

70-22,979

CREWS, Norma Conley, 1924-
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF LIFE AND
ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL ORIENTATION OF JUVENILE
DELINQUENTS LIVING IN DETENTION.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1970
Education, special

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF LIFE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD
SCHOOL ORIENTATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS LIVING IN DETENTION

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

NORMA CONLEY CREWS

Norman, Oklahoma

1970

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF LIFE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD
SCHOOL ORIENTATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS LIVING IN DETENTION

APPROVED BY

J. T. T. T. T.
O. D. D. D. D.
Mary Clare J. Petty
Leah P. Williams

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation and gratitude to all those who have assisted and encouraged her in the completion of this study. Special gratitude is expressed to Dr. P. T. Teska, Chairman of the Committee, for aiding the writer to grow in maturity as a person over a period of several years. Without this help, this study would never have been undertaken. Gratitude is also extended to Dr. Omer J. Rupiper, who helped immeasurably in planning the study and to Dr. Mary C. Petty for her kind and considerate cooperation on the committee.

The writer is especially indebted to the Programs for Exceptional Children and to the teachers in the classes for social deviates at the Juvenile Detention Homes in DeKalb, Fulton, and Clayton Counties in Georgia. Their cooperation in permitting the writer to interview their students and administer the survey instrument is genuinely appreciated. Also, a special expression of gratitude is given to Mrs. Alice Fish who scored all tests six times each and accompanied the writer throughout the data collection.

The writer is deeply grateful for the quiet vote of confidence expressed by her colleague, Dr. Marvin M. Cole. He also allowed her the freedom to complete this study.

Finally, the author expresses sincere appreciation to her parents, Mary and Nolan Conley, her husband, Luther William, and her children, William, Mary, and Danny for support and inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Background Research	2
Statement of the Problem.	5
Hypotheses.	7
II. METHOD.	10
The Subjects.	10
The Procedures.	12
The Instruments	12
Analysis of Data.	15
III. RESULTS	17
Experimental Hypotheses Concerning Attitudes Toward School Orientation	17
Experimental Hypotheses Concerning Perceptions of Life	24
IV. DISCUSSION.	29
Conclusions	31
Implications for Further Research	32
Chapter	
V. SUMMARY	35
REFERENCES	37
APPENDIX A	40
APPENDIX B	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Mean Scores of Social Deviates and National Norms.	18
2. Mean Intercorrelation Coefficients of Subscales (Experimental Group)	19
3. Mean Intercorrelation Coefficients of Subscales (Control Group).	20
4. Reliability of the SSHA - Form H	21
5. Mean Amount of Attitude Change SSHA Total Groups	22
6. The Means of Amount of Attitude Change From Pretest to Posttest SSHA	23
7. Total Responses on Life Perception Interviews.	25
8. Total Life Perceptions, Results, <u>Chi-Square</u> Test	26
9. Perception of Life While in Detention, Results, <u>Chi-Square</u> Test.	27

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF LIFE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD
SCHOOL ORIENTATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS LIVING IN DETENTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Social deviation in our schools and society among adolescents has been categorized into two kinds of maladjustment, namely, "emotionally disturbed," and "juvenile delinquent." Studies of emotionally disturbed adolescents tend to deal with socio-economic background, I.Q., family background, etc. (Glueck and Glueck, 1950). Recent research findings, however, point to the idea that the two concepts of social deviation cannot be separated and both psychological and sociological factors are significant in the etiology of the group to be dealt with in this study (Hathaway and Monachesi, 1963). Whether social deviates are to be defined in a legalistic manner as children between seven and seventeen which violate the law or as children who exhibit antisocial or asocial aggressive behavior unapproved by the community, the problem is a complex one. The implications of the problem of social deviation for education demand studies to aid in character, since a "preventive medicine" of personality and character is as necessary as early medical examination and preventive treatment of physical disorders (Glueck and Glueck, 1962).

The follow-up of these findings needs to be evaluated, especially in the areas related to school.

The present study is designed to assess the attitudes of social deviates who are in detention in a Juvenile Home residential setting toward how they perceive life and the way they perceive school orientation in an attempt to ascertain if the special education classes for social deviates make any difference in these attitudes. Since it has been established that social deviation and school failure are related, attitudes of the social deviate toward school are significant in determining how they are related.

