

ATLANTA

72-DF-04-0034

Street Academy

Final Evaluation Report August 1973-March 75

36537

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

ATLANTA-STREET ACADEMY -

August, 1973-March, 1975

NCES

SEP 17 1976

ACQUISITIONS

Georgia Institute
of
Technology
School of Industrial
and Systems Engineering
(404) 894-2300

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to analyze the degree to which the specified goal and objectives for the Atlanta Street Academy have been attained, and, more broadly, the extent to which the program has generally been effective. The analysis includes:

- (1) assessment of the goal and objectives in light of the data contained in the monthly summaries during the period August, 1973-March, 1975 (March being the final month for which data were submitted);
- (2) examination of the quality of inputs, i.e., the composition of enrollees, the usefulness of the data, the degree to which grant requirements are met;
- (3) observations about "additional outcomes," not specified in the evaluation component;
- (4) broad speculation about the achievements and failures of the project and ways in which greater success might have been achieved.

II. ANALYSIS OF GOAL AND OBJECTIVES

A. Goal and Evaluation

The goal for the Atlanta Street Academy is that 50 percent of the youths aged 16 to 22 that have been enrolled at least six months not commit a target crime within one year after completion of enrollment. A youth is considered enrolled for the duration of the program once the two week orientation period has been completed.

Table 1 provides the data concerning commission of target crimes by enrollees. To date seven enrollees have been reported as committing crimes subsequent to the specified period of program participation.

The most notable, indeed remarkable, finding is that four (of a total seven) target crimes were committed in January, 1975. Perhaps this unlikely state of affairs is due to coincidence, but the natural odds against four of seven target offenses occurring in a single month of the project are prodigious. Possibly there is a structural or seasonal explanation to this phenomena, but more likely it is due to some vagary of reporting.

The rate of target crimes committed by participants scrutinized

Table 1: Analysis of Target Crimes
Committed by Enrollees

<u>Enrollee Code No.</u>	<u>Type of Participant</u>	<u>Month Committed</u>	<u>Months Since Enrollment When Crime Committed</u>
T-21	target offender	2/74	2
T-28	target offender	6/74	5
P-54	potential offender	8/74	12
P-49	potential offender	1/75	15
T-22	target offender	1/75	12
T-26	target offender	1/75	12
T-27	target offender	1/75	11

under the specifications of the project goal is, nevertheless, well under the desired rate of no more than 50 percent.

Final judgment about the success of the Street Academy in regard to the project goal cannot be passed at this time due to the fact that a substantial number of enrollees have not been away from the program for twelve months. Preliminary evidence tentatively suggests success in terms of the project goal. However, the significance of that achievement can not be determined since neither a control group nor comparison group was constructed.

B. Objectives and Evaluation

B.1. Objective--- Fifteen percent of those enrolled are to pass the examination for obtaining a Graduate Equivalency Degree (G.E.D.) within one year of enrollment.

The computation for evaluation of this objective is as follows:

$$P = \frac{N}{T - E} \times 100\%$$

where,

N = the number of enrollees who have passed the G.E.D.

T = the total number of enrollees

E = the number of enrollees still in the program who have been enrolled less than one year

P = adjusted rate of passage of the G.E.D. exam

In order for the objective to be met P must exceed fifteen percent.

To date ten enrollees, all potential offenders, have passed the G.E.D.

exam.

Table 2 presents the data for G.E.D. success rate. The results have fallen far short of the objective. As mentioned in the interim evaluation for the period August, 1974-December, 1974, the poor record concerning the rate of success in attaining a G.E.D. is partly attributable to the fact that about half of the enrollees are ineligible due to the fact that an age of 18 years is required for eligibility.

Still, the success rate among eligibles clearly is insufficient in terms of the objective.

Another possible explanation cited by the Street Academy for lack of progress towards this objective was that students entering the L.E.A.A. funded program had a lower achievement level than previous groups. Information supplied by the Street Academy stated that prior to L.E.A.A. funding the average entry level for reading and mathematics was 5.7 in both subjects. Average entry levels subsequently reported for groups under L.E.A.A. funding showed the reading level to be 5.7

Table 2: Analysis of G.E.D. Success

	<u>T.O.</u>	<u>P.O.</u>	<u>All</u>
Number enrolled	59	231	290
Number presently enrolled yet to pass G.E.D. exam	31	137	168
Number passing	0	11	11

and mathematics to be 5.3. Therefore, this explanation is apparently not valid.

The Sequential Test of Educational Progress was used to determine level of entry and educational progress. Data problems--particularly changes in the test groups--render some of the data meaningless from an evaluation standpoint, but the overall data, for all tested participants, can be examined fruitfully. Table 3 gives the data for the aggregate entry level scores, post test scores (with the post test being given six months after the entry test, and progress in grade levels). As is shown, some progress is reported, with the exception of English, but the meaning of this progress is unclear with no control group or comparison group. There is no way of knowing how the progress made under Street Academy enrollment would have compared with public school enrollment.

