MENARD CORRECTIONAL CENTER

JUVENILE TOURS

IMPACT STUDY

Greater Egypt Regional Planning and Development Commission
P. O. Box 3160, 608 E. College
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone: (618) 549-3306

August 1979

The preparation of this document has been funded in part through a grant from the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration according to the provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1974, as amended. Publication No. GERPDC-79-534.

GREATER EGYPT REGIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Commission Members

Franklin County

R.A. Bonifield
Albert Chiaventone
John Chullen
George Tomlinson

Jackson County

Russell Elliott
Gary Hartleib
Bill Kelley
Sharon Kowalzik

Jefferson County

Carl Baker
Charles Covington
Stan Partridge
Gene Wells

Perry County

Dr. Allen Y. Baker
J. Paul McNutt
Victor Provart
Gene Schumaier

Williamson County

John Hamilton
William Humphreys
Jack Murray
Curtis Palmer

Assembly of Local Governments

William Schettler

Conservancy District

Charles Prather

Municipal Representatives

Leland Brown, Benton
Archie Jones, Carbondale
Robert Armstrong, DuQuoin
Robert Butler, Marion
Raymond Baril, Mt. Vernon
Joe Williams, Murphysboro
John Pellow, West Frankfort

Executive Committee

Chairman -	C. J. Covington
1st Vice Chairman -	George Tomlinson
2nd Vice Chairman -	Bill Kelley
3rd Vice Chairman -	Vic Provart
4th Vice Chairman -	Archie Jones
Secretary -	Jack Murray
Treasurer -	Curtis Palmer

Commission Staff

A. S. Kirkikis - Executive Director
James R. Rush - Acting Executive Director
Ronald Clark - Director of Current Planning
Christine Svec - Planner III
Wayne D. Martin - Criminal Justice Training Coordinator
William M. Harris - Planner II
Sharon Yeargin - Planner II
Jan Dorfler - Planner I
Jim Duke - Planner I
Tony Crebs - Planner I
Morris Eaton - Planner I
Frank Pallini - Planner I
David Muir - Planner I
Angela Kazakevicius - Planner I
Dave Woodard - Planner I
Victoria Freund - Planner I
Alan Meyers - Planner I
*Jack VanZandt - Evaluation Specialist II
Stephen Knox - Citizens Resource Specialist
Margie Mitchell - Administrator II
Barbara Hays - Secretary III/Bookkeeper
Debra Borecky - Secretary II
Joy Andrews - Secretary II
Candace Fozard - Secretary II
Deborah Stout - Clerical Aide
Wendell Keene - Planning Technician II
Bill Tennert - Planning Technician II
Albert Bustos - Research Analyst I
Kay Clary - Research Analyst I
Oliver Hoard - Research Analyst I

*Person Primarily Responsible For This Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

FOREWORD

Deterring youth from crime and the juvenile justice system has been a pre-occupation with criminal justice and related agencies for several decades. By setting wayward youth straight it is assumed that they will be unlikely to turn to crime in adulthood and live more fruitful lives. However, deterring youth has proven far from simple and a myriad of programs have been developed to deal with the problem. Some are total failures, some help a little, few are glowing successes.

The concept of youths touring prisons to see where they might end up if they break the law is not a new idea. However, a rebirth of this idea has gained much notoriety recently as a result of the documentary "Scared Straight" filmed at Rahway Prison in New Jersey. Claims of glowing success at turning delinquent youth around were reported. The tours and "Scaring Youth Straight" caught the nation's fancy. Many replications were attempted including the Menard Prison Tours in Illinois.

A Rutgers University criminology professor undertook an intense study of the claims of program success. No significant difference between youths touring the prisons and a control group of non-tour youth was found. In fact, there were negative findings and the tours have since been curtailed. The value of the tour concept is now considered dubious.

The Menard tours were undertaken in an attempt to find out what effect the idea of scaring, or at least educating youth straight, would have. It was a more valid experiment that the Rahway experiment and took place over a year's time span.

The Greater Egypt Criminal Justice Evaluation program was requested to evaluate the impact of tours on youth. Roger Higgins, the Director of the Police Intervention Group* of Mt. Vernon was responsible for designing

*A juvenile justice deterrant program

the experiment, coordinating the tours and collecting the data. Acknowledgement of appreciation is expressed to the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission Statistical Analysis Center for their computation of statistical information and to the Lifers Group who responded to questionnaires and to all those involved who aided in this evaluation.

Funds for the evaluation were provided by Illinois Law Enforcement Commission with matching fundings provided by the Greater Egypt Criminal Justice Regional counties including Alexander, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Massac, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Saline, Union and Williamson Counties.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Scared Straight, an unrehearsed film of confrontive dialogue between hard core prisoners and juvenile offenders at Rahway Correctional Center in New Jersey, has been hailed by many as a major breakthrough in deterring young people from the juvenile justice system. The film has won an academy award. It was narrated by that expert TV crime fighter, Lt. Colombo (actor Peter Falk). Scared Straight is an appealing, theatrical, "quick fix" approach. Officials in many states have received pressure from citizens to implement similar prison tour programs.

The Police Intervention Group of Mt. Vernon, Illinois, in cooperation with the "Lifers Group" of Menard Maximum Security Correctional Center undertook an experiment to measure the actual effects of juvenile-correctional center tours.

The Police Intervention Group serves juveniles and their families in the Mt. Vernon area. Its goal is to divert youth from the juvenile justice system. Mt. Vernon (population 17,000) is located in south central Illinois. The "Lifers Group" is a group of inmates at Menard Correctional Center serving 20 years or more for mainly felonious crimes.

Menard was built a century ago of sand stone and is located in south-eastern Illinois on the Missouri - Illinois border. It has a rated capacity of 2,620 and presently houses 2,596 inmates. It is dreary and crowded and houses only high risk serious offenders. Rather than "scaring" youth straight the Menard inmates entered into dialogue with the juveniles in an attempt to educate them about prison life. There was little strutting, yelling or bullying as depicted in "Scared Straight". The dialogue was graphic and honest. Prior to the dialogue juveniles were taken on a tour of sections of the Correctional Center including several cell blocks and the dining area.

