

NCJRS

MAY 9 1979

ACQUISITIONS

X JUVENILE AWARENESS PROJECT HELP

Evaluation Report No. 1

58617

James O. Finckenauer, Ph.D.  
Consultant/Project Director

Janet R. Storti, M.A.  
Project Specialist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
ABSTRACT . . . . .	v
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
JUVENILE AWARENESS PROJECT HELP . . . . .	5
METHODOLOGY - DATA COLLECTION . . . . .	9
FINDINGS . . . . .	14
CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	25
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	28
APPENDICES	

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the result of the efforts of a number of persons who directly or indirectly contributed to and facilitated completion of the study.

For the most part, these persons are so numerous that attempting to individually recognize them is sure to result in inadvertently leaving some out. In the aggregate, they include Department of Corrections staff who provided administrative and in some cases moral support; State Law Enforcement Planning Agency staff who provided administrative and financial support; juvenile court judges who permitted us to have access to juveniles and juvenile records in their jurisdiction; members of the Lifers' Group; staff at Rahway State Prison; and especially, the numerous sponsoring agency persons who cooperated above and beyond the call of duty in helping us with the research.

The authors wish to extend special thanks to Diane Eid and Margaret Finckenauer for their efforts in coding, preparing materials, typing, etc., and to Bernadette Fiore and Donald Barry of the School of Criminal Justice for their invaluable assistance in analyzing the data.

The evaluation is being conducted with grants from the New Jersey State Law Enforcement Planning Agency, Grant #E-D-3-3-77, to the Department of Corrections; from the Rutgers University Research Council Fund (07-2136); and, with generous financial support for computer time and research assistance from the Rutgers University School of Criminal Justice. For the latter, special appreciation is due Dean Don M. Gottfredson.

This report is dedicated to the 81 boys and girls who gave of their time and of themselves not once, but twice, in order that our

testing could be completed. There is a contribution to the advancement of social scientific knowledge.

»

ABSTRACT

The Lifers' Juvenile Awareness Project Help at Rahway State Prison is designed to deter youth from involvement in juvenile delinquency. The purpose of the evaluation is to study its effects and to address the question of whether it is reasonable to expect this Project to have a deterrent effect on such a complicated attitude and behavior pattern.

Results from the attitude change component of the authors' evaluation, while somewhat mixed, show no consistent and significant differences in pre and post attitude testing of a sample of 46 juveniles attending the Project and a like sample of 35 youths used as a control or comparison group. Nine different attitude change measures were administered to both groups; on only one measure is there a significant difference between experimentals and controls. Although it is not assumed that measurable changes in attitude are necessary and sufficient conditions for behavior change, it is assumed that attitude change is an intervening link to behavior change.

uV

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Probability of Delinquency by Group . . . . .	14
2.	Differences in Attitude Toward Punishment of Criminals by Group . . . . .	16
3.	Differences in Attitude Toward Crime by Group . . . . .	17
4.	Differences in Attitude Toward Crime by Group and Time Lapse . . . . .	18
5.	Differences in Attitude Toward Law by Group . . . . .	19
6.	Differences in Attitude Toward Justice by Group . . . . .	20
7.	Differences in Attitude Toward Self by Group . . . . .	20
8.	Differences in Attitude Toward Policeman by Group . . . . .	21
9.	Differences in Attitude Toward Prison by Group . . . . .	22
10.	Differences in Attitude Toward Punishment by Group . . . . .	23
11.	Differences in Attitude Toward Obeying the Law by Group . . . . .	23

## INTRODUCTION

Criminal deterrence has long provided one of the fundamental rationales for the use of punishments and sanctions in our society. It has always been one of the basic means by which the criminal justice system attempts to prevent crime. More recently, in part because of the disillusionment with the effectiveness of rehabilitation, deterrence has also assumed a more important function in the juvenile justice system as well. Herbert Packer defines deterrence as follows: "The classic theory of prevention is what is usually described as deterrence: the inhibiting effect that punishment, either actual or threatened, will have on the actions of those who are otherwise disposed to commit crimes. Deterrence, in turn, involves a complex of notions. It is sometimes described as having two aspects: After-the-fact inhibition of the person being punished, special deterrence; and inhibition in advance by threat or example, general deterrence" (Packer, 1968).