Background Research

The first appearance of social deviance as a social problem appeared in the literature in 1823 when a New York philanthropic society changed its name from the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism to the Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents (Cavan, 1964). However, Cavan points out that there was an institution in the world for the treatment of delinquent youth in Rome in 1704. The problem was presented with the title "The Habit of Going to the Devil," by Hulbert (1926) reported that in 1827 the youth constituted half the number of persons convicted of crimes in the nation. In 1938 a startling study of juvenile social deviates in New York City revealed 54.8 percent were less than 21 when convicted (Harrison and Grant, 1939).

Studies of social deviates were reported by the Children's Bureau around 1940 when Juvenile Courts began to keep statistics (Perlman, 1953). Social deviation with reference to the schools appears in the

literature very rarely until the early 1950's and delinquency as an important problem in education was studied by Brownell (1954). Samuel Miller Brownell, former commissioner for the United States Office of Education substantiated that education has not been fully successful in that it has not been able to prevent an increase in social deviation. In a child welfare experiment in New Jersey it was found that schools may produce delinquency (Kvaraceus, 1945). He stated that "much of the school data points to a multiplicity of unwholesome, unsatisfactory, unhappy, and frustrating situations in which delinquents are enmeshed."

Educator Bertram M. Beck (1964) reports extensively in the decade of the fifties and points out that the "social delinquent" can respond to a curriculum especially designed to enrich his experiences and serve as a supplement where his neighborhood or family milieu is deprived. This is one of the early studies of how education could meet the special needs of social deviates. Beck's study was reported on a school for delinquent girls.

A search of the recent (since 1959) literature is of primary interest to this study. Studies specifically related to the adolescent and his relationship with school are prevalent. In a study concerning the low school status as a predisposing factor of the delinquent, Jackson (1961) revealed that high status boys who were not intellectually successful were as likely as low status boys to seek companions with delinquency records and to have delinquency records. Though studies of this nature established some of the causes for school failure as related to delinquent behavior, a number of factors have not been studied. Studies continue to reveal that especially large-city schools are increasingly responsible

for the rising rate of delinquency and social maladjustment among youth (Kvaraceus, 1966). There is much in the literature that indicates more research is needed to know how the school contributes to social deviation.

Graham (1963) showed that public schools confuse the rewarding of success with the alleviation of distress. He concluded that methods of appraising achievement must be more realistic to and for the deviate individual.

Landis (1963) found marked correlation between the scores on the value and opportunity instruments and scores on measures of delinquency. His study supported the contention that value orientation is related to delinquency proneness.

A study on recidivism found that juvenile crime and delinquency are directly related to achievement failure (Mandel, 1965). He further suggests that communities engage in educational programs to meet these needs.

The probable syndrome in terms of educational experiences which precipitates delinquency and eventual incarceration was studied. The results showed a strong positive relationship between school experiences, drop-outs, and incarceration (Simons, Burke, 1966).

Another study which substantiates Jackson's findings is one reported by Elliott (1966). His study showed delinquency rate to be higher for boys while in school than out of school.

Perhaps the most inclusive survey of the entire field of social deviation has been done by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck (1964). Their definition of the purpose of research in this field is cogent to this discussion. Glueck and Glueck state,

We are concerned with discovering a general relationship between well-defined preceding factors of one type or another and a strong tendency to a specific subsequent course of conduct. Having discovered general relationship, we have at hand much of the crucial information necessary as a guide to experimental programs...We can now attack...those factors which have been found to contribute most frequently and most heavily to the tendency in question. (p. 17)

The more recent studies show a tendency to test specifics rather than generalities concerning the relationship between social deviation and education. Special education for social deviates is a relatively new trend in education. Its results are not known even though experiments on changing behavior are reported frequently.

Eisentein (1968) tested the value system in a neighborhood crisis. As a result of his study, several new instruments have been developed for more specific studies in particular situations.

Tannenbaum (1966) developed a Student's School Attitude Scale which was used for improving instruction in schools for socially maladjusted children and educational services in urban New York.

