personal relationships and incarceration may have damaged their social networks; they may have experienced mental health difficulties or acquired self-defeating habits and attitudes.

Homelessness, in particular, may place youth at risk of offending (Arnall, Eagle, Gammampila, Patel and Sadler, 2007). Lack of place to accommodate ex-offenders, both for living and practising what they have learnt while in prison custody, as a result of lost of relationship and stigmatisation problem from the public, contributed to the concentration of ex-prisoners in the most problematic parts of the community where there are high rates of crime and disorder and an absence of support services. There is a paucity of reliable information on ex-prisoners' experiences in securing accommodation in the community or/and on the relationship between housing and recidivism (Baldry, McDonnel, Maplestone, and Peeters, 2002). Theses among other problems, forces ex-offenders back into their criminal group where they are welcomed back and as a result, reformation, rehabilitation and reintegration become difficult for ex-offenders. It is along this background that the present study aims at investigating the effectiveness of After-Care service in the rehabilitation and supply of labour into the economy by ex-offenders in Oyo and Lagos state commands of the Nigerian prison service. Three hypotheses were raised and tested for the study.

Research hypotheses

- i. There is no significant effect of community supervision programme of after-care on reintegration and supply of labour by ex-offenders in Oyo and Lagos state command of the Nigerian prison service.
- ii. There is no significant effect of space acquiring programme of after-care on reintegration and supply of labour by ex-offenders in Oyo and Lagos state command of the Nigerian prison service.
- iii. There is no significant effect of tools purchase programme of after-care on reintegration and the supply of labour by ex-offenders in Oyo and Lagos state command of the Nigerian prison service.

Methodology

The research design adopted for the study is descriptive survey research design of the ex post facto type.

The population for the study consists of all ex-prisoners who have at one time or the other been incarcerated in Prison in Oyo and Lagos state commands of the Nigerian prisons service and have during this period, undergone one training or the other for the purpose of skill acquisition towards eventual rehabilitation and supply of labour into the economy.

A purposive random sampling method was used to select a total of 450 respondents who had benefited from the aftercare programme of the Nigerian prison service in both Oyo and Lagos state.

The main instrument used for the study is a single questionnaire titled; “Supervision, Space Acquiring, Tools Purchase, Rehabilitation and Labour Supply Questionnaire-SSTRQLQ” with five sub-sections. Section A measures the demographic data, section B is the measurement of Supervision Scale, Section C measures Space Acquiring programme, section D is the measurement of Tool Provision Scale, Section E measures Rehabilitation/Labour Supply.

- a) Supervision Scale (SS): This is made up of six items measuring Supervision. The items were adapted from “Supervision Questionnaire-Child (Grade7, Year 8 Update)” developed by Doyle & McCarty, (2001). The respondents were asked to respond to a 4 – point rating scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4).
- b) Space Acquiring Scale (SAS): The instrument contained six questions measuring the participants’ Space Acquisition. The questions was adapted from “Merger or Acquisition Questionnaire” developed by Jorgensen, (2004). The participants were asked to respond to a 4 – point rating scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4).
- c) Tools Acquiring Scale (TAS): The instrument consists of six items measuring Tools Acquisition. The items were adapted from “Merger or Acquisition Questionnaire” developed by Jorgensen, (2004). Participants were asked to respond to a 4 – point rating scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4).

- d) **Rehabilitation and Labour Supply Scale (RLSS):** The instrument consists of 10 items measuring rehabilitation/labour supply. The items were adapted from the Rehabilitation Scale developed by Hendrik (2007), titled “The impact of prison reformation on the Inmates Population in Swaziland”, Malot and Fromader (2010), titled, “Male Inmates Perspective in Reducing Recidivism Rates Through Post-Incarceration Resources”. Participants were asked to respond to a 4 – point rating scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4); with high scores indicating a positive or favourable overall rehabilitation.