Deterrence works where the potential offender, in deciding whether or not to commit a crime, weighs the probability that he or she might be caught and punished and is, therefore, dissuaded from committing the crime. Unfortunately, our knowledge of deterrence, either general or special is limited. For example, we do not know which variables determine, in any particular case, whether deterrence will be effective, nor how to make it effective. It is assumed that some of these variables include the individual's personality and moral and social values, his knowledge of the law, the immediate situation (situational ethics might intervene), the potential rewards of the crime contemplated, the perceived likelihood of being caught and punished, the severity of the punishment, etc.

Much of the research on deterrence, particularly the early research, has been limited to studies of the deterrent effect of capital punishment, e.g. Dann (1935), Schuessler (1952), Vold (1952), Savitz (1958), Mattick (1963), and Walker (1965). More recently, other researchers, e.g. Chambliss (1966), Gibbs (1968), Gray and Martin (1969), Tittle (1969), Logan (1972), Ross (1973) and Tittle and Rowe (1974) have examined the relation of rate of offenses to certainty of punishment. Other studies by Claster (1967), Jensen (1969), Chiricos and Waldo (1970) and Teevan (1973) looked at the relation of perception of certainty or severity of punishment and deterrence. Henshel (1978) indicates that public awareness of sanctioning outcomes is a critical dimension in deterrence research. It is alledged by Lotz, Regoli and Raymond (1978) that only the 1967 study by Claster contains any information relating to special deterrence.

The latter trio replicated the Claster research in the framework of special deterrence. The overall conclusion from their research was that punishment, i.e. training school incarceration in their case, had limited or no deterrent effect upon the juveniles committed to the training school. Their speculations as to why this might be so were that adolescent boys are not as calculating and rational as adults in weighing potential risk; that risk may be disregarded by adolescents because engaging in deviant behavior may be status enhancing; and, that experiencing negative outcomes may reduce the fear of such outcomes in the future. Each of these hypothetical explanations are important foundations for the hypotheses tested in the research reported on here.

The Juvenile Awareness Project, which is the focus of this evaluation, provides an excellent opportunity for testing the efficacy

of one form of deterring juvenile delinquency. In the words of the Lifers' Group at New Jersey's Rahway State Prison, the inmates who created and are carrying out JAPH, its objective is ". . . to enlighten the youth of our communities to the facts of what involvement in crime, prison or its ramifications will lead them into."

#### Prisoners as agents of attitude change

The 1960's witnessed the development in more than twenty states of inmate groups formed to speak to religious, educational and youth groups on crime and corrections (Brodsky, 1970). Examples are "Operation Teenager" in Texas, "Prison Profiles" in Illinois, "Don't Follow Me" in Colorado, and "Operation Crime Prevention" in Tennessee. The procedures followed in these programs have been fairly typical. The inmates tell stories about their early years and illustrate the sequential relationship of minor offenses through major offenses. The presentations are done with a sincere emotional delivery that is intended to bring maximum effectiveness. One of the usual goals of these programs has been to change the behavior of the juveniles in the audience.

Evaluation of the programs, if there is any, has typically consisted of collecting informal remarks and letters. These come from participants, from relatives or associates of participants, from schools, etc. The letters received by the Colorado program, to use an example, were examined. It was reported, according to Brodsky, that that program was overwhelmingly rated excellent and considered an impediment to crime and delinquency. However, Brodsky notes that the letters represented less than one per cent of the estimated audience. A field investigator's comments on the Tennessee program were as follows: "Operation Crime Prevention seemed well-regarded by the persons interviewed, with

responses ranging from almost unlimited enthusiasm to mild praise. No one suggested that the program is not accomplishing its goals, which include the prevention of juvenile crime. However, there has been no systematic assessment of the effects of the program, nor is any such research under way."

In 1970, Brodsky conducted a study "to investigate one of the often-cited goals of the prison-speakers programs. It sought to investigate if youth attitudes toward the punishment of criminals and attitudes toward prisons were modified as a result of being exposed to the programs." He studied attitude changes in high school pre-delinquents and forestry camp boys, among others, who had participated in the "Prison Profiles" program at Illinois State Penitentiary. He found that there was a slight, but insignificant change toward less punitive attitudes in before and after testing among these groups. Brodsky concluded that, ". . . the pre-delinquents and delinquents are likely target groups for changing attitudes and, hopefully, behavior. The results indicate that they were not strongly influenced."