The researcher was able to find only one study on attitudes as expressed by the social deviates about school orientations. However, it was not designed to involve teacher approval, study habits, or educational acceptance. Some previous studies offer some insight, but an attempt to compare school attitudes was not found.

Statement of the Problem

Since previously indicated research studies have established that there is a relationship between social deviation and school failure and between social deviation and a negative perception of life in general,

the problem in this study is to determine whether, in an experiment controlled in a Juvenile Detention Home environment, special education can make any difference in the way the subjects perceive life as discerned from rating personal interviews and if the special education experience changes attitudes concerning school orientation as measured by the standardized survey instrument described below in the operational definitions.

Operational Definitions

Social Deviate: Any adolescent who has been adjudicated delinquent by the County Courts of DeKalb County, Fulton County, and Clayton County, Georgia, and sentenced to detention in the respective County Juvenile Home.

Attitude Measure: That behavior which is recorded by the subscales and total score of the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, Form H by Brown and Holtzman, for students in junior and senior high school.

Attitude Change: The difference in pretest and posttest results on the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, Form H.

Assessment of Life Perception: Positive and negative ratings obtained from examining and listening to tape recorded personal interviews with the subjects. Interviews were between the writer and the subjects on a one to one basis and followed a guide found in the Appendix.

Major Assumptions

1. The subjects of the study have shown antisocial and/or asocial behavior which is disapproved by the school and society.
2. The students in the special education classes may be considered a normal population of social deviates.

3. The students in the control group who do not attend school may be considered a normal population of social deviates.

4. There is an established relationship between delinquency and school failure.

5. There is an established relationship between delinquency and a negative perception of life in general.

6. Attitudes and life perception are related to overt, delinquent behavior.

7. Attitudes and changes in attitudes toward school orientation can be adequately measured by The Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, Form H.

8. Perception of life in general as positive or negative by the social deviate can be obtained by a personal interview following an interview guide designed by the writer.

9. Under controlled conditions in this study, changes of attitudes can take place over a period of 60 days.

Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that social deviates adjudicated and detained in Juvenile Homes in DeKalb, Fulton, and Clayton Counties in Georgia who were enrolled in special education classes would show a greater positive change in attitudes toward school orientation than those who were detained but who were not enrolled in special education classes. It was further hypothesized that females would change a greater amount in a positive direction than males.

It was also hypothesized that social deviates who were enrolled

in special education classes would perceive total life in general the same way as those who were not enrolled in special education classes. It was further hypothesized that females enrolled in special education classes would perceive life in general the same way as females who were not enrolled and males enrolled in special education classes would perceive life in general the same way as those who were not enrolled. It was further hypothesized that social deviates who were enrolled in special education classes would perceive life at the time of detention with more positive responses than those who were not enrolled.

The following null hypotheses were tested for statistical significance:

1. H₁ Students enrolled in the special education classes show more attitude change in a positive direction than those social deviates who were not enrolled in the special education classes.
2. H₂ Of those students enrolled in the special education classes, boys show less attitude change in a positive direction than girls.
3. H₃ There is no difference in the frequency of positive and negative responses to total Life Perception by those students enrolled in special education classes and those social deviates who were not enrolled in the special education classes.
4. H₄ There is no difference in the frequency of positive and negative responses to total Life Perception by those female students enrolled in special education classes and those female social deviates who were not enrolled in the special education classes.
5. H₅ There is no difference in the frequency of positive and negative response to total Life Perception by those male students

enrolled in special education classes and those male social deviates who were not enrolled in the special education classes.

6. ⁶H Students enrolled in the special education classes give a greater frequency of positive responses to Life Perception while in Detention than those social deviates who were not enrolled in special education classes.