B.2. Objective--The average daily attendance rate of the students enrolled in the project and not having passed the G.E.D. is to be 75 percent after the first six months of the program. Attendance is defined as the number of students "showing their faces" on the classroom days divided by the number of students enrolled minus the number having

Table 3: Aggregate Test Progress for Street Academy
Participants (in grade levels, by subject
matter)

	<u>Entry Average</u>	<u>Post Average</u>	<u>Average Progress</u>
Reading	5.7	6.7	1.0
Math	5.3	6.5	1.2
English	5.6	5.6	0
Social Studies	4.6	5.3	0.70
Science	4.6	5.0	0.40

passed the G.E.D.

The pertinent figures given on the monthly summary reports are total average daily attendance, beginning enrollment, ending enrollment, and number of students passing the G.E.D. The rate in question is determined by A/E , A being the average daily attendance and E the average enrollment (the numerical average of beginning enrollment and ending enrollment minus the number who have passed the G.E.D.).

Table 4 provides data on attendance for the period January, 1975 to March, 1975 and summary data for the periods August, 1974-March, 1975 and August, 1973-March, 1975. During the most recent period (January, 1975-March, 1975) the attendance rate has fallen off to a total rate of 70 percent for that period. Attendance for the month of January plummeted to 68 percent. The diminished attendance for this period was of sufficient magnitude to have consequences for the objective. The rate for the entire project period fell to 73 percent, slightly below the 75 percent required under the objective.

B.3. Objective--Sixty percent of the students' family members will respond positively when asked about the effects of the Academy on the student in terms of ambition in education and employment.

The questionnaire was neither administered nor developed.

Table 4: Attendance Data

	<u>Ending Enrollment</u>			<u>Average Daily Attendance</u>			<u>Rate</u>		
	<u>Qualified</u>	<u>Unqualified</u>	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Qualified</u>	<u>Unqualified</u>	<u>Totals</u>	<u>Qualified</u>	<u>Unqualified</u>	<u>Totals</u>
January									
T.O.	17	26	43	9	16	25	53	62	58
P.O.	47	131	178	36	90	126	77	69	71
ALL	64	157	221	45	106	151	70	68	68
February									
T.O.	17	27	44	11	13	24	65	48	55
P.O.	45	139	184	34	104	138	76	75	75
ALL	62	166	228	45	117	162	73	70	71
March									
T.O.	16	29	45	10	19	29	63	66	64
P.O.	47	136	183	36	94	130	77	69	71
ALL	63	165	228	46	113	159	73	68	70
<u>Averages</u>									
January-75									
March-75									
T.O.				10	16	26	60	59	59
P.O.				35	96	131	76	71	72
ALL				45	112	157	72	69	70
August 74- March 75									
				29	102	131	72	75	74
August 73- March 75									
				19	72	91	72	73	73

C. Descriptive and Explanatory Information

The evaluation design states that "a narrative type self-opinion questionnaire will be administered to each student when he enrolls in the program and five months after enrollment. The response will be analyzed to determine if there is a relationship between particular attitudes and commission of target crimes." While some developmental work was done, the questionnaire was never finalized. As a consequence, planned administration of the questionnaire did not occur as described in the grant.

However, the "Indices of Psychological Factors Related to Criminal Behavior," a special study which has been developed since by Georgia Institute of Technology, would be an appropriate substitute. The study is contained in Appendix I.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE INPUT

One of the most significant problems with the Atlanta Street Academy has been the continuing failure to recruit an enrollee population with the required mix of target offenders and potential offenders; throughout

the duration of the program the population has been heavily skewed in favor of potential offenders.

As can be seen in Table 4 the average enrollment figure for the period August, 1973 to March, 1975 was 91. By the last quarter, January, 1975 to March 1975, this had increased to 157. From August, 1973 to December 31, 1974, 79.7 percent of the enrollees were potential offenders and 20.3 percent were target offenders (see Interim Street Academy Evaluation for period ending December 31, 1974), whereas the requirement by terms of the grant was no more than 38.5 percent potential offenders. The figures for the period January, 1975 to March, 1975 were even less satisfactory--of the average daily attendees only 16.5% were target offenders.

Furthermore, the proportion of qualified enrollees (residing in one of the specified high crime areas) was also inadequate. Up to December 31, 1974, 75 percent of the enrollees were not qualified (see interim evaluation ending on that date). For the period January, 1975 to March, 1975, 28.6 percent of the average daily enrollees were qualified. Such a marked insufficiency can, of course, change the meaning of the project. Implications are further discussed in the Conclusions section.

Table 5 gives the referral data for January, 1975-March, 1975 and totals for August, 1973 to March, 1973. Only sixty referrals were given by the Juvenile Court. Of those only 41 were target offenders. The streetworkers averaged 2.3 referrals per month per streetworker over the nineteen months of project operation. It is likely that this low level of referrals is a function, at least in part, of the numerous other services the streetworker is to provide the students. For a description of these refer to Appendix II. It is the opinion of this evaluator that the reluctance of the Street Academy to shift provision of those services away from any of the streetworkers in order to allow more concentration on recruitment existed because the streetworker concept is an integral part of the underlying philosophy of the Academy and those activities are inherent in that concept.