## JUVENILE AWARENESS PROJECT HELP

The Lifers' Juvenile Awareness Project at Rahway was designed to enlighten youth to the effects of involvement in crime through a "shock-confrontation" treatment modality. The approach is authoritarian in style, and is intended to represent the most negative aspects of prison life.

The Lifers' Group itself was founded in 1975, and its membership consists of approximately 40 inmates serving sentences in excess of 25 years. JAPH was conceived and initiated on September 1, 1976. The Lifers describe the operation of their project as follows:

We are showing these young people that the stories about the big house (adult prison) being the places of bad men is in all reality the places of sad men. We are using ourselves as examples to prove the fact of what crime and its involvement is really all about.

We are far from being experts on life and its problems, but we do feel that our prison experiences put in the proper perspective just might turn a young person away from crime and the following in our poor footsteps. In using ourselves as examples we are showing and explaining to them what a life of crime is really all about. This is our main objective. We are explaining to these young people that we who have been through these difficulties and are paying for our misdeeds are both willing to help and are able to understand their problems.

Through our own experiences we feel that these young people might be apt to heed our advice where they might not listen to a parent or someone in authority. We can and do expound freely on this, and we are able to relate to their problems having lived them ourselves. Over fifty percent of our membership has been involved in a juvenile offence or has spent time in a juvenile prison. We are trying to destroy the peer relationship of offenders and non-offenders . . . .

The young people are brought into the institution and are taken on a tour which consist of showing and explaining what an isolation cell is, (the hole, used to house men who have committed rule infractions.) A showing of a regular cell block with explanation. Then they are escorted to the prison auditorium where we have a rap session in which we try to cover the full spectrum of crime and its non-rewards. In these rap sessions we explain using ourselves

as examples about prison, crime and its ramifications. We have a group classification of the youngsters who may be taking part in our program. Our conversation is geared to our classification, or what we are told by the authority who may be escorting them.

The Good (those with no involvement in crime) - The Bad (minor infractions with the law or authority) - The Ugly (those who have been away or are borderline cases.) Our language may be that of the street or prison language or a discussion in a question and answer talk with high school or college students.

The critical issue guiding this evaluation was does the project work. And, why or why not?

Previous evaluative efforts of JAPH have pretty much proceeded along the lines described earlier in the discussion of other similar prison projects. One method of collecting follow-up information has been a letter sent by the Lifers' Group to parents or guardians of juveniles who have visited Rahway. The resulting very rough data, which are generally very positive, have been reported in the news media and other publications. Some examples of such reporting are the following:

"Does the 'shock therapy' work? In less than six months, the Lifers have met with over one-hundred and fifty-five juveniles. . . Only one has been taken into custody following the visit to Rahway."

The Police Chief, July, 1977

"Since the program started seven months ago, the Lifers' Group has talked to 600 juvenile ex-offenders. Only nine have been arrested again after the talk, all on minor offenses."

The Bergen Record, March 17, 1977

During this period, some 8000 young people have participated - and we have been able to reduce their recidivism rate from 86.2 per cent to 10.2 per cent.

Newark Star-Ledger, August 28, 1978

These reported data are of questionable reliability and validity. Among other problems, they are suspect because of self-selection in reporting, adequacy of knowledge of juveniles' subsequent behavior, differing definitions of recidivism, etc.

The most rigorous evaluation of the project was carried out for the New Jersey Department of Corrections in July, 1977. It employed a literature review, interviews, and a telephone survey. One of the underlying assumptions in the evaluation was stated as follows:

"Since the Lifers' JA Program conveys information specifically aimed at increasing the perceived magnitude of the probability and losses of imprisonment for juveniles, the deterrence theory provides it with a strong theoretical basis. Deterrence theory provides this basis, however, only to the extent that the JA Program specifically conveys information."

Unfortunately, that evaluation could not or did not test this assumption. The main conclusion was that: "Although there is no conclusive data, the program seems to be effective in changing juveniles' behavior, . . ."

#### Research questions and hypothesis

The goals of this research were to evaluate the psychological and behavioral reactions juveniles experience as a direct result of their involvement in JAPH, the recidivism rates of these juveniles, and the extent to which the initial exposure and the effects therefrom are manifested in the lives of the participants.