The first several tour dialogues were confrontive, graphic and frank. A panel of five inmates spoke in turn about the daily monotomy, trauma and danger of prison life. They also spoke of how they started a life of

crime and its consequences. The juveniles were then offered the opportunity to ask questions or offer comments. There was some provocation and baiting of the juveniles by inmates but not nearly so much as depicted in "Scared Straight". There were six bi-monthly tours in 1978.

In the last four tours the dialogues became more settled, but remained graphic and frank. The nature of the last four dialogues changed somewhat in that following a brief prisoner panal introduction the juveniles broke up into four sub-groups with one or two inmates grouped with four or five juveniles. This sub-group arrangement seemed to enhance information flow and intimacy.

Chapter 2

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this venture was a classical experimental design whereby an experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) group were randomly selected from a population of adolescent males aged 13 to 18 years residing in Franklin and Jefferson Counties (both located in Southern Illinois). This population was stratified into three sub-groups: (1) youths who had been petitioned to juvenile court; (2) youths who had been contacted by the police but not referred to court; (3) youths who had never been contacted by police.

There were a total of 161 youths in the experiment, 94 in the tour group and 67 in the control group.

Originally it was proposed that there would be about 15 youths in each tour group. However, due to cancellations, no-shows and other influences the numbers in the tours and control groups varied slightly in each tour.

		Tour	Control	Total
1/78	Tour 1	16	3	19
3/78	2	10	24	34
5/78	3	16	16	32
7/78	4	16	11	27
9/78	5	10	6	16
11/78	6	20	6	26
	Unknown	9	3	7
		94	67	161

Because of random selection and control group utilization the variance was not conceived as a threat to validity. Other possible validity threats included the difference in seasons of the tours and the slight difference in juvenile - inmate dialogues between the tours.

It was hypothesized that mean scores on two personality and attitudinal tests would not significantly differ before the tours comparing the tour and control groups. However, after the tours, if there was an effect, mean scores should differ significantly. It was further hypothesized that criminal behaviors should vary significantly after the tours when comparing the tour and control groups; the tour groups showing a significant decrease in criminal activity. A secondary hypothesis was that the type of juvenile justice contact (sub-group category) would affect test results.

The null hypothesis stated that the tours would affect no significant change as measured by test scores or criminal behaviors.

Testing Instruments

The two tests administered several days before and within ten days after the tours were the "Jesness Inventory" and "Piers" Harris Children's Self Concept Scale". These tests were administered to the experimental and control groups.

The "Jesness Inventory" is used in the classification and treatment of disturbed children and adolescents. Although the inventory was designed for use with delinquents, there are reasons to believe that the scales will prove useful with adolescents in a variety of settings. It scores 11 personality characteristics. A final scale is based on a regression equation that combines attitude syndromes and personality traits into an index most predictive of delinquency (Asocial Index). Variables measured on the Jesness Inventory include:

1. Social Maladjustment Scale (SM) - 63 items. Social Maladjustment refers to a set of attitudes associated with inadequate or disturbed socialization, as defined by the extent to which a youth shares the attitudes of persons who do not meet environmental demands in socially approved ways.

2. Value Orientation Scale (VO) - 39 items. Value Orientation refers to a tendency to share attitudes and opinions characteristic of persons in the lower socioeconomic classes.

3. Immaturity Scale (Imm) - 45 items. Immaturity reflects the tendency to display attitudes and perceptions of self and others that are usual for persons of a younger age than the subject.

4. Autism Scale (Au) - 28 items. Autism measures a tendency, in thinking and perceiving, to distort reality according to one's personal desires or needs.

5. Alienation Scale (Al) - 26 items. Alienation refers to the presence of distrust and estrangement in a person's attitudes toward others, especially toward those representing authority.

6. Manifest Aggression Scale (MA) - 31 items. Manifest Aggression reflects an awareness of unpleasant feelings, especially of anger and frustration; a tendency to react readily with these emotions; and an obvious discomfort concerning the presence and control of these feelings.

7. Withdrawal Scale (Wd) - 24 items. Withdrawal indicates the extent of a youth's dissatisfaction with self and others, and a tendency toward isolation from others.

8. Social Anxiety Scale (SA) - 24 items. Social Anxiety refers to conscious emotional discomfort in getting along with people.

9. Repression Scale (Rep) - 15 items. Repression reflects the exclusion from conscious awareness of feelings and emotions that the individual normally would be expected to experience; or it reflects his failure to label these emotions.

10. Denial Scale (Den) - 20 items. Denial indicates a reluctance to acknowledge unpleasant events or conditions encountered in daily living.

11. Asocial Index. Asocialization refers to a generalized disposition to resolve social or personal problems in ways that show a disregard for social customs or rules.

The population mean (μ) for each scale on the Jesness Inventory ranges from 45-55 for "average" subjects with a population standard deviation (σ) of about 10.

The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale measures self concept based on behavior, intellectual school status, physical appearance and attributes, anxiety, popularity and happiness, and satisfaction.

The population mean (μ) for the Piers-Harris is about 50 with a population standard deviation (σ) of about 12.

Statistical Tests

Three statistical tests for significance were utilized.

1. Students t test for significance for related means.

2. Students t test for significance for independent means.

3. Chi-Square test relationships for data arranged on a bivariate table.

Symbolically stated the statistical tests appear:

(Null Hypothesis) Ho : $\bar{X} = \bar{Y}$ ($\bar{x}$ = tour means)

(Alternative Hypothesis) Ha: $\bar{X} \neq \bar{Y}$ ($\bar{Y}$ = control mean)

test: (a) t test for independent mean comparison $\left(t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{SM_1 - M_2}\right)$

(b) t test for related mean comparison $\left(t = \frac{\bar{D}}{S\bar{D}}\right)$

(c) chi-square test for significant relationships $\left(\chi^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}\right)$

$\alpha = .05$

The Jesness Inventory and Piers-Harris tests yield interval data.

Chapter 3

EXPERIMENT FINDINGS

Testing Outcomes

The mean age was 15.13 for the tour groups and 16.31 for the control group. The percent of blacks was 15.95% for the tour groups and 16.41% for control groups. All involved in the tours were males. The criminal history for both groups were classified as (1) court contacted (2) police contacted and (3) non-contacted.