1. ¹H ⁰H : $\bar{X}....1.. = \bar{X}....2..$
¹H : $\bar{X}....1.. > \bar{X}....2..$
2. ²H ⁰H : $\bar{X}....1.. = \bar{X}....2..$
¹H : $\bar{X}....1.. < \bar{X}....2..$
3. ³H ⁰H : $f....1.. = f....2..$
¹H : $f....1.. \neq f....2..$
4. ⁴H ⁰H : $Ff....1.. = Ff....2..$
¹H : $Ff....1.. \neq Ff....2..$
5. ⁵H ⁰H : $Mf....1.. = Mf....2..$
¹H : $Mf....1.. \neq Mf....2..$
6. ⁶H ⁰H : $f....1.. = f....2..$
¹H : $f....1.. > f....2..$

The level of statistical significance required to support the trial hypotheses, the t tests and the chi square tests was at $p < .05$.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

The Subjects

The subjects in this study were 90 males and females adjudicated by the Juvenile Courts to be delinquent and sentenced to live in detention in the County Juvenile Homes of DeKalb, Fulton, and Clayton Counties in Georgia.

The subjects chosen for the experimental group were enrolled in one of the special education classes from the three counties. The sample was limited to all those students between the ages of 13-16 enrolled in the classes who possessed normal or above intelligence as shown by previous school records, and who showed ability to read the items on the survey instrument which was administered. Twenty-two males and 23 females were included in the experimental group of subjects. Delinquents are enrolled in the special education classes on a first come, first serve basis since the facilities at the schools are not adequate to allow all who live in detention to attend and thus represented a random sample of delinquents sentenced by the court to live in detention. Subjects are listed in Appendix A.

The subjects for the control group were sampled at random from all of the delinquents living in detention who were not enrolled in special

education classes. They were drawn by number by attendants working in the homes. A proportionate number of females and males were drawn according to the population living in detention at the time. These subjects were then checked to see if school records indicated normal or above intelligence and if they possessed the ability to read the survey instrument. In cases where the subjects drawn could not meet these assumptions they were replaced by others chosen at random who could meet them. Nineteen females and 26 males made up the control group of subjects. The subjects in this group were also between the ages of 13-16. Control subjects are listed in Appendix A.

In order to check the variable of how the subjects perceived life and to determine if the experimental group differed in this respect from the control group, 15 subjects were chosen from the experimental group and 15 subjects were chosen from the control group to be interviewed by the writer. These subjects were chosen at random and proportionately sampled as to the females and males who had been administered the survey instrument and who were living in detention at the time of the interviews.

The choosing of the subjects for this study controlled the variables of age, intelligence, environment, school attendance or non-school attendance, reading ability, and since subjects were chosen from Juvenile Homes from three different counties and three different socio-economic areas in Georgia, it is assumed that all levels of socio-economic factors were represented in the 90 subjects.

Although there was no attempt to control grade level in choosing the subjects, the range varied from grades 7-11. This range was within the limits of the survey instrument chosen to check the hypotheses

concerning attitudes toward school orientation.

Procedures

The design for this study utilized two methods of experimentation. First, a pretest-posttest design with a 60-day interval between the pretest and posttest administrations attempted to find out if significant changes in attitudes toward school orientation occurred between the experimental and control groups.

Next, personal, tape-recorded interviews were held with thirty of the subjects previously administered the attitude survey to determine if members of the control group perceived life in general in the same way as members of the experimental group.

The Instruments

The instrument utilized to collect data on attitudes toward school orientation was The Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, Form H for students in junior and senior high school by William F. Brown and Wayne H. Holtzman and published by the Psychological Corporation, New York. This instrument consists of seven scales measuring attitudes of Delay Avoidance, Work Methods, Study Habits, Teacher Approval, Education Acceptance, Study Attitudes and yielded a total attitude score termed School Orientation. High scores on this instrument correlate positively with success in school and low scores correlate positively with failure in school.

Research has been completed on the SSHA (Buros 5th edition) to establish its reliability and validity. Because of its low correlation

with measures of scholastic aptitude and its appreciable relationship to academic success, it appeared suitable for research investigations of the educational process. The total score represents the Attitude toward School Orientation variable in this research design and specific subscale scores served as checks on the attitudes of the groups studied. Subscale scores were also used as checks on changes in attitude on each of the subscales of Delay Avoidance, Work Method, Study Habits, Teacher Approval, Education Acceptance and Study Attitudes in this pretest-posttest research design.

Also, an Interview Guide was designed by the writer which contains four unstructured or semi-structured, open-ended questions and was used to collect information on how a sample of the total number of subjects given the SSHA perceived life before, during and after the experience of living in detention in a Juvenile Home. One-half of those interviewed were a part of the experimental group and one-half were a part of the control group in this study. Rating scales were designed by the writer to check the positive and negative perceptions verbally expressed by the subjects during the interviews.