IV. ADDITIONAL OUTCOMES

Table 6 presents data concerning various categories of educational, employment and criminal activities of the enrollees for the period January, 1975-March, 1975. While these educational and employment outcomes are not directly related to the evaluation component, the data indicate that some progress has been made, especially in regard to

Table 5: Referrals (for period January, 1975-March, 1975)

	<u>Juvenile Court</u>			<u>Streetworkers</u>			<u>Total</u>		
	<u>T.O.</u>	<u>P.O.</u>	<u>Tot.</u>	<u>T.O.</u>	<u>P.O.</u>	<u>Tot.</u>	<u>T.O.</u>	<u>P.O.</u>	<u>Tot.</u>
Jan	3	1	4	5	31	36	8	32	40
Feb	1	0	1	0	21	21	1	21	22
Mar	4	0	4	0	10	10	4	10	14
Jan- Mar Totals	8	1	9	5	62	67	13	63	76
Aug '73- Mar '75 Totals	41	19	60	35	277	312	76	296	372

Table 6: Change of Status Data
for Participants, January,
1975 - March 1975

	January			February			March			Jan-Mar Totals		
	Target O	Potential O	Total	Target O	Potential O	Total	Target O	Potential O	Total	Target O	Potential O	Total
Entered College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Began Part-time Employment	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	5
Began Temporary Employment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Began Full-time Employment	4	6	10	2	11	13	1	9	10	7	26	33
Committed Target Crime	5	1	6	5	1	6	4	1	5	14	3	17

employment. The employment record for the three month period is superior to that for the period August, 1974 to December, 1974.

Table 7 presents additional change of status data for the months January-March, 1975 and totals for the period August, 1973 to March, 1975.

There are problems with the data reporting that have the effect of rendering Table 7 inaccurate. Some of the data is reported cumulatively across months, while other is not; there are inconsistencies in the data such that one total is arrived at from one source and another from an alternative source. Moreover, given the errors, some irremediable, in the data reported in Table 7, the data should be given little weight.

V. CONCLUSIONS

A number of problems persisted over the entire nineteen months of project life which limit the inferences which can be drawn from the evaluation. The major difficulties and qualifications are discussed below.

1. The Composition of the Enrollee Population. The discrepancies between the actual composition of the enrollee population and the composition required under the provisions of the grant have been discussed at length in several of the interim evaluations, but not in terms of impact on

Table 7: Analysis of Change of Status
by Project Participants,
January, 1975-March 1975, and
Totals (August, 1973-March, 1975)

	<u>Target Offenders</u>	<u>Potential Offenders</u>	<u>All</u>
Began Full-time Employment	7 (15) *	26 (52)	33 (67)
Committed Target Crime	3 (5)	1 (2)	4 (7)
Completed Program (G.E.D.)	0 (0)	1 (11)	1 (11)
Irregular Attendance	1 (2)	8 (16)	9 (18)
Joined Armed Forces	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (2)
Moved to Another City	1 (3)	5 (11)	6 (14)
Never Completed Orientation	0 (4)	0 (1)	0 (5)
Not Attending Due to Illness	0 (1)	0 (3)	0 (4)
Probation Violation	0 (3)	0 (3)	0 (6)
Returned to Program	2 (4)	1 (5)	3 (9)
Returned to Public Schools	0 (3)	3 (10)	3 (13)
Transferred to Another Program	0 (1)	0 (3)	0 (4)
Terminated	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)

* Number in parentheses total for August, 1973 to March, 1975

the evaluation process.

There are two aspects to this problem, the disproportionate number of potential offenders and the presence of a large number of participants that are unqualified due to their residing outside the high crime areas specified under the grant. During all of the program months a majority of the participants were unqualified and the vast majority were potential offenders (no more than 38.5 percent were supposed to be potential offenders). Given that target offenders are, according to the data, much more likely to commit a target crime and much less likely to attain the G.E.D., the overbalance of potential offenders provides an element of "built in" success. It is not clear that the same evaluation criteria should be applied for a program composed chiefly of those that are potential offenders and reside outside the high crime areas as for a program made up predominantly of target offenders residing in the specified high crime areas. This is not to suggest that the distortion of the enrollee population was a subterfuge or was undertaken deliberately; problems in streetworkers' recruitment, Juvenile Court "underreferral" and the existence of unqualified participants prior to funding, all contributed to the demographic inadequacy. Other less obvious factors may

also have played a role. But the possibility remains that the program effects may have been very different for an enrollee population that met the requirements of the grant.

2. Absence of a Control Group. The fact that no control group or even a comparison group was constructed (though this problem was entertained) means that inferences about program effects cannot be made with any degree of confidence and that the various statistical tests that could be employed in connection with the program would be feckless.