The specific aims of the research were to seek answers to the following questions:

1. How is the "shock-confrontation" treatment modality received by the youth?

2. Which youth are deterred, if any?
3. Are any youth negatively affected with regard to both psychological effects and future behavior patterns?
4. Does the experience have a lasting, constructive influence on the participating juveniles?
5. What contributing factors such as age, sex, race, socio-economic status, delinquency potential, criminal history, peer influences, etc. influence receptivity to this approach?
6. Is there a typology of juveniles which can be defined in accordance with potential amenability to involvement in the Project?

The basic or key hypothesis underlying this evaluation is that JAPH has no effect, either attitudinally or behaviorally on the juveniles attending. Consistent with findings from other similar research, e.g. Brodsky, there should be no significant differences in pre and post-testing of experimentals and controls.

This report concerns only the attitude change component of the evaluation. It is not assumed that measurable changes in attitude are necessary and sufficient conditions for behavioral change. However, it is assumed that attitude change may be an intervening variable or link to the dependent variable of behavioral change. Absence of any evidence of attitude change will cast doubt upon the likelihood of finding behavioral changes as the evaluation continues.

## METHODOLOGY - DATA COLLECTION

One objective of the evaluation was to select a sample of approximately 100 juveniles designated for attendance at the JAPH. These juveniles were to be randomly assigned to experimental and control groups - 50 youths to each. The experimental group would attend the Project; the control group would not.

In order to select a sample representative of the type of juveniles attending JAPH, monthly reports of sponsoring agencies visiting Rahway during September, October and November, 1977 were obtained from the Lifers. Out of state agencies and agencies serving a national population such as the Job Corps were excluded. The remaining 49 agencies were classified by agency type, i.e. counseling, police, educational, drug treatment, employment and recreational. A stratified random sample of 21 agencies was selected to represent agency type. Each of these agencies was then contacted and asked to provide the names of juveniles selected to attend JAPH. The design called for random assignment to experimental and control groups within these designated lists. Ultimately, nine sponsoring agencies participated in the study (See appendix for further discussion of sampling problems). The nine agencies, by type, were as follows:

### Counseling

- Youth Guidance, Totowa, N.J.
- \*White Rock Baptist Church/Abraham Clark High School  
Roselle, N.J.
- Juvenile Intake Services  
Essex County Probation Department  
Newark, N.J.

- Probationfields  
Essex County Probation Department  
Newark, N.J.
- Woodbridge Action for Youth  
Colonia, N.J.
- \*Mercer Street Friends/Trenton Police Department  
Trenton, N.J.

Police

- Ridgefield Park Police Department  
Ridgefield Park, N.J.
- \*Trenton Police Department/Mercer Street Friends  
Trenton, N.J.

Educational

- \*Abraham Clark High School/White Rock Baptist Church  
Roselle, N.J.

Employment

- Hightstown/East Windsor Neighborhood Service Center  
Hightstown, N.J.

Recreational

- YMCA  
Orange, N.J.

For reasons outlined in the appendix, the experimental design became a quasi-experimental design in which assignment to experimental and control groups was not purely random for all agencies. Although dictated by reasons of feasibility, the design is still considered to be sufficiently rigorous to protect against the effects of extraneous

\*Cooperative agency arrangement

variables on the outcome measures. Each juvenile in the sample was designated by the referring agency for participation in JAPH in accordance with the selection criteria employed by that agency. Thus, the experimentals and controls are assumed to be equivalent. A total of 46 experimentals and 35 controls was pre and post-tested. Samples of this size are considered to be large for statistical purposes. The conventional division between small and large samples is in the range of 25 to 30.

The instruments used in the testing were as follows:

1. The Attitude Toward Punishment of Criminals. This 34-item scale was originally developed by Wang and Thurstone in 1931. The statements are concerned with the purpose of and appropriate use of punishment, as well as with the question of whether or not to punish criminals at all. The simplified high school form of the scale, used here, is deemed to be satisfactory with regard to both reliability and validity. It was used by Brodsky in his study; thus, there is a basis for comparing results.
2. Semantic differential scales employing seven relevant concepts and 10 pairs of polar adjectives which are high on evaluative loading, i.e. indicating suitability for use as attitude measures. SD is a method of observing and measuring the psychological meaning of concepts (Osgood, et. al., 1957). It has been shown to be reliable and valid for many research purposes. The seven concept words used were Crime, Justice, Law, Policeman, Prison, Punishment and I (myself).
3. The Attitude Toward Obeying the Law test. This is a

four-item subscale of the attitude measures used to evaluate Highfields and Annandale Reformatory boys (Weeks, 1958).