Table 1.A
PRE TOUR CRIMINAL HISTORY
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL YOUTH INVOLVED IN THE
JUVENILE-MENARD CORRECTIONAL CENTER TOURS

Pre-Tour Criminal History	Tour	Control	Total
Non-contacted	36 (38%)	17 (25%)	53 (33%)
Police contacted	31 (33%)	27 (40%)	58 (36%)
Court contacted	27 (29%)	23 (34%)	50 (31%)
	94 (100%)	67 (100%)	161 (100%)

(χ^2 = 2.96; 1df; α = .05; n.s.)

The table indicates that there is no significant difference between the tour and control groups concerning criminal history.

Thus regarding age, sex, race and criminal history the tour and control groups were well matched. The only factors which could cause this experiment to be devalued from classical to quasi-experimental would be slight differences between the styles of the six tours and some questions concerning validity of the criminal history subgroupings. It is the author's opinion that these factors aren't strong enough to devalue this experiment.

The analysis of the test results were approached from several different prospectives:

1. Test for significant differences between the means of the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before and after the tours. (independent samples).

2. Test for significant differences between the means of experimental (tour) group before and after the tours. (related samples)

3. Test for significant differences between the means of the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before and after the tours for each subgroup of "criminal history" (court contacted, police contacted, non-contacted) to see which group was most (or least) affected by the tours according to the tests. (independent samples.)

4. Test for significant differences between the means of the experimental (tour) groups before and after the tours for each subgroup of criminal history. (related samples)

The tests generally indicate no significant changes in self concept or propensity towards asocial (delinquent) behavior resulting from the tours. See appendix 1 for details.

There were some important exceptions to the general trend of the null effect of the tours:

1. There were several instances of significant difference between the experimental and control groups' test score means before; after; and before and after the tours. Many of these differences occurred due to a significant change in the control group's score means following the tour and no significant change in the experimental groups test score mean.

   Why these differences occurred is probably due to confounding influences beyond the control of the experimental design.

2. When analyzing test results of the experimental group pre and post without utilizing the control group the variables "manifest aggression" and "social anxiety" showed significant decrease which are desirable outcomes.

3. When analyzing test results for court contacted youth only pre and post without utilizing the control groups the summative propensity towards delinquency (asocial index) showed significant increase which is an undesirable outcome.

Behavior Follow-up

Behaviors of the experimental and control group youth were monitored following the tours and summated in May, 1979. Fifteen months had lapsed following the first tour, five since the last tour. It is not surprising that more youth from the first several tours were involved in criminal behavior following the tours; more time had elapsed.

Table 1.B
POST TOUR CRIMINAL ACTIVITY OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL YOUTH INVOLVED IN MENARD CORRECTIONAL CENTER TOURS

Post Tour Criminal History* B	Tour	Control	Total
Contacted by police	16 (17%)	8 (12%)	24 (15%)
Non Contacted	78 (83%)	59 (88%)	137 (85%)
Total	94 (100%)	67 (100%)	161 (100%)

(χ^2 = 2.73, 1df, α = .05, N.S.)

This table indicates that there is no significant relationship between police contacts following the tours and what group (tour or control) the youth was in. The tour groups, however, had proportionatly had more police contacts following the tours than the control group. Also, there was no significant differences in crime types (or seriousness of crimes) committed by the tour and control group youth following the tours.

Table 1.C
POST TOUR POLICE CONTACTS OF MENARD CORRECTIONAL CENTER EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS STRATIFIED AS NOT CONTACTED, POLICE CONTACTED AND COURT CONTACTED

Post Tour Criminal History*C	Tour	Control	Tour
Not contacted	1 (6%)	1 (12%)	2 (8%)
Police contacted	5 (31%)	3 (38%)	8 (34%)
Court Contacted	10 (63%)	4 (50%)	14 (58%)
	16 (100%)	8 (100%)	24 (100%)

(χ^2 = 1.24, 1df, ns $\leq$ .05)

*Does not include investigations, disturbances or status offenses.

The majority (14) of those youth who have thus far committed a criminal offense following the tours had prior court contact. However, of those 14, 10 were tour participants. It would seem that this group (court contacted youth) may actually feel motivated to commit crime as a result of the tours. The Jesness test indicated a higher propensity of asocial index mean scores for those court contacted tour participants following the tour than before. Therefore, both behavior and testing indicate that the tours may have an adverse affect on youth who have had contact with the court prior to the tours. Also, the experimental (tour) group exhibited 6% more criminal activity than the control group.

Other Findings

There were no significant correlations between age of youth and criminal activity for the youth in the experimental and control groups or between the time of tours and successive criminal activity. More, though not significantly more, youth commit a reported offense in the first several weeks following a tour than many weeks or months later.

Interviews and mail surveys of tour participants, their parents and teachers indicted unanimous support for the program. However, the teachers and parents noted no major behavioral changes in youth who participated in the tours.

Chapter 4

PRISONER'S VIEW

This evaluation has dealt with the impact of the tours on the juveniles involved. However, the main actors in this venture were the inmates who spoke with the juveniles. There were ten inmates involved in various tours (the same ten weren't in every tour). Five responded to a mail survey form. An optional section of the form requested age, race, reasons for incarceration, length of time served, and length of sentence. All respondents answered the optional section.

The ages of the inmates were 27, 30, 32, 37 and 44. Three were black, two were caucasian. Two were sentenced for murder, one for rape, and two for armed robbery. All were sentenced for over 20 years, two for life. The average time served was eight years with a range of five to 14 years. All were members of "Lifers, Incorporated", a group of prisoners involved with socially oriented programs and serving 20 or more year sentences.

All responses were lengthy and thoughtful. "Lifers, Incorporated" representatives also sent a letter which indicated the inmates had no input into the tour development and were monitored through administrative censorship throughout the program. It would be interesting to know how they would have changed program structure or style and how it would have affected impact on the juveniles.

Responses are as follows:

1. Which tours did your participate in?

Answer: Most participated in four or five of the six tours.

2. How honest were you discussing prison life with juveniles?

Answer: All answered "very honest".