3. The Quality of the Data. There have been consistent problems with the data reported by Street Academy officials. In some cases data simply were not provided that were required under the grant or were suspect; in other cases summary data were not consistent with disaggregated data, cumulative data were presented with noncumulative data with no clear distinction between the two, and errors in calculation were evident. It is likely that data problems were not so severe as to alter the tenor of the evaluation, but the data problems do cast a small shadow of doubt about the integrity of the evaluation.

Given the several qualifications advanced appropriate caution should have been instilled. In drawing final conclusions, two

categories of outcomes are considered, "crime reduction benefits" and "individual benefits."

1. Crime Reduction. The most significant indicator of effects was in regard to the goal. The Street Academy was successful in terms of the operationalization of the goal. Commission of target crimes was reported as substantially below the critical level (50 percent) for those who had completed the program for at least 12 months. There is, of course, at this point no way to ascertain how many of the individuals would have committed target crimes had they not been enrolled.

2. Individual Benefits. Street Academy officials expressed a belief that the value of the program was not reflected in previous evaluation reports. While the officials' initiative in providing additional data about benefits to the individuals in the program was limited, the available evidence indicates that the project was successful, to some undeterminable degree, in finding employment for enrollees and providing political socialization and familiarity with the operation and individuals of local government. Further, some educational progress is reported, with the exception of English, but the meaning of this progress is unclear with no comparison group.

In summary, after analysis of nineteen months of project operation,
the degree of success achieved can still not be determined with confidence.

APPENDIX I

INDICES OF PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS
RELATED TO CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

Correlates of delinquent tendencies have long received attention in the literature of criminology. The earliest writers examined such factors as anatomical peculiarities, demographic variables, and socio-economic factors. Explanatory models generally fell into one of two groups, the inadequates and the truisms. Tangri and Schartz (1967) review the development of models which include, as supplements to demographic, socio-economic, and familial variables, personality traits as explanatory variables. Verification of the importance of defined and measurable personality traits is of significance in the area of social programs as these variables are more easily manipulated than are socio-economic variables.

Perhaps it was the influence of the sociologist which resulted in the initial treatment of personality characteristics which were traditionally either ignored or taken as given. At any rate, the psychologist eventually exerted his influence. Since Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray's (1956) well known research on the self-concept a number of personality-oriented procedures have successfully distinguished various classes of offenders from non-offenders. Much recent literature has dealt with the particular personality traits which best predict anti-social inclinations. For a counter view see Mandel and Barron (1966).

Reckless et. al. (1956, 1957) obtained a sample of non-delinquent "good boys" by teacher recommendations. Comparisons were then made with a group of delinquents, with

the basis for comparison being the pattern of response to the following questions: (1) Up to now, do you think things have gone your way? (2) Do you feel that grown-ups are usually against you? (3) Do you expect to get an even break from people in the future? To each of these 90 percent of the non-delinquents responded positively. The figures for the delinquents were, respectively, 50 percent, 29 percent, and 30 percent. The self-concept has received continued attention as an important predictor. Fannin and Clinard (1965), E. Clifford and M. Clifford (1967), Taylor (1968), Gough and Peterson (1964), Himmelhoch (1965). Other opinions do exist of course. Tangri and Schartz (1967) suggest that self-concept may merely reflect the internalized valuations of parents, teachers, and peers. White and Porter (1970) found little support for "commonality between the attitudes...expressed about themselves and their personalities..." in a study of 60 youthful offenders. Peterson, Quay, and Tiffany (1961) did not find inadequacy to be an important factor related to juvenile delinquency.

Another area which has received general consideration is that of attitudes toward family interrelationships. E. Blueck (1966), in seeking a method of fitting young children into one of three groups: those with a one-in-ten likelihood of becoming delinquent, those with a nine-in-ten likelihood of becoming delinquent, and a middle group with a five-in-ten likelihood of becoming delinquent, finds cohesiveness of family to be an important consideration in reducing the relative size of this ambiguous middle group. Her results were in part:

<u>Cohesiveness of Family</u>	<u>Delinquency Score</u>
Marked	20.6
Some	61.3
None	96.9

where cohesiveness of family is one of five factors which make up the total delinquency score which is interpreted as follows:

<u>Total Delinquency Score</u>	<u>Delinquency Rate</u>
-240	7.2%
240-280	50.5%
280-	91.0%

It may be noted that the contribution to the total delinquency score arising from no family cohesiveness is the largest of any of the levels of the five factors considered. Numerous other writers, among them Peterson, Quay and Tiffany (1961), Mandel and Barron (1966), Tangri and Schartz (1967), and Gough and Peterson (1969) have cited familial attitudes as important considerations in predicting delinquent behavior.

Another line of inquiry is represented by the work of the Eysencks (1970) and various reassessments of their results, Hoghughi and Forrest (1970), Davis (1974); Cochrane (1974), Deusinger (1973), Wilson and Maclean (1974), Taylor (1968).