Administration of the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes

All subjects in the experimental and control groups were administered the pretest during their first month in detention in one of the three Juvenile Homes studied and the same instrument was administered to all subjects 60 days after the pretest was administered. The posttest was administered to determine the amount of change in attitude toward school orientation which had occurred during this period.

The SSHA's were administered in small groups of from four to six

subjects. The experimental subjects were administered the surveys by the writer and the teachers in the classrooms. The classrooms were quiet and pleasant during the time the subjects were responding to the surveys. The control group subjects were administered the surveys by the writer in the day rooms of the Juvenile Homes. Attendants were present either in adjoining rooms or in the day rooms themselves. The small groups in the control group sat around tables and the surroundings were quiet. Both the experimental and control subjects were behind locked doors at the time the surveys were administered.

Method of Interview

Thirty of the subjects, 15 from the experimental group chosen at random by the attendants and 15 from the control group chosen at random by the teachers were interviewed by the writer on a one to one basis and the interviews were recorded by tape. In the course of the interviews, each subject was asked four open-ended questions about how he perceived life in general in his or her past, present and future. These interviews were played back by the writer and rated as to positive and negative responses for each individual subject. An individual record sheet containing the rating scale was used for each subject and the total number of positive and negative responses given in the interview were recorded.

Total negative and positive responses were recorded for the experimental group and control group and the chi square statistical test was performed on the frequencies to ascertain any significant difference in life perceptions between the groups.

Interviews in all Juvenile Homes were held in small offices which

adjoined day rooms. For the most part, the rooms were quiet and all were behind the locked doors of the detention areas. The subject and the writer were alone in the room for the interview and away from any other activities going on in the building at the time. The subject sat at the side of an office desk with the small tape recorder in front of him and the interviewer sat at the end of the desk at right angles with the subject. The physical proximity of the interviewer and the subject was such that they could use the same microphone which was placed on the desk. The fact that the interview was to be tape recorded for the writer's convenience in completing a study was explained by the writer to each subject and he or she was given the choice of whether or not to participate in the interview. Two subjects chosen for an interview did not wish to take part and two others who did wish to be interviewed were chosen at random by the attendants to participate. Ratings of the interviews were made from listening to the tapes after the interviews were all completed. Ratings were determined during one weekend when all could be listened to again over a relatively short period of time consisting of about 17 hours with only time for eating and sleeping intervening, in order that objectivity in hearing all of the interviews could be maintained.

Analysis of Data

In order to test the first two hypotheses of this study, t tests (Downie and Heath, 1956) were used. Means of the two groups were compared on one independent variable, namely, attitude change toward school orientation or the total score on the SSHA instrument. Means of the two groups were also compared on all subscores..

Reliability of internal consistency of the SSHA instrument was statistically checked by utilizing the Kuder-Richardson 8. (Kuder and Richardson, 1937).

Trial hypotheses three, four and five were tested by applying chi square (Ferguson, 1966) to the frequencies of positive and negative responses given by a random sample of subjects to questions asked in personal, tape-recorded interviews.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Experimental Hypotheses Concerning Attitudes Toward School Orientation

Twenty females and twenty males from the experimental group completed both the pretest and posttest on the SSHA. Nineteen females and twenty-three males from the control group completed both the pretest and posttest on the SSHA. A total of eighty-two subjects were administered both the pretest and posttest on the SSHA. Table 1 reveals the mean scores of the experimental and control groups as compared the national norms on which the SSHA was standardized. As indicated in assumption four in Chapter I, social deviation is related to school failure, and the subjects in this study scored substantially below the mean when compared with national norms on the SSHA.

The reliability of internal consistency of the SSHA instrument was revealed to be adequate as shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4. Correlation coefficients relating all of the subscales were obtained by using the Kuder-Richardson 8, and Table 3 revealed the lowest correlation coefficient to be .4921 between Delay Avoidance and Teacher Attitude on the posttest for the Control Group. The highest correlation coefficient revealed is .9401 between Study Attitudes and School Orientation on the pretest for

the Control Group. Intercorrelation coefficients for the Experimental Group varied from .5120 when the relationship between Delay Avoidance and Teacher Attitude on the pretest is revealed to .9215 when comparing Study Attitude and School Orientation on the pretest.