Results here can be compared with results from that study.

ATOL was adopted as a direct measure of the deterrence effect of JAPH.

4. The Glueck's Social Prediction Table. This table was developed by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck in their 1950 Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency study to identify "delinquency-prone or delinquency-endangered children" (Gluecks, 1972). The particular version of the table used here was adapted by Kramer in 1961. It consists of the five family items developed by the Gluecks; but, in this case the subjects themselves evaluate the condition described. Kramer determined that, "the Glueck index, dealing with family situations as perceived by the boys, proved to be exceptionally powerful in its discriminating effect," and that, "the Glueck scale is a powerful differentiating tool . . . in determining delinquency proneness" (Gluecks, 1972). The weighted items which constitute the table enable one to classify subjects into low, medium and high probability of delinquency categories. These classifications can be used as independent variables to further delineate and differentiate outcomes.

The entire test package of nine attitude measures and the Social Prediction Table (See Appendix) was pilot tested on a group of juveniles from Independence High School in Newark. The results affirmed the feasibility and suitability of the measures with a closely comparable group.

Pre-testing began in February, 1976 and was completed in October,

1978. Post-testing began in May and was completed in November. The time lapse between pre and post ranged from one day for some juveniles to almost nine months for others. Because of this variation, time lapse is classified into three categories: less than one week, one to ten weeks, and eleven weeks or more. It is treated as an independent variable possibly effecting outcomes; and, it is analyzed for measurement of decaying effects upon attitude changes.

## FINDINGS

Because the research was unable to adhere strictly to an experimental design with random assignment, it was considered necessary to test for comparability of the experimental and control groups. Significance tests were conducted for five independent variables: sex, race, delinquency probability, age, and time lapse between pre and post-testing.

In the experimental group, there were 38 boys and 8 girls; in the control group, 27 boys and 8 girls. These differences are not significant. There were 27 blacks, 17 whites, 1 Hispanic and 1 other in the experimental group; there were 15 blacks, 16 whites, 2 Hispanics and 2 others in the control group. These differences also are not significant.

From the Glueck Social Prediction Table results, the subjects were classified into low, medium and high probability of delinquency categories.

TABLE 1  
PROBABILITY OF DELINQUENCY BY GROUP

Glueck	Experimental	Control	Total
Low	31(70.5%)	24(75.0%)	55(72.4%)
Medium	10(22.7%)	5(15.6%)	15(19.7%)
High	3 (6.8%)	3 (9.4%)	6 (7.9%)
Total	44	32	76

$\chi^2 = 0.68; 2df; n.s.$

The table indicates that the two groups do not differ on the

probability of delinquency dimension. Beyond that conclusion, the magnitude of the low probability category would seem to have serious implications for the outcome measures. Assuming that the Glueck table is a valid predictor of delinquency - and this will be tested against the criterion of pre and post involvement in delinquent behavior - it indicates that a large proportion (70.5%) of the juveniles exposed to JAPH were not likely to be or become delinquents in any event. If this is so, it raises several issues: Why do these particular kids need to attend the Project? Why are referring agencies not sending more high probability juveniles who might be more in need of deterrence? If the low probability of delinquency juveniles in fact do not become delinquent, can the JAPH claim credit? Answers to some of these questions may become more apparent as the evaluation continues.

On the variable of age, the mean age of the experimental group is 15.4 years, ranging from 12 years old to 18 years old. The mean age of the control group is 14.6 years, ranging from 11 to 18 years old. Dichotomizing the sample by the median age (15.135 years) and testing for independence between age and experimental/control group, indicates that the two groups do not differ significantly in age. Thus, on four characteristics, age, delinquent probability, race and sex, the two groups are well-matched.

The remaining independent variable is time lapse between pre and post-testing. A chi square test of independence between time lapse and experimental condition (experimental or control group) shows a significant difference between the two groups. A majority of the experimental group (54.3%) had a time lapse of one to ten weeks; a majority (48.6%) of the control group had a time lapse of less than one week.

Consequently, time lapse will be introduced in testing for differences in outcomes.