The Eysencks present empirical support for a three factor model of anti-social inclination which has as its broad basis three principles: (1) there exists a universal propensity to crime which is normally held in check by the conditioned "conscience," (2) extraverted people tend to

condition less well and hence are more likely to behave in an anti-social fashion, (3) anxiety or neuroticism reinforces extraverted or introverted tendencies favoring or disfavoring anti-social conduct.

Subsequent investigation suggested a third factor, psychoticism, whence the E (extraversion), N (neuroticism), and P (psychoticism) scales much discussed in the recent literature. The Eysencks list nine general traits having high loadings with reference to psychoticism: (1) solitary, not caring for others, (2) troublesome, not fitting in, (3) cruel, inhumane, (4) lack of feeling, insensitive, (5) sensation-seeking, "arousal jag," (6) hostile to others, aggressive, (7) liking for odd, unusual things, (8) disregard for danger, foolhardy, and (9) making fools of other people, upsetting them.

In a study of a prison population the Eysencks obtained the following reliability coefficients for the three scales.

P	.60
E	.67
N	.81

Assessment of the Eysencks' three factor model has been mixed. The orthogonality of the three scales has been questioned, Hoghughi and Forrest (1970), Davis (1974), and it has been pointed out that the E scale measures things other than criminality, e.g., younger populations consistently score higher on E, Cochrane (1974). Yet in many cases the three factor model has successfully distinguished offenders from non-offenders, Wilson and Mclean (1974), Burt (1965) deals with N and E, Scott (1960), West (1969).

A significant improvement of the three factor model is the inclusion of the "lies" (L) scale, Deusinger (1973), Gibson (1969). In part the L scale adjusts for the subjects' reluctance to give socially unacceptable responses, Eysencks (1971).

An additional area of research bears a general relationship to the development of the Jesness Inventory, Jesness (1966). Kelly and Baer (1969) report the following results on the Jesness Inventory administered as a pre- and post-test in connection with an outward bound program:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Mean</u>		<u>Change</u>	<u>T</u>
	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>		
Social Maladjustments	24.4	21.1	-3.94+	.60+
Value Orientation	16.2	12.9	-4.30+	.49+
Immaturity	13.2	13.3	0.51	
Psychopathy	8.0	6.7	-2.42*	.49+
Alienation	8.9	5.9	-5.44+	.42+
Manifest Aggression	14.5	11.7	-3.98+	.36*
Withdrawal	12.0	11.9	-0.69	.34+
Social Anxiety	13.9	13.1	-0.75	
Repression	3.5	4.4	2.32*	
Denial	11.5	12.3	1.89	-.39+

Significance Levels

+ $p < .001$

* $p < .05$

A similar scale used by Taylor (1968) finds factors such as trust, alienation, and self-worth to provide a "sufficiently valid, reliable, and useful psychometric tool." Taylor's study of 230 offenders and 86 non-offenders using a group of 15 items (of which 10 scaled) yielded correlations of .65 for female subjects and .86 for males.

Bibliography

- Burt, A. R. "Factorial studies of personalities and their bearing on the work of the teacher." Br. J. Educ. Psych., 1965.
- Clifford, E. and M. Clifford. "Self-concepts before and after survival training." Br. J. of Soc. and Clinical Psych., 1967, 6, 241-248.
- Cochrane, Raymond. "Crime and personality: theory and evidence." Bulletin of the Br. Psych. Soc., 1974.
- Davis, Hilton. "What does the P scale measure?" Br. J. of Psychiatry, 1974.
- Deitz, George E. "A comparison of delinquents with non-delinquents on self-concept, self acceptance, and parental identification." J. of Genetic Psych., 1967, 285-295.
- Deusinger, Ingrid M. "The personality structure of delinquents." Psychologische Beiträge, 1973.
- Eysenck, Sybil and H. J. Eysenck. "Crime and personality: an empirical study of the three factor theory." Br. J. of Criminology, 1970.
- Eysenck, Sybil and H. J. Eysenck. "Crime and personality: an item analysis of questionnaire responses." Br. J. of Criminology, 1971, 49-62.
- Fanin and Clinard. "Differences in conception of self as a male among lower and middle class delinquents." Social Problems, 1965, 13, 205-214.
- Gibson, H. B. "The significance of 'lie' responses in the prediction of early delinquency." Br. J. of Educ. Psych., 1969, 284-290.
- Glueck, E. "A more discriminative instrument for the identification of potential delinquents at school entrance." J. of Crim. Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1966.
- Gough, H. G. and D. R. Peterson. "The identification and measurement of predispositional factors in crime and delinquency." J. of Consulting Psych., 1952, 16, 207-212.
- Himmelhoch, . "Delinquency and opportunity: an end and a beginning of theory." Gouldner and Miller, eds., Applied Sociology, 1965.
- Hogarty, M. S. and A. R. Forrest. "Eysenck's theory of criminality." Br. J. of Criminology, 1970.
- Jesness, C. F. The Jesness Inventory. Palo Alto, Calif: Consulting Psycholitic Press, 1966.
- Kelly, Francis and Daniel Baer. "Jesness inventory and self-concept measures for delinquents before and after participation in outward bound." Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 719-724.
- Knapp, Robert R. "Personality correlates of delinquency rate in a Navy sample." J. of Applied Psych., 1963, 47, 68-71.
- Mandel, Nathan G. and Alfred J. Barron. "The MMPI and criminal recidivism." J. of Crim. Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1966.
- Peterson, D. R.; H. C. Quay; and G. R. Cameron. "Personality and background factors in juvenile delinquency." J. Const. Psy., 1955, 23, 393-399.
- Peterson, D. R.; Herbert Quay; and Theodore Tiffany. "Personality factors related to juvenile delinquency." Child Development, 1961, 32, 355-371.
- Quay, H. C.; D. R. Peterson; and C. Consalvi. "The interpretation of three personality factors in juvenile delinquency." J. of Consulting Psych., 1960, 24, 555.
- Reckless, C.; R. Dinitz; and L. Kay. "The self-component in potential delinquency and non-delinquency." Am. Soc. Rev., 1957.