The reliability of the instruments were done through test retest, of two weeks interval, on 30 prisoners in the Nigerian Prison Service, Ilesa, Osun State. Reliability co-efficient for each instrument were: Supervision Scale($r = 0.85$), Space Acquiring Scale ($r = 0.79$), Tools Acquiring Scale ($r = 0.81$) and Rehabilitation/ Labour Supply Scale ($r = 0.92$).

The instruments were administered by the researchers with the assistance of the Controller of the prisons involved and prison officers in charge of Social Welfare Unit. The questionnaires were left with the respondents for two weeks for proper completion. Out of the 450 questionnaires distributed, only 400 were returned and found usable for data analysis.

The statistical methods employed for analyzing the data are frequency counts, simple percentage for demographic data and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance for the hypotheses.

Results

Analysis of demographic variables

The respondents were made-up of 380 males and 20 females with ages between 15years and 41years and a mean age of 30.91years. Only 22.8%(91), had no formal education before incarceration. However, all respondents had training while in prison and are currently under the after-care scheme.

Analysis of research hypotheses:

From table 2, space acquisition programme of after-care significantly have effect on reintegration and supply of labour into the workplace ($F = 76.565$; $p < 0.05$), also, supervision programme of after-care significantly affect the reintegration and supply of labour by ex-offenders ($F = 29.630$; $p < 0.05$). However, provision of tools programme does not significantly affect reintegration and supply of labour by ex-offender ($F = 1.135$; $p > 0.05$).

Looking at the result of the 2-way interaction of the variables, space acquisition and supervision programmes significantly affect reintegration and supply of labour by ex-offender that passed through the after-care service ($F=12.310$; $p<0.05$). space acquisition and tools provision programmes; supervision and tools provision programmes of after-care service do not significantly affect the reintegration and supply of labour into the economy ($F=0.208$; $p>0.05$; $f=3.700$; $p>0.05$ respectively).

Discussion

From the findings, the result of the first hypothesis showed that supervision programme helped ex-offender to remain at work and get employed by their jobs. This result support the finding of Paparozzi and Gendreau (2005); Serin, Voug, and Briggs (2003) that the application of Intensive Supervision Practices (ISP) to high-risk offenders lowers rates of readmission to incarceration hence the continuous employment and supply of labour into the economy. Employment provides more than the income necessary to support adequate material conditions. It also provides structure and routine, while filling time (Graffam, *Shinkfield, Lavelle & McPherson, 2004*). The employment of ex-offenders provide opportunities to expand their social network and enhance self-esteem and other psychological health, thereby dissuading them from crime and become more positively productive.

The finding that space provision for the practice of learned job had effect on the supply of labour is as a result that both the job and the ex-offender were provided with accommodation. From experience offenders who are reconvicted often point to lack of suitable housing as a key factor in their unsuccessful transition to life in the community (Lewis, Sam, Julie, Mike, Peter, Maurice, Steve & Andrew, 2003). So, the absence of suitable accommodation for released offenders and the new trade in the community result in ex-prisoners becoming problematic to the community. Therefore, provision of space keeps them busy and productive within the economy.

The non significance of tools provision program to the provision of labour into the economy by ex-offenders is in line with the finding of Webster, Hedderman, Turnbull, and May, (2001) that numerous financial difficulties and inability to purchase working tools/equipments are among several conditions that restrict employment and rehabilitation outcomes for prisoners/ex-prisoners. The true situation is that most ex-offenders want quick money to settle down fast into the society because they are not accepted nor given social support by both the family and the community,

hence, all tools supplied are sold to keep 'mind and soul' together. The resultant effect is non-practice of learnt trade, reduction in labour supply into the workforce and recidivism.

Implications for industrial social workers and recommendations

Findings from the study have useful implications. For instance, the Industrial Social Workers and Social welfare officers attached to prisons are to carry out survey of training needs of inmates so as to give adequate advice regarding the trade to be learnt while in prison so that they will be appropriately accommodated when they are out of prison. Furthermore, industrial social workers should advocate on behalf of released prisoners to get necessary support from the family in particular and the society in general so as to have conducive environment to practice their trade.