TABLE 1
TOTAL STUDY ORIENTATION
MEAN SCORES OF SOCIAL DEVIATES AND NATIONAL NORMS

	Pretest	Posttest	National Norms
Exp. Females	95.9	82.3	100.3
Exp. Males	71.5	84.3	100.3
Con. Females	67.1	67.4	100.3
Con. Males	80.2	78.9	100.3

Table 4 revealed the stability coefficients to indicate the SSHA scores are sufficiently stable to justify their use in assessing the degree of change in attitudes toward school orientation which occurred after the sixty-day period between the pretest and posttest. The standard deviations of the stability coefficients are indicative of homogeneity of variance of the correlation coefficients.

The coefficients as revealed in Tables 2 and 3 show correlations of every subscore and score with every other subscore and score. The coefficients as revealed in Table 4 combine and average all subscore correlations and indicates the reliability of internal consistency of the SSHA.

TABLE 2

MEAN INTERCORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF SUBSCALES

SSHA - FORM H (EXPERIMENTAL GROUP)

<u>Pretest</u>							
	DA	WM	SH	TA	EA	SA	SO
DA		.7310	.9281	.5120	.6523	.6512	.8561
WM			.9316	.5562	.6491	.6329	.8432
SH				.5629	.7218	.6873	.9322
TA					.7481	.9321	.8621
EA						.9281	.8831
SA							.9215
<u>Posttest</u>							
DA		.7296	.9118	.5220	.6712	.6522	.8511
WM			.9216	.5616	.6491	.6219	.8612
SH				.5517	.7217	.6712	.9342
TA					.7318	.9412	.8602
EA						.9110	.8711
SA							.9212

Correlation coefficients of the experimental group show practically no difference from the coefficients of the control group. Internal consistency appears to be the same for all subjects. Noticeable variation occurs only between subscales within each group.

TABLE 3

MEAN INTERCORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF SUBSCALES

SSHA - FORM H (CONTROL GROUP)

<u>Pretest</u>							
	DA	WM	SH	TA	EA	SA	SO
DA		.7112	.9320	.5106	.6408	.6006	.8519
WM			.9115	.5712	.6591	.6361	.8376
SH				.5613	.7308	.6709	.9075
TA					.7411	.9318	.8596
EA						.9007	.8702
SA							.9401
<u>Posttest</u>							
DA		.6921	.9123	.4921	.6681	.6712	.8703
WM			.88875	.5421	.6406	.6208	.8509
SH				.5709	.7382	.6561	.9412
TA					.7012	.9092	.8006
EA						.9121	.9221
SA							.9286

Study Habits (SH) and School Orientation (SO) show inflated correlation coefficients since one score is part of another score with which it is correlated. Work Methods (WM), Delay Avoidance (DA), Teacher Approval (TA), Education Acceptance (EA), and Study Attitudes (SA) are independent correlations.

Table 4 was the result of the correlation data obtained from

averaging the intercorrelation coefficients of the subscores and the scores and the internal consistency coefficients, as shown below, were computed with the Kuder-Richardson Formula 8 for estimating test reliability from the variance of the total scores and the sum of the item variances.

TABLE 4
RELIABILITY OF THE SSHA - FORM H ESTIMATED BY
INTERNAL CONSISTENCY AND STABILITY COEFFICIENTS

Scale	Internal consistency			Stability			
	r	mean	SD	r	test	mean	SD
DA	.9123	18.22	9.81	.9122	pre post	18.62 17.88	7.18 6.10
WM	.8617	20.74	10.85	.9200	pre post	19.82 19.30	9.28 7.36
TA	.8823	20.56	11.03	.8615	pre post	23.25 24.02	6.24 10.20
EA	.8921	20.35	8.73	.8923	pre post	22.40 21.88	8.42 9.90
SO		83.73	38.26	.9206	pre post	83.72 83.28	29.59 30.40

The first hypothesis stated that students enrolled in the special education classes show more attitude change in a positive direction than social deviates who were not enrolled in