- Reckless, C.; R. Dinitz; and L. Murray. "Self-concept and an insulator against delinquency." Am. Soc. Rev., 1956.
- Reiss, A. J. "Social correlates of psychological types of delinquency." Am. Soc. Rev., 1952, 17, 710-718.
- Scott, C. B. "The social adjustment of children." Manual to the Bristol Social Adjustment Guide, 1960.
- Siegmann, Aron Wolfe. "Personality variables associated with admitted criminal behavior." J. of Consulting Psych., 1962, 26, 199.
- Tangri, Sandra and Michael Schartz. "Delinquency research and the self-concept variable." J. of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science.
- Taylor, A. J. W. "A brief criminal attitude scale." J. of Cr. Law, Criminology, and Police Science.
- Tiffany, T. C.; D. R. Peterson; and H. C. Quay. "Types and traits in the study of juvenile delinquency." J. of Clinical Psych., 1961, 17, 19-24.
- West, L. "Present conflict and future delinquency."
- White, William F. and Thomas L. Porter. "Multivariate analysis of attitudes and personality characteristics among 60 youthful offenders." Psych. Rep., 1970, 26, 487-491.
- Wilson, Glenn D. and Alastair Maclean. "Personality, attitudes, and humor preferences of prisoners and controls." Psych. Rep.

INDICES OF PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS RELATED TO CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR: THE SCALES

The review of the literature revealed a considerable degree of consensus about the psychological correlates of criminal behavior. The indices that are provided here represent an attempt to create measurable instruments for those attitudes most commonly observed to be related to criminal predispositions. Before discussing the content of the scales, however, a few words need to be said about the creation of the scales, their uses, and their limitations.

The scales were formulated partly by selectively drawing items from existing scales, reformulating them when necessary, and by creation of items that seemed intuitively to tap the psychological dimension in question. The advantage of such a procedure is that the scales are more timely and "fresh" and, perhaps, more suited for present needs. The disadvantage is that the items have not been well-validated and reliability measures are tenuous. Use of more standard items would have overcome this problem, but no existent set of scales seemed as appropriate as that developed here. Moreover, possible procedures for improvement and adjustment of the scales will be discussed here.

Six scales have been developed--Psychopathy/Sociopathy, Family Relations, Neuroticism/Alienation, Egocentricity, Self Image and a Truth Index. The latter index is employed to estimate whether the respondent is "putting us on" with his answer. Three questions are asked that were constituted such

that a positive response would be highly unexpected--especially three positive-responses--and should lead the test administrator to be suspicious about the seriousness and truthfulness of the respondent's answer. Table 1 gives the three items of the Truth Index.

Both the literature of psychology and of sociology indicate that hostile, highly aggressive and ruthless attitudes are predispositions toward criminal behavior. The relationship is straightforward. Many forms of criminal behavior require at least momentary hostility. Given the high incidence of inter-correlation between psychopathy and sociopathy, a simple scale has been composed that seems to tap these two "oblique" dimensions. Table 2 gives the Psychopathy/Sociopathy Scale.

Another common theme in the criminology literature concerns the centrality of familial relations to criminal behavior. Criminals, especially those that commit violent crimes, are much more likely than others to have had damaged relationships at home. Table 3 gives the items of the Family Relations Scale.

The Neuroticism/Alienation Scale is given in Table 4. This scale is basically designed to indicate the degree to which the respondent feels that others, either real individuals or "generalized" others, are "out to get him" and also the existence of "me against the world" feelings.

The Egocentricity Scale, which is somewhat related to the previous scale, indicates the degree to which the welfare and feelings of other people are salient to the respondent. Table 5 provides the item of the Egocentricity Scale.

Table 1: Truth Index*

1. If I got back 10¢ too much change in a store, I'd take it back even if I had to drive across town to do it. (22)
2. If I was starving I wouldn't steal a loaf of bread--even if I knew I wouldn't get caught. (15)
3. The police are always very fair--whether you're black or white, rich or poor. I trust them completely. (24)

* The figure in parentheses for this scale and the others is the weight to be accorded the item. The weight is an estimate of the "level of difficulty" for the item and has been empirically-derived from response patterns.