Prison authorities and social workers should endeavour to collect all relevant information about prisoners before their exit from the prison. This will enhance proper monitoring and supervision, in all ramifications, of ex-offenders. Supervisors should also involve parents, spouse or friends of the ex-offenders so as to have adequate information about the ex-offenders for adequate reintegration and continuous employment. Efforts of the Nigerian prison service in making sure that ex offenders secure accommodation so as to be able to practice what they have been trained for during incarceration should be improved. Proper supervision should be carried out on ex-offenders so as to reduce the temptation of selling the tools/equipments provided for them after release.

In conclusion the prison authorities, policy-makers, and practitioners (social workers) should identify programmes and strategies that will help prisoners to be successfully reintegrated back into their communities without re-offending. Some of the programmes suggested are the after-care (employment training, counselling, supervision, accommodation and tools provision). These treatments will solve the problem of recidivism when applied individually and will be more effective when jointly used on individual ex-offenders.

References

- Alessandro, Pirona. (2009). Social reintegration. Retrieved from: www.wikipedia.com. 10/04/2010.
- Arnall, E., Eagle, S. Gammampila, A. Patel, S.L. Sadler, J. (2007). Housing Needs and Experiences. London, UK: Youth Justice Board for England and Wales.
- Baldry, E. McDonnell, D. Maplestone, P. and Peeters, M. (2002). Ex-prisoners and Accommodation: What Bearing do Different Forms of Housing Have on Social Reintegration of Ex-Prisoners? Paper presented at the Housing, Crime and Stronger Communities Conference convened by the Australian Institute of Criminology and the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne, 6-7 May 2002.
- Borzycki, M. (2005). *Interventions for Prisoners Returning to the Community*. A Report Prepared by the Australian Institute of Criminology for the Community Safety and Justice Branch of the Australian Government Attorney General's Department. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Borzycki, M. and T. Makkai. (2007). *Prisoner reintegration Post-release*, Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Burke, H. C. (1997). *"Perceived Factors Related to Conditional Release Outcome by Successful and Unsuccessful Male Offenders*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Doyle, S.R. & McCarty, C.A. (2001). "Supervision Questionnaire-Child (Grade7, Year 8 Update)" (Technical Report). Retrieved from: www.fasttrackproject.org. 15/03/2011
- Fox, A. (2002). "Aftercare for Drug-Using Prisoners: Lessons from an International Study". *The Probation Journal*, 49, 120-129.
- Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A., Lavelle, B. and McPherson, B. W. (2004). "Variables Affecting Successful Reintegration as Perceived by Offenders and Professionals." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*.40 (1/2), 147-171.
- Harper, G. and Chitty, C. 2004. *The Impact of Corrections on Re-offending: A Review of 'What Works'*. (Third edition). London, UK: Research, Development, and Statistics Directorate, Home Office.
- Hartwell, S. W. and Orr, K. (1999). "The Massachusetts Forensic Transition Program for Mentally Ill Offenders Re-Entering the Community." *Psychiatric Services*, 50(9), 1220-1222.