Comments: a. "I had no reason to fabricate anything...I answered all questions honestly, even personal questions directed at me."

3. To your knowledge how honest were other prisoners about discussing prison life with juveniles?

4 Very

1 Somewhat

Comments: a. The inmate that answered "somewhat" indicated that some prisoners told of incidences that happended to others and claimed them as personal incidents.

4. What, in your opinion, was the basic intent of your dialogue with the juveniles?

0 scare them

5 Educate them

0 Answered Questions Only

0 Other

Comments: a. "I see no reason to scare the juveniles because the fear will leave them, but facts (education) won't...."

b. "If scaring them would help, then that was also my intent."

c. "I only tried to get them to stop and think...my honesty could have scared them - but prison is a place to fear of living in."

d. "(The juveniles) were very smart. I think a little smarter than myself."

5. In your opinion, did you feel that the youth you talked with were: (multiple answers)

____ Frightened

3 Interested

1 Bored

3 Shocked

____ Other

Comments: a. "They never gave thought to losing freedoms they now take for granted, such as seeing their families."

b. "I have to say interested, because most of the panel (inmates) didn't come on too strong."

c. "They (juveniles) knew we were not kidding or making jokes about prison life."

d. "I don't believe in scaring kids; 'it don't work'. Most of these kids are 'reefer heads'. I found none real bad.

6. How did you feel about speaking with youths about your prison experiences? (multiple answers)

_____ Sad

__4__ Good

_____ Frightened

_____ Bored

_____ Interested

__2__ Anxious

_____ Other

Comments: a. "I love to tell the truth about prisons to anyone who is interested. It is just so damn bad in all U.S. prisons that these young kids find it hard to believe."

b. "I believe in a program like this....I hope (the juveniles) have the sense to make a decision of what they want out of life."

c. "Just knowing my errors in life...might cause another to do right."

7. What, do you feel, is the general intent of juveniles touring a prison and talking with select prisoners?

a. "To show youth what happens to those who broke the law...."

b. "I think it is an important step for a kid to take. 'Good Luck', some may get meaner."

c. "To learn from one who has experience about prisons and crime and how they can avoid coming to prison."

8. Do you feel that the tours are a __5__ good __0__ bad idea?

All respondents answered that the tours are a "good" idea.

Comments: a. "Because it's educational and no one can tell them better than one who has experience as a prisoner.

b. "It depends who is in charge; that person would have to have a business head which is not the case for our social service workers and certainly not prison workers."

c. "Once a youth see's the inside of a prison and feels the awe of such a place..."

d. "Because it brings the youth closer in touch with reality."

e. "I feel by allowing the juveniles to speak to the prisoners and realizing that the amount of time we have served here is wasted, and that is the consequence of breaking the law."

9. Would you like to participate in similar dialogues with other youth touring prisons?

__5__ Yes __0__ No

Comments: a. "A few of my reasons are: I don't wish for anyone to follow my errors, and to show juveniles the 'opportunities' that's waiting for them."

b. "To help prevent them from making the mistakes I made."

c. "Kids are like the stock market to me 'so many different factors'. I would never turn down helping one."

d. "Prisons today are filled with once youth offenders. The only real way to fight against crime is at the juvenile level."

10. Do you think that, if you had gone on such a tour when you were a youth, it would have made any difference about your attitudes towards crime?

__3__ Yes __2__ No

Comments: a. "I honestly believe, if I witnessed the reality of what prison life was, seen an institution such as Menard or any other maximum security prison, it would have made an impact upon me."

b. "I was born to roam. I believe the system has just locked me up on account of my temperment. Some of those kids have the same problem."

c. "Because from the advice of one who has experienced being in prison, I think I would have given committing crime a second thought."

d. "(no) simply because I wasn't a youth in and out of trouble."

11. Do you feel that the tours portrayed prison life as:

_____Glamerous

_____Not so bad

__1__Bad

__4__Very bad

Comments: a. "After I finished talking with the youth it left a very bad picture in their minds."

b. "There is nothing glamerous about prison - it's living mental hell."

c. "Behind these prison walls is a living hell, grave yard and worse."

12. Please indicate any further comments or suggestions about juvenile tours of prisons below. (edited)

a. "Find the right mixture of private business and social service types supportive and helping in the planning of this program and it will be a success."

b. ".....perhaps some younger prisoners should be involved" .

c. "I feel that parents of problem youth should also visit the prisons... would like to see juveniles come in on a more regular basis....I can try to prevent others (youth) from ending up in jail."

d. "I hated to see the program slow down or end...there are juveniles, right now, that need our help."

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on all available findings one would be ill advised to recommend continuation or expansion of the juvenile-prison tours. All empirical findings indicate little positive outcome, indeed, they may actually indicate negative effects.

Why would a tour of a dreary prison and dialogue with inmates outlining horrors of prison life prompt some adolescents towards negative behavior? Many delinquent youth feel alienated and cut off from interaction with others and are often unable to verbalize thoughts or feelings. Perhaps some of the more extreme delinquents view a prison as a place where they can have "friends" and a community now lacking in their lives. For some the world is too large and threatening. Four walls and bars may, in some-way, offer security and a sense of belonging. It is interesting that most of those reapprehended by police following the tours had more serious criminal involvement previous to the tours. These youth are probably feeling most alienated and exhibit minimal impulse control.

The prisoners feel positive about the tours. Perhaps this is a rare time in their lives when they were asked to help and share their experiences with others in a positive way. While their efforts may be for naught their enthusiasm should be noted. It would appear that some of "worst" elements of our society, when asked, want to do good!

Recommendations:

1. The prison tours and dialogues with inmates as now conceived do not affect desirable change in juveniles. Based on these findings the tours, as they were conducted, should be discontinued.

2. There may be benefits to consideration of alternative methods of deterrance using the concept of prison tours but changing the approach.

   a. Include counseling and therapeutic methods following the tours which would dispel misconceptions about prison life and support positive social interaction. This could be accomplished through peer group as well individual therapy.

b. As one inmate expressed, consider offering tours to parents of youth and offer follow-up counseling. This may affect more caring from parents whose children may otherwise end up in "that terrible place".

c. The main actors, the inmates, should be given more planning responsibilities. It is more likely that they will take more stock of the program if they can offer more input at the design stage of the plan.

d. Consider eliminating high risk youth from tour participation. (High risk youth are those who have committed serious crimes and have been contacted by the courts)

There may be benefits to be derived from the tours as <u>part</u> of an overall treatment; but not as an isolated event in an adolescent's life.