The statistical technique or procedure used to compare differences for each of the nine attitude measures by group is analysis of variance. This is a procedure for testing the significance of the differences among a set of means, in which every combination of means is considered simultaneously. Factorial analysis of variance is used when time lapse is introduced as an additional independent variable. This method analyzes the independent and interactive effects of this variable on attitude changes.

Each of the nine measures is treated separately beginning with the Attitude Toward Punishment of Criminals.

Attitude Toward Punishment of Criminals

TABLE 2  
DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE TOWARD PUNISHMENT  
OF CRIMINALS BY GROUP

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	18.304	1	18.304	0.068	0.795
Group	18.304	1	18.304	0.068	0.795
Explained	18.305	1	18.305	0.068	0.795
Residual	21283.105	79	269.406		
Total	21301.410	80	266.268		

This table indicates that the juveniles in the experimental group who attended JAPH did not change their attitudes, as measured by this scale, more than did a comparable control group of juveniles who did

not attend the Project. There was a very slight, but insignificant shift toward less punitive attitudes in post-testing. The mean change for the experimental group was -0.67. This compares with Brodsky's finding of changes of -0.66 for forestry camp boys and -0.29 for high school pre-delinquents. The results are obviously very comparable. The mean change for the control group was 0.28, a very small shift toward more punitive attitudes in the post-tests.

When time lapse between pre and post-testing is introduced as a source of variation, the difference is still not significant.

Crime

TABLE 3  
DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE TOWARD  
CRIME BY GROUP

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	726.561	1	726.561	5.806	0.018
Group	726.561	1	726.561	5.806	0.018
Explained	726.563	1	726.563	5.806	0.018
Residual	9886.715	79	125.148		
Total	10613.277	80	132.666		

Table 3 shows a significant ( $p < .05$ ) difference between experimentals and controls in their shifts in attitude toward crime. The juveniles visiting Rahway became significantly more negative in their outlook on crime than did the comparison group. The mean change for the experimental group was -4.21. In contrast, the control group mean change was in the opposite direction, increasing 1.83. This

change is clearly in the direction hoped for by the sponsors and supporters of JAFH. It indicates that the Lifers' Group did change the attitudes of these young people toward crime.

TABLE 4  
DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE TOWARD CRIME  
BY GROUP AND TIME LAPSE

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	994.998	3	331.666	2.673	0.053
Group	541.587	1	541.587	4.364	0.040
Time 2	268.437	2	134.219	1.082	0.344
2-Way Interactions	311.019	2	155.509	1.253	0.292
Group Time 2	311.019	2	155.509	1.253	0.292
Explained	1306.020	5	261.204	2.105	0.074
Residual	9307.258	75	124.097		
Total	10613.277	80	132.666		

Table 4 indicates that the significant difference between the experimental and control groups holds when time lapse is introduced as a possible source of variation. The table also shows that there is no significant interaction between group and time lapse. Interaction refers to the fact that variables, such as group (experimental or control) and time lapse may not act independently, but rather may act in concert to produce the effect upon attitude change observed. This result adds to the strength of and confidence in the conclusion about the effect of the Project on this variable. The fact that time lapse does not have a significant effect is important because it suggests that this attitude change may not be subject to decay, at least over the period of time studied here.

Law

TABLE 5  
DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE TOWARD  
LAW BY GROUP

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	0.654	1	0.654	0.004	0.950
Group	0.654	1	0.654	0.004	0.950
Explained	0.656	1	0.656	0.004	0.950
Residual	13174.395	79	166.764		
Total	13175.051	80	164.688		

This table shows no difference in the variance between the groups on their attitude toward law. Both groups became more negative in the post-testing. The mean change for experimentals was -2.70; for controls it was -2.52. Law is perhaps a more esoteric and complex concept in the minds of the young people in our sample. As such, it is less likely than some other concepts to be subject to change through exposure to the Lifers' program. Because a negative shift occurred in both groups, it cannot be considered meaningful.

Justice

Table 6 shows no difference in the variance between groups on their attitude toward justice. Both groups again shifted in the negative direction, but the change was more pronounced for the controls (mean = -2.03) than for the experimentals (mean = -0.67). Justice is also a complex and multi-faceted concept, probably not subject to

simple manipulation. The fact that no significant changes occurred in attitudes toward law and justice is not surprising, given the nature of these concepts. Time lapse again is not a significant source of variation.