Table 2: Psychopathy/Sociopathy Scale

1. The best way to make big money is to rip it off. (23)
2. The only way to really settle an argument is to kick ass. (21)
3. It's okay to steal if you don't have much to live on. (20)
4. Anybody that picks a fight with me better be ready to die. (14)
5. I don't take shit from nobody. (13)
6. There's nothing I wouldn't do for enough money. (16)

Table 3: Family Relations Scale

1. Most brothers and sisters are more trouble than they're worth. (22)
2. I'd be able to get along a lot better if only my parents would stay off my back. (14)
3. My parents never thought I'd amount to much. (27)
- *4. Everyone has their faults but I guess my (mother, father) is no worse than most. (10)
5. My brother and sister always seem to get their way. (18)
- *6. When things go wrong I'd rather be at home. (5)
7. My parents don't give a damn about what I think. (25)

* Reverse scoring scheme for this item.

Table 4: Neuroticism/Alienation Scale

1. People talk about me behind my back. (2)
- *2. Most people seem to like me as soon as they meet me. (6)
3. It seems like I get caught in every lie I ever tell. (5)
4. Usually when I get punished it's for a good reason. (16)
5. There's only two kinds of people--those that hustle and those that get hustled. (20)
6. Nobody really cares whether I live or die. (22)
7. When I have a bad problem I like to talk to someone about it. (10)

Table 5: Egocentricity

1. I'm going to take all I can get in this world any way
I can get it. (21)
2. I don't give a damn about what other people think of me. (10)
3. Anybody that doesn't look out for himself first, last,
and always is a sucker. (10)
- *4. We've got to be ready to help each other out. (24)

The final scale, the Self Image Scale, is designed to give an indication of the feelings of self-worth of the respondent. Existing literature suggests that criminals often have strong feelings of inferiority, especially those that are prone to commit violent crimes.

A 3-point scale has been set for the items, all of which are "forced choice." Respondents are asked to reply "yes," "maybe," or "no" to each of the items. A residual category, "doesn't apply," is available for those few items--all having to do with family relations--that may not be meaningful for certain respondents (e.g., orphans, no siblings). While a more sensitive scale might be desirable (e.g., 5-point, 7-point), it was felt that a rapid "gut level" response to the questions would be most desirable and that a more discriminating range of responses might militate against the "non-reflective" response. Also it was felt that a less complex set of response types should help to minimize confusion.

The way in which the scales are administered is crucial. In the first place, the ordering of the items should be randomized not only within scales but among scales. It would also be desirable to inspect a few "noise" items--items which are not of interest to the evaluators--in order to disguise the dimensions as best as possible. The items may be read to the respondents--indeed this would be desirable unless the respondents are average readers--but must be coded by the respondent; simply writing "1," "2," or "3" might be most advisable. Transferring these numbers could be done but by analysts.

Table 6: Self Image

1. Maybe down deep I'm just no good. (22)
- *2. I can think of several things I'm good at. (10)
3. Anybody would have to be pretty stupid to think I'm going to amount to much. (25)
4. I expect that I'll always be in trouble, it just runs in my blood. (22)
5. I can't seem to do anything right. (21)
6. The world would be better off if I was dead. (20)
7. I guess I'm really pretty stupid. (24)
- *8. I may not be well-educated but that doesn't mean I'm dumb. (15)

It is strongly recommended that persons administering the questionnaire should be acquainted with and, hopefully, trusted by the respondents. Additionally, the respondents must be assured that there is no "right" answer to the questions and that the information will not be used against them.

The questionnaire should be administered twice, once at the time a group or individual enters into the program, the first day if possible, then again at the very end of the program. It is critical that the questionnaire be administered before the program "treatment" is underway so that the earliest effects will not be lost. The trade-off here is that respondents will be less familiar with the program personnel and the administrator of the exam, but in this some degree of data quality may have to be sacrificed, for it is possible that the effects of any particular program may diminish rapidly and a questionnaire administered as little as one week after the program has begun may yield significantly different response patterns than would have been the case had the pre-test been administered at the beginning.

After the first administration of the exam, the data should be transferred to code sheets (with numbers assigned for each of the subjects). The coding instructions are straightforward--yes = 3, maybe = 2, and no = 1 except in cases noted where the item for the dimension is taken from the opposite direction; in those cases which are represented by the asterisks beside the various items, yes = 1, maybe = 2, and no = 3. In all cases a high coded number indicates strength along the dimension.

The coding is complicated to some degree by the fact that the questions are weighted according to their level of "item difficulty" in respect to the dimensions. The weightings were derived from an administration to a Georgia Tech student sample that is likely no more (and probably much less) crime-prone than a theoretical cross-section of the population of the United States. For each scale a sum can be calculated that represents the position of the individual on the dimension. The dimensions themselves have also been weighted so that they may be combined for a single criminal predisposition indicator, but the validity of the general indicator is much more suspect than in the case for indicators of the respective scales.