- Hendrik, J. B. (2007). The Impact of Prison reform on the Inmate Population of Swaziland. *Journal of Criminology*. Retrieved from: www.internetjournalofcriminology.com 12/03/2011.
- Hirschi, T. (2002). *Causes of Delinquency*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Jorgensen & Company.(2004). Merger or Acquisition Questionnaire. Retrieved from www.google.com 12/03/2011
- Lewis, Sam, Julie Vennard, Mike Maguire, Peter Raynor, Maurice Vanstone, Steve Raybould, and Andrew Rix. (2003). *Resettlement of Short-Term Prisoners: An Evaluation of Seven Pathfinders*. London, UK: Research, Development, and Statistics Directorate, Home Office.
- Lievore, D. (2004).” *Recidivism of Sexual Assault Offenders: Rates, Risk Factors and Treatment Efficacy*” A Report Prepared for the Office of the Status of Women. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- MacKenzie, D.L. (1997). “Criminal Justice and Crime Prevention”, in L. Sherman, D. Gottfredson, D. MacKenzie, J. Eck, P. Reuter, and S. Bushway (Eds.), *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. Report to the United States Congress. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
- Malot, M. & Fromader, A. (2010). Male inmate perspective on reducing recidivism rates through post-incarceration resources. Retrieved from: www.internetjournalofcriminology.com. 15/02/2011
- Maruna, S. and LeBel, T. (2002). “Revisiting Ex-prisoner Re-entry: A Buzzword in Search of a Narrative.” in S. Rex and M. Tonry (eds), *Reform and Punishment: The Future of Sentencing*. Portland: Willan Publishing. 158-180.
- Olojede, G. A. (2009). Aftercare Practice and Sectoral Collaboration. A Paper Presented at the Workshop for Aftercare and Welfare Officers at Prison Staff College, Kaduna.
- Paparozi, M. A. and Gendreau, P. (2005). “An Intensive Supervision Program that Worked: Service Delivery, Professional Orientation, and Organisational Supportiveness.” *The Prison Journal*, 85(4), 445-466.
- Rakis, J. (2005). “Improving the Employment Rates of Ex-Prisoners Under Parole”. *Federal Probation*, 69(1), 7-12.
- Serin, R., B. Voung, and S. Briggs. (2003). *Intensive Supervision Practices: A Preliminary Examination*. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada. Retrieved from http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/publications/pub_174_1.pdf

- Travis, J. and Petersilia, J. (2001). "Re-entry reconsidered: A new look at an old question". *Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 47, pp. 291-313.
- Uggen, C. (1999). "Ex-offenders and the Conformist Alternative: A Job Quality Model of Work and Crime." *Social Problems*, 46(1), 127-151.
- Ukueku, B.O. (2009). Paper presented at the training workshop for aftercare and welfare officers, held at prisons staff college, Kaduna on 15th of may, 2009.
- Visher, C. A., Winterfield, L. and Coggeshall, M. B. (2005). "Ex-offender Employment Programs and Recidivism: A Meta-analysis." *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1(3), 295-315.
- Webster, R., Hedderman, C., Turnbull, P. J., & May, T. (2001). *Building bridges to employment for prisoners* (Home Office Research Study 226): The Communication and Development Unit, Home Office, London.

Table 1: Showing the number of inmates that benefitted from after-care service programme of the Nigeria Prison Service in Oyo and Lagos states between 2005 and 2010.

	Lagos	Oyo	Total
	2005-2010	2005-2010	
Numbers of Inmates Trained	2,000	1,500	3,500
Inmates that benefitted from Supervision Programme	500	450	950
Inmates that benefitted from Tools Acquisition Programme	300	280	580
Inmates that benefitted from Space Acquisition Programme	131	87	218

Source: After care service unit, Nigeria Prisons Service, Oyo and Lagos state (2010).

Table 2: Analysis of Variance showing the effect of after-care programmes on reintegration and supply of Labour into the economy by ex-offenders

Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Main Effects	1911.992	3	637.331	36.443	.000
Space Acquisition(SPA)	1373.968	1	1373.968	78.565	.000
Supervision(SUP)	518.179	1	518.179	29.630	.000
Tools Acquisition(TA)	19.844	1	19.844	1.135	.287
2-Way Interactions	295.293	3	98.431	5.628	.001
SPA and SUP	215.288	1	215.288	12.310	.001
SPA and TA	3.639	1	3.639	0.208	.649
SUP and TA	64.712	1	64.712	7.700	.055
3- Way Interactions	0.459	1	0.459	0.026	.871
SPA, SUP and TA	0.459	1	0.459	0.026	.871
Explained	2207.744	7	315.392	18.034	.000
Residual	6855.434	392	17.488		
Total	9063.178	399	22.715		