TABLE 6  
DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE TOWARD  
JUSTICE BY GROUP

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	36.475	1	36.475	0.157	0.693
Group	36.475	1	36.475	0.157	0.693
Explained	36.477	1	36.477	0.157	0.693
Residual	18411.004	79	233.051		
Total	18447.480	80	230.594		

I (Myself)

TABLE 7  
DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE TOWARD  
SELF BY GROUP

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	55.570	1	55.570	0.233	0.630
Group	55.570	1	55.570	0.233	0.630
Explained	55.570	1	55.570	0.233	0.630
Residual	18824.004	79	238.279		
Total	18879.574	80	235.995		

One of the purposes of our evaluation was to determine whether

or not the JAPH had any effects upon self-perception. The concept I (Myself) was employed in the Semantic Differential scales as one measure of such effects. Table 7 indicates no difference between experimentals and controls on this variable. Mean change for experimentals was only -0.04; for controls it was 1.63. The project seems to have had no effect upon this measure of self-perception. Time lapse is also not a significant source of variation.

Policeman

TABLE 8  
DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE TOWARD  
POLICEMAN BY GROUP

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	35.677	1	35.677	0.162	0.688
Group	35.677	1	35.677	0.162	0.688
Explained	35.680	1	35.680	0.162	0.688
Residual	17379.125	79	219.989		
Total	17414.805	80	217.685		

Table 8 shows no difference in the variance between groups on their attitude toward the concept policeman. Time lapse is not a contributor to variation. Although less esoteric a concept than law and justice, the concept policeman is also somewhat removed from the direct influence of the Juvenile Awareness Project. Because of its symbolic meaning, however, it is not an irrelevant concept. The results indicate that the existing attitude is not subject to change by the Lifers.

Prison

TABLE 9  
DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE TOWARD  
PRISON BY GROUP

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects	214.504	1	214.504	1.421	0.237
Group	214.504	1	214.504	1.421	0.237
Explained	214.508	1	214.508	1.421	0.237
Residual	11922.273	79	150.915		
Total	12136.781	80	151.710		

One of the major purposes of the Juvenile Awareness Project is to influence attitudes about prison. Although there was a shift among the experimentals in the direction of becoming more negative about prison, this shift was not significantly different between experimentals and controls as reflected in Table 9. This result is complementary to that from the Attitude Toward Punishment of Criminals scale discussed earlier. The mean change for the juveniles visiting Rahway was -1.46. For the control group it was 1.83. This change is in the direction desired by the sponsors and supporters, but it doesn't reach statistical significance. Whether or not it is socially or behaviorally important, is a separate issue to be decided by others. Time lapse was not an important source of variation on this measure.

Punishment

Table 10 shows no significant variance between groups in their attitude toward punishment. Surprisingly, the overall change was in

the direction of becoming slightly more positive toward punishment on the post-tests. The mean change for the experimental group was an almost imperceptible 0.04; for the control group it was 1.20. Time lapse is not significant.

TABLE 10  
DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDE TOWARD  
PUNISHMENT BY GROUP

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects Group	26.586	1	26.586	0.212	0.646
	26.586	1	26.586	0.212	0.646
Explained	26.586	1	26.586	0.212	0.646
Residual	9897.414	79	125.284		
Total .	9924.000	80	124.050		

Attitudes Toward Obeying the Law

TABLE 11  
DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES TOWARD  
OBEYING THE LAW BY GROUP

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Signif of F
Main Effects Group	2.624	1	2.624	0.383	0.538
	2.624	1	2.624	0.383	0.538
Explained	2.624	1	2.624	0.383	0.538
Residual	541.372	79	6.853		
Total	543.996	80	6.800		

The ATOL measure is a four-item scale employed to directly test

the deterrent effects, attitudinally, of participation in JAPH. Each of the scale items was scored 1 - 4, resulting in a range of possible scores for the entire scale of from 1 to 16. Low scores indicate more favorable attitudes toward obeying the law, and high scores indicate less favorable attitudes. The experimental group shifted very slightly (mean change = -0.06) toward more favorable attitudes after participation in the Project. The control group change was in a similar direction, but of somewhat greater magnitude (mean change = -0.43). Table 11 indicates no significant variance between the experimental group and the control or comparison group on this measure.