Several steps may be taken later to refine the scale. One of the most important issues is reliability. Reliability questions can be answered by administering the instrument at very close intervals (a day or two) to see to what degree different responses are elicited.

The weighting is extremely crude at this time. Ideally, inter-item correlations should be computed to determine statistical redundancy in responses and, further, cumulative scaling will yield a better estimate of item difficulty.

Validity questions are also very real. Tests for validity are envisioned however. First, if there is little variance in responses between the subjects and the Georgia Tech student sample, the instrument is of little use. Secondly, the instrument can be tested, to a limited degree, by retrodiction. Do subjects with the most serious criminal records score highly on

the scale? The best test, of course, would be to follow up subjects and see if their behavior corresponded to that "predicted" by the scale scores.

APPENDIX II

WHO IS THE STREETWORKER?¹

A streetworker is an indigeous adult who gives himself to teenagers. He is always there - playing ball, hanging out, doing all he can, wherever he can, to relate to youth in an honest manner. He is the key person who makes initial contact with troubled youth in the community in which he works or Juvenile Court. The streetworker identifies those who might benefit from the Academy by visiting places where youth gather, by using a list of dropouts obtained from the Atlanta Public Schools, and through Juvenile Court referrals. The streetworkers develop a "trust" relationship with the youth by going to court with him, meeting with his family, visiting his hangouts (pool halls, recreation areas, street corners, etc.) - in short, by showing concern. The building of this relationship enables the streetworker to present to the youth the possibility of entering the Academy.

After the potential student visits the Academy with the streetworker, he decides whether or not to enroll. Juvenile Court referrals come from certain high crime areas and are automatically enrolled. After enrolling, the student familiarizes himself with the Atlanta Street Academy by entering a two-week orientation program.

Since the inception of the Atlanta Street Academy it has been our belief that like all youth, the dropout and juvenile delinquent is dying

¹Source: The Atlanta Street Academy, July 1, 1973 to December 31, 1974
(self-evaluation by the project)

for a drop of real concern about their lives, not just sentimentality, but the combination of love and discipline. Rarely is this combination a reality in the life of a juvenile delinquent. If it were so then possibly he would not have resorted to crime. All too often a youngster gets love from a mother who cannot discipline him or discipline from a policeman or teacher who could care less.

The Street Academy attempts to provide tools and resources for youth so that they can cope with the frustrations of inner city life. Since the Atlanta Street Academy serves the whole person, it offers a multi-faceted, person-centered program. Education is only one of the basic tools that are offered. The Academy also caters to physical, emotional, and spiritual needs as well. When the concern for the total person is shown, much of the youth's frustration begins to disappear. He opens himself to a new and better feeling about himself as well as the possibility of building a better future with his newly acquired tools.

How this occurs is not too difficult to comprehend once one recognizes that a streetworker becomes a substitute family structure. He is the great encourager, the disciplinarian, the fountain of acceptance and love, the big brother, the mother, and the father. He raises the level of aspirations of a youth by emphasizing to him that he does have talent and abilities and that there are opportunities which can be grasped.

In that streetworkers are indigenous people, they know what the student's life is like. It is because of this common experience that a streetworker can help. "In order to help that man--you must be that man".

A disconsolate youth does not want to hear pretty words; he wants to see proof. If a youth has a toothache, he wants the pain removed. If a youth's mother can't buy groceries, he needs food or money. If a youth can't read, he needs meaningful instruction. Before we can expect this youth to seriously think about education or before we can attempt to prevent him from turning to crime or violating the law, his survival needs must be met. To this end, the streetworker taps unlimited resources in the community for assistance.

In many ways the Street Academy took on the true character of the old one room school house where the teacher was more involved in the students' lives. The underlying concept upon which the Academy was built was the desire to deal with the total life of a student, not just from 9 to 5. No youth stops at 5 P.M.

When classes at the Academy are over, the streetworker is there. When a problem arises, the streetworker is there. Because he has been trained to locate and utilize resources, he can solve many problems which otherwise would inhibit and prevent a student from productive growth.

The life of the streetworker is no easy lot. Long hours, little pay, conflict and tension are his diet.

The streetworker's role is very vital. During the past eighteen months streetworkers have made considerable progress in the following areas:

- hustling food for students and their families
- arranging for day care slots for children of academy students
- making arrangements for public housing for students and their families

Who Is the Streetworker? (Continued)

- arranging for free dental care
- free medical care
- free eyeglasses for students
- free legal services for students
- streetworkers took over classes on occasions when teachers were out
- hustled supplies and equipment
- coordinated basketball teams
- hustled uniforms for basketball team and drill team of the Academy
- hustled free tickets to sports events, entertainment shows, movies, etc.
- hustled free food and lodging in out of town field trips
- coordinated local and out of town field trips
- coordinated transportation for field trips
- hustled supplies and refreshments for special projects
- coordinated social functions
- attended community meetings
- participated in community programs and affairs