Appendix 1-A

t TEST FOR INDEPENDENT MEANS OVERALL TOUR

(R) XOX
(R) X X

α = .05

Table - 2A
Jesness Inventory

Social Maladjustment Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
:E-TOUR	46.81	52.00	14.90	10.48	152	-2.43	PRE
)ST-TOUR	48.20	54.19	15.68	10.14	140	-2.36	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups mean scores both before and after the tours. This difference was not due to effects of the tours as it occurred before as well as after the tours. Rather it may have been the result of confounding influences.

Table - 2B
Jesness Inventory

Value Orientation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	55.64	54.67	10.48	10.14	152	.58	PRE
OST-TOUR	54.27	54.19	12.13	12.85	140	.04	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning value orientation between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on value orientation as a result of the tours.

Table - 2-C
Jesness Inventory

Immaturity Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRÉ-TOUR	56.94	57.12	12.60	12.92	152	-.05	PRE
POST-TOUR	57.01	59.71	13.19	13.44	140	-1.19	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning immaturity between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on immaturity as a result of the tours.

Table - 2-D
Jesness Inventory

Autism Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	57.81	56.64	10.71	10.57	152	-.48	PRE
OST-TOUR	57.71	57.81	11.55	9.22	140	-.06	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning autism between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on autism as a result of the tours.

Table - 2-E
Jesness Inventory

Alienation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	56.42	58.42	10.27	9.75	152	-1.23	PRE
POST-TOUR	57.60	59.25	11.68	9.86	140	- .90	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning alienation between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on alienation as a result of the tours.

Table - 2-F
Jesness Inventory

Manifest Aggression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
E-TOUR	54.09	53.05	9.81	10.36	152	.64	PRE
ST-TOUR	52.07	51.37	12.36	11.20	140	.34	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning manifest aggression between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on manifest agression as a result of the tours.

Table - 2-G
Jesness Inventory

Withdrawal Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	53.36	51.53	10.95	10.10	152	1.08	PRE
OST-TOUR	52.80	48.25	10.69	10.13	140	2.57	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There was no significant difference concerning withdrawl between the experimental (tour) and control groups (non-tour) before the tour. However, the control group displayed the major change following the tour, not the experimental group. This change is probably the result of a testing confoundness and not a result of the tours.

Table - 2-H
Jesness Inventory

Social Anxiety Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	46.70	44.71	9.88	9.27	152	1.28	PRE
POST-TOUR	44.67	41.91	12.46	11.13	140	1.38	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning social anxiety between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on social anxiety as a result of the tours.

Table - 2-I
Jesness Inventory

Repression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	53.40	52.76	11.82	11.45	152	.34	PRE
OST-TOUR	53.34	54.26	13.17	11.48	140	-.44	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning repression between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on repression as a result of the tours.

Table - 2-J
Jesness Inventory

Denial Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	45.69	47.44	11.56	10.81	152	-.96	PRE
POST-TOUR	45.99	45.88	11.77	9.89	140	-.49	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning denial between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on denial as a result of the tours.

Table - 2-K
Jesness Inventory

Asocial Index

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	43.93	48.91	14.64	14.04	152	-2.12	PRE
POST-TOUR	46.46	51.21	14.55	13.54	140	-1.99	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There was a significant difference (increase) concerning asocial index between the experimental (tour) and control groups both before and after the tours. This is probably a result of confounding influences for this variable and not a result of the tours.

Appendix 1-B

t TEST FOR RELATED MEANS, OVERALL TOURS

(R) X O X

α = .05

Table - 3

Piers-Harris

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	55.71	12.47	82	-.12
POST-TOUR	55.84	13.76		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant difference concerning self-concept between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on self concept as a result of the tours.

Table - 4-A
Jesness Inventory

Social Maladjustment Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	46.82	13.09	84	-.97
POST-TOUR	48.20	14.91		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning social maladjustment for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on social maladjustment.

Table - 4-B
Jesness Inventory

Value Orientation

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	55.56	10.56	84	1.35
POST-TOUR	54.27	13.13		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning value orientation for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on value orientation.

Table - 4C
Jesness Inventory

Immaturity Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	56.52	12.44	84	-.39
POST-TOUR	56.01	13.19		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning immaturity for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on immaturity.

Table - 4D
Jesness Inventory

Autism Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	57.71	10.77	84	.00
POST-TOUR	57.71	11.55		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning autism for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on autism.

Table - 4-E
Jesness Inventory

Alienation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	56.26	10.35	84	-1.50
POST-TOUR	57.60	11.68		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning alienation for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on alienation.

Table - 4-F
Jesness Inventory

Manifest Aggression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	54.27	9.89	84	2.45
POST-TOUR	52.07	12.36		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There was a significant change concerning manifest aggression for the experimental group following the tour. Reject the hypothesis: accept the alternative hypothesis; the tours do seem to affect a desirable (decrease) change on manifest aggression.

Table - 4-G
Jesness Inventory

Withdrawal Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	53.27	11.09	84	.45
POST-TOUR	52.80	10.69		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning withdrawl for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on withdrawal.

Table - 4-H
Jesness Inventory

Social Anxiety Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	46.79	9.93	84	2.17
POST-TOUR	44.69	12.47		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There was a significant change concerning social anxiety for the experimental group following the tour.

Reject the null hypothesis: the tours seem to affect a desirable (decrease) change on social anxiety.

Table - 4-I
Jesness Inventory

Repression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	53.54	11.68	84	.18
POST-TOUR	53.33	13.17		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning repression for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on repression.

Table - 4-J
Jesness Inventory

Denial Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	45.62	11.56	84	-.34
POST-TOUR	46.00	11.77		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning denial for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on denial.

Table - 4-K
Jesness Inventory

Asocial Index

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	43.89	14.52	84	-1.41
POST-TOUR	46.46	14.55		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning asocial index for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on asocial index.

Appendix 1-C

t TEST FOR INDEPENDENT MEANS,
ONLY THOSE SUBJECTS NEVER CONTACTED BY POLICE

NON-CONTACTED

Table - 5

Piers Harris

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	58.13	60.61	10.72	10.93	48	-.78	PRE
OST-TOUR	57.45	63.00	12.40	13.68	45	-1.40	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning self-concept between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on self-concept as a result of the tours.

NON-CONTACTED

Table - 6-A
Jesness Inventory

Social Maladjustment Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
'RE-TOUR	45.50	48.56	11.21	14.00	48	-.84	PRE
'OST-TOUR	45.19	47.44	15.45	14.70	45	-.48	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning social maladjustment between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on social maladjustment as a result of the tours.

NON-CONTACTED

Table - 6-B
Jesness Inventory

Value Orientation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	53.78	49.00	11.97	11.21	48	1.39	PRE
OST-TOUR	53.00	47.81	14.37	15.44	45	1.14	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning value orientation between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on value orientation as a result of the tours.

NON-CONTACTED

Table - 6-C
Jesness Inventory

Immaturity Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	59.47	59.94	13.61	14.44	48	-.12	PRE
OST-TOUR	60.71	57.69	15.43	13.27	45	.67	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning immaturity between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on immaturity as a result of the tours.

Table - 6-D
Jesness Inventory

NON-CONTACTED

Autism Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	55.19	55.78	13.18	8.71	48	-.17	PRE
POST-TOUR	60.71	57.69	15.43	13.27	45	.67	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning autism between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effec on autism as a result of the tours.

NON-CONTACTED

Table - 6-E
Jesness Inventory

Alienation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	55.38	54.00	10.39	11.34	48	.43	PRE
OST-TOUR	56.19	53.69	13.51	10.84	45	.65	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning alienation between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on alienation as a result of the tours.

NON-CONTACTED

Table - 6-F
Jesness Inventory
Manifest Aggression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	52.06	47.28	10.49	11.57	48	1.18	PRE
OST-TOUR	50.03	47.06	15.09	11.70	45	.69	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning manifest aggression between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on manifest aggression as a result of the tours.

NON-CONTACTED

Table - 6-H
Jesness Inventory
Social Anxiety Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	45.50	44.17	7.73	7.18	48	.60	PRE
OST-TOUR	43.19	40.13	12.54	9.56	45	.86	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning social anxiety between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on social anxiety as a result of the tours.

NON-CONTACTED

Table - 6-I
Jesness Inventory

Repression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	57.34	55.83	10.50	13.37	48	.44	PRE
OST-TOUR	58.29	52.44	14.14	11.51	45	1.43	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning repression between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no signficant effect on repression as a result of the tours.

NON-CONTACTED

Table - 6-J
Jesness Inventory
Denial Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	48.06	53.89	11.99	10.86	48	-1.75	PRE
POST-TOUR	47.81	51.38	14.32	9.32	45	- .90	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There was no significant difference concerning denial between the experimental (tour) and control groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no effect on denial as a result of the tours.

NON-CONTACTED

Table - 6-K
Jesness Inventory

Asocial Index

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	42.69	49.61	12.35	14.11	48	-1.81	PRE
OST-TOUR	44.39	47.68	14.49	12.42	45	.78	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There was no significant difference concering asocial index between the exerimental (tour) and control groups before and after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: There is no significant effect on asocial index as a result of the tours.

Appendix 1-D

t TEST FOR INDEPENDENT MEANS, ONLY THOSE SUBJECTS CONTACTED BY POLICE

Table - 7

Piers-Harris

POLICE CONTACTED

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	51.37	53.04	14.23	12.88	55	-.46	PRE
OST-TOUR	51.64	54.20	15.36	12.97	51	-.66	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning self concept between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on self concept as a result of the tours.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 8-A
Jesness Inventory

Social Maladjustment Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	47.84	53.07	13.56	14.31	56	-1.43	PRE
OST-TOUR	47.86	56.80	14.34	14.05	52	-2.31	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There was no significant difference concerning social maladjustment between the experimental (tour) and control groups before the tours. There was a significant difference following the tours. However, the control group's mean was increased and the experimental group's mean stayed about the same. The difference was probably due to a confounding influence rather than a result of the tour.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 8-B
Jesness Inventory
Value Orientation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	57.94	57.30	8.17	9.33	56	.28	PRE
OST-TOUR	55.76	58.00	11.61	10.00	52	-.75	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning value orientation between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on value orientation as a result of the tours.

Table - 8-C-
Jesness Inventory

Immaturity Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
\E-TOUR	55.45	58.59	11.00	12.79	56	-1.01	PRE
)ST-TOUR	56.24	62.84	10.91	10.27	52	-2.28	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There was no significant difference concerning immaturity between the experimental (tour) and control groups before the tours. There was a significant difference following the tours.

The control group showed the largest mean increase between pre and post tests. It is difficult to say whether the tour had any effect on the tour participants. Likely, confounding influences affected the outcome.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 8-D
Jcsness Inventory

Autism Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	59.07	61.82	7.04	10.13	56	-1.21	PRE
POST-TOUR	59.72	60.88	9.02	8.64	52	- .48	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning autism between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on autism as a result of the tours.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 8-E
Jesness Inventory

Alienation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	57.42	60.67	9.94	10.84	56	-1.27	PRE
POST-TOUR	59.21	61.24	9.52	9.47	52	- .73	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concering alienation between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on alientation as a result of the tours.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 8-F
Jesness Inventory

Manifest Aggression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	56.52	55.70	9.65	9.38	56	.32	PRE
OST-TOUR	54.93	54.40	10.57	10.46	52	.19	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning manifest aggression between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on manifest aggression as a result of the tours.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 8-G
Jesness Inventory

Withdrawal Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	56.03	52.78	12.60	9.44	56	1.10	PRE
OST-TOUR	56.21	48.88	8.08	10.28	52	2.93	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There was no significant difference concerning withdrawal between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before the tours. There was a sinnificant difference following tours. However, the greatest mean difference was between the control group pre-post thus is probably the result of confounding influences.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 8-H
Jesness Inventory
Social Anxiety Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	48.45	45.68	12.59	9.26	56	.95	PRE
POST-TOUR	46.28	42.28	14.65	12.71	52	1.06	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning social anxiety between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on social anxiety as a result of the tours.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 8-I
Jesness Inventory

Repression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	51.03	52.89	12.11	10.61	56	-.62	PRE
OST-TOUR	49.28	56.88	13.02	10.29	52	-2.35	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There was no significant difference concering repression between the experimental (tour) and control groups before the tours. However, following the tours there was a significant difference possibly the result of the tours.

Reject the null hypothesis: the tours may have affected the repression scale for those youth also have been contacted by police for minor infractions.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 8-J
Jesness Inventory

Denial Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	42.39	43.07	10.32	8.54	56	-.27	PRE
POST-TOUR	42.38	45.12	8.58	9.18	52	-1.13	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning denial between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on denial as a result of the tours.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 8-K
Jesness Inventory

Asocial Index

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	44.45	47.04	16.47	15.32	56	-.62	PRE
POST-TOUR	44.66	52.32	14.41	13.17	52	-2.03	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There was no significant difference concerning asocial index between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before the tour. There was a significant difference following the tours. A large pre - post mean difference occurred with the control group and not the experimental groups. The significant difference is probably the result of confounding influences.

Appendix 1-E

t TEST FOR INDEPENDENT MEANS, ONLY THOSE SUBJECTS PETITIONED TO COURT FOR LEGAL VIOLATIONS

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 9
Jesness Inventory

Piers Harris

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	56.40	53.25	11.30	13.47	43	.85	PRE
OST-TOUR	57.92	55.88	13.08	12.55	40	.50	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning self concept between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on self concept as a result of the tours.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 10-A
Jesness Inventory

Social Maladjustment

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
PRE-TOUR	47.20	53.57	15.46	10.15	44	-1.62	PRE
POST-TOUR	52.32	56.88	14.50	14.34	39	- .99	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning social maladjustment between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on social maladjustment as a result of the tours.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 10-B
Jesness Inventory

Value Orientation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
E-TOUR	55.16	56.14	10.86	8.60	44	-.34	PRE
ST-TOUR	54.12	54.62	9.74	12.28	39	-.15	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning value orientation between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on value orientation as a result of the tours.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 10-C
Jesness Inventory

Immaturity Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	55.56	52.81	13.11	11.08	44	.76	PRE
OST-TOUR	53.32	56.94	11.82	17.34	39	-.80	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning immaturity between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on immaturity as a result of the tours.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 10-D
Jesness Inventory

Autism Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	59.60	57.00	10.71	11.90	44	.78	PRE
OST-TOUR	55.96	57.75	9.49	9.31	39	-.59	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning autism between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on autism as a result of the tours.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 10-E
Jesness Inventory

Alienation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	56.52	59.33	10.81	7.51	44	-1.01	PRE
OST-TOUR	57.48	61.69	10.31	7.48	39	-1.41	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning alienation between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on alientation as a result of the tours.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 10-F
Jesness Inventory

Manifest Aggression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
E-TOUR	53.68	53.71	8.77	9.50	44	-.01	PRE
ST-TOUR	51.28	50.94	10.17	10.99	39	.10	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning manifest aggression between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on manifest aggression as a result of the tours.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 10-G
Jesness Inventory

Withdrawal Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	50.04	51.23	8.02	10.69	44	-.43	PRE
OST-TOUR	49.20	50.13	9.55	8.76	39	-.31	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning withdrawal between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on withdrawal as a result of the tours.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 10-H
Jesness Inventory

Social Anxiety Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	46.08	43.95	8.52	11.04	44	.74	PRE
OST-TOUR	44.64	43.13	9.53	10.34	39	.48	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning social anxiety between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on social anxiety as a result of the tours.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 10-I
Jesness Inventory

Repression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	51.32	49.95	12.18	10.53	44	.40	PRE
OST-TOUR	51.88	52.00	10.25	13.02	39	-.03	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning repression between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on repression as a result of the tours.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 10-J
Jesness Inventory

Denial Scale

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
RE-TOUR	46.76	47.52	11.96	11.04	44	-.22	PRE
OST-TOUR	47.92	45.13	10.91	10.67	39	.81	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning denial between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on denial as a result of the tours.

Table - 10-K
Jesness Inventory

Asocial Index

	Experimental Mean	Control Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Control Standard Deviation	Degress Freedom	T-Value	
'RE-TOUR	44.88	50.71	15.42	12.57	44	-1.39	PRE
OST-TOUR	51.12	53.00	14.28	15.30	39	- .40	POST

(Method: t test for independent samples)

There is no significant difference concerning asocial index between the experimental (tour) and control (non-tour) groups before or after the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: there is no significant effect on asocial index as a result of the tours.

Appendix 1-F

t TEST FOR RELATED MEANS,
ONLY THOSE SUBJECTS NEVER CONTACTED BY THE POLICE

NON CONTACTED

Table -11
Piers Harris

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	58.39	10.79		
			30	60
POST-TOUR	57.45	12.40		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning self concept for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on self concept.

Table - 12-A
Jesness Inventory

NON CONTACTED

Social Maladjustment Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	45.65	11.37		
			30	.22
POST-TOUR	45.19	15.45		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning Social Maladjustment for the experimental group following the tours. Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on Social Maladjustment.

Table - 12-B
Jesness Inventory

NON CONTACTED

Value Orientation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	54.00	12.10		
			30	.87
POST-TOUR	53.00	14.37		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning value orientation for the experimental group following the tours. Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on Value Orientation.

NON CONTACTED

Table - 12-C
Jesness Inventory

Immaturity Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	59.03	13.61		
			30	.91
POST-TOUR	60.71	15.43		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning immaturity for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on immaturity.

Table - 12-C
Jesness Inventory

NON CONTACTED

Autism Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	55.32	13.38		
			30	.73
POST-TOUR	57.21	14.79		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning Autism for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on Autism.

Table - 12-D
Jesness Inventory

NON CONTACTED

Alienation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	55.48	10.54		
			30	-.46
POST-TOUR	56.19	13.51		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning alienation for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on alienation.

Table 12-E
Jesness Inventory

NON CONTACTED

Manifest Aggression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	52.39	10.50		
			30	1.24
POST-TOUR	50.03	15.09		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning manifest aggression for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on manifest aggression.

Table - 12-F
Jesness Inventory

NON CONTACTED

Withdrawal Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	53.52	10.95		
			30	.48
POST-TOUR	52.52	12.80		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning withdrawal for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on withdrawal.

Table - 12-G
Jesness Inventory

NON CONTACTED

Social Anxiety Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	45.52	7.85		
			30	1.32
POST-TOUR	43.19	12.54		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning social anxiety for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on social anxiety.

Table - 12-H
Jesness Inventory

NON CONTACTED

Repression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	57.19	10.63		
			30	-.58
POST-TOUR	58.29	14.14		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning repression for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on repression.

NON CONTACTED

Table - 12-I
Jesness Inventory

Denial Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	47.55	11.83		
			30	-.11
POST-TOUR	47.81	14.32		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning Denial for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on Denial.

NON CONTACTED

Table - 12-J
Jesness Inventory

Asocial Study

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	42.71	12.55		
POST-TOUR	44.39	14.49	30	-.57

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning Asocial Study for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on Asocial Study.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 13
Piers Harris

Self Concept

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	52.00	14.65		
			26	-.03
POST-TOUR	52.07	15.48		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning self concept for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on self concept.

Table - 14-A
Jessness Inventory

Social Maladjustment Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	47.76	12.97		
			28	-.04
POST-TOUR	47.86	14.34		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning social maladjustment the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on social maladjustment.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table -14-B
Jessness Inventory

Value Orientation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	57.59	8.33		
			28	.86
POST-TOUR	55.76	11.61		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning value orientation for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on value orientation.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 14-C
Jesness Inventory

Immaturity Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	54.66	10.36		
			28	-.80
POST-TOUR	56.24	10.91		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning immaturity for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on immaturity.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 14-D
Jesness Inventory

Autism Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	58.62	6.92		
POST-TOUR	59.72	9.02	28	-.76

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning Autism for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on Autism.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 14-E
Jesness Inventory

Alienation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	56.86	10.04		
			28	1.47
POST-TOUR	59.21	10.84		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning alienation for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on alienation.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 14-F
Jesness Inventory

Manifest Aggression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	56.79	9.93		
			28	1.64
POST-TOUR	54.93	10.57		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning manifest aggression for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on manifest aggression.

Table -14-G
Jesness Inventory

Withdrawal Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	55.79	13.00		
			28	-.26
POST-TOUR	56.21	8.08		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning withdrawal for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on withdrawal.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table -14-H
Jesness Inventory

Social Anxiety Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	48.76	12.69		
			28	1.32
POST-TOUR	46.28	14.65		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning social anxiety for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on social anxiety.

Table - 14-I
Jesness Inventory

Repression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	51.55	16.75		
			28	1.19
POST-TOUR	49.28	13.02		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning repression for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on repression.

POLICE CONTACTED

Table - 14-J
Jesness Inventory

Denial Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	42.59	10.66		
			28	.16
POST-TOUR	42.38	8.58		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning Denial for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on Denial.

POLICE CONTACTED:

Table - 14-K
Jesness Inventory

Asocial Index

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	44.31	16.04		
POST-TOUR	44.66	14.41	28	-.10

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning asocial index for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on asocial index.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 15

Piers Harris

Self Concept

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	56.40	11.30		
			24	-.71
POST-TOUR	57.92	13.08		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning self concept for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on self concept.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 16-A

Jesness Inventory

Social Maladjustment Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	47.20	15.46		
			24	-1.96
POST-TOUR	52.32	14.50		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning social maladjustment for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on social maladjustment.

COURT CONTACTED

Table -16-B
Jesness Inventory

Value Orientation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	55.16	10.86		
			24	.64
POST-TOUR	54.12	9.74		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning value orientation for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: The tours had no significant effect on value orientation.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 16-C
Jesness Inventory

Immaturity Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	55.56	13.11	24	.81
POST-TOUR	53.32	11.82		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning immaturity for the experimental group following the tours.

Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on immaturity.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 16-D
Jesness Inventory

Autism Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	59.60	10.70		
			24	2.62
POST-TOUR	55.96	9.49		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There was significant change concerning autism for the experimental group following the tours. Reject the null hypothesis: the tours had a significant (desirable) affect on autism.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 16- E
Jesness Inventory

Alienation Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	56.52	10.81		
			24	-.62
POST-TOUR	57.48	10.31		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning alienation for the experimental group following the tours. Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on alienation.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 16-F
Jesness Inventory

Manifest Aggression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	53.68	8.77	24	1.60
POST-TOUR	51.28	10.17		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning manifest aggression for the experimental group following the tours. Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on manifest aggression.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 16-G
Jesness Inventory

Withdrawal Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	50.04	8.02	24	.49
POST-TOUR	49.20	9.55		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning withdrawal for the experimental group following the tours. Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on withdrawal.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 16-H
Jesness Inventory

Social Anxiety Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	46.08	8.52	24	1.07
POST-TOUR	44.64	9.53		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning social anxiety for the experimental group following the tours. Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on social anxiety.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 16-I
Jesness Inventory

Repression Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	51.32	12.18	24	-.25
POST-TOUR	51.88	10.25		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning repression for the experimental group following the tours. Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on repression.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 16-J
Jesness Inventory

Denial Scale

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	46.76	11.96	24	-.70
POST-TOUR	47.92	10.91		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is no significant change concerning denial for the experimental group following the tours. Retain the null hypothesis: the tours had no significant effect on denial.

COURT CONTACTED

Table - 16-K
Jesness Inventory

Asocial Index

	Experimental Mean	Experimental Standard Deviation	Degrees Freedom	t-Value
PRE-TOUR	44.88	15.42	24	-2.06
POST-TOUR	51.12	14.28		

(Method: t test for related samples)

There is significant change concerning asocial index for the experimental group following the tours. Reject the null hypothesis: the tours had undesirable significant effect on asocial index.