When this scale was used in the Youthful Offenders at Highfields study, post-test results classified by Highfields blacks and whites and Annandale blacks and whites, indicated "a slight tendency for all but the Highfields Negroes to show a more favorable attitude toward obeying the law by the time the boys take their post-tests, but the differences are very small. Examination of the internal shifts indicates that two-fifths or more of the boys change, and that relatively about as many boys change favorably as unfavorably." Three of the four groups, Highfields whites being the exception, showed no significant change from the pre-test to the post-test. The results from our administration of this test are not terribly dissimilar to these. Weeks found further that success rate was related to favorable or no change. Since the aggregate result for our experimental group is no change, there is perhaps reason to be optimistic about positive behavioral outcomes.

## CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions from the first phase of our evaluation of the Juvenile Awareness Project need to be presented and understood in the context of two dimensions. The first dimension concerns the importance of measuring attitude change as a means of evaluating whether or not the Project "works." There are probably those who have concluded or will conclude that the Project is not trying to change attitudes, but is rather trying to prevent or deter delinquent behavior. Therefore, this thinking goes, attitude change measurement is an academic exercise which bears little relationship to the real world. After all, isn't behavior what it is all about? Isn't that what is really important? Our answer to these questions is that behavior is indeed important, but that there must be some way of getting from here to there. Behavior is the "proof of the pudding," but it is a function of attitudes, and of the immediate situations in which an individual finds himself at different times. Attitudes affect overt behavior, as well as perception, learning, etc. Since we are generally not in a position to alter the immediate situations in which delinquents or potential delinquents find themselves, we ordinarily concentrate upon the attitude component of the equation in attempting to deter juvenile delinquency. In other words, we try to change behavior by changing attitudes. This is in fact the approach being followed by the Lifers' Project, therefore evaluating its effectiveness is not only appropriate but necessary.

The conceptual foundation for JAPH rests in deterrence theory, whether or not this was intended. The recent research on deterrence has increasingly pointed to the importance of the perceptual properties of punishments and other sanctions. In other words, the argument is

that potential offenders are deterred, if at all, by what they perceive to be the certainty, swiftness, severity, etc. of sanctioning, whether or not that perception is accurate. The objective of the Project, which is to heighten the awareness or perception of juveniles, is linked to this idea.

There is, therefore, a complex series of interactions among attitudes, perceptions, deterrence and behavior. Attitudes influence behavior; attitudes influence perceptions; perceptions influence deterrence; deterrence influences behavior, and so on. It is therefore critically important to measure attitude change as an initial trigger in this entire process.

Operating on this premise, the second dimension of the evaluation conclusions focuses on the question of whether or not the Juvenile Awareness Project in fact changes attitudes. The answer to this question, as should be apparent from the findings, is both yes and no. The results are mixed.

The nine attitude measures may be logically grouped into four clusters or categories: crime/deterrence, prison/punishment, law/justice/policeman, and self-perception. In the crime/deterrence category, the semantic differential scale for crime indicated significant effect upon attitude. The importance of this result rests in the possible interaction between attitudes toward crime and inclinations to engage in it. The ATOL results diminish this effect somewhat because they show little or no deterrent effect upon attitudes. The semantic differential is considered the better measure of the two, but the results are mixed.

In the prison/punishment category, the ATFC and the semantic

differential indicate similar shifts toward less punitive attitudes, but neither is statistically significant. The punishment semantic differential is also insignificant. Learning that prisons are bad may generate a group of prison reformers, but whether they are crime-free remains to be seen.

The law/justice/policeman cluster reflects no significant shifts in attitudes. These are relevant concepts, but may simply be beyond the scope of the Project's possible effects.

The self-perception concept - I (Myself) - also showed no attitude change. This is neither a plus nor a minus, but may indicate that changing self-perception is also beyond the scope of the Project. Self-perception or self-image is a complex notion.

The authors find no overriding reasons at this point to reject our hypothesis that the Juvenile Awareness Project has no effect on the attitudes of the juveniles attending. Consistent with most theories of delinquency causation which indicate that delinquent behavior and its predisposing attitudes arise from a multitude of complex factors, we maintain, until there is further evidence to the contrary, that it is probably simplistic and unrealistic to expect that a two or three hour visit to Rahway can counteract the long term effects of all these other factors. But then, all the evidence is not yet in.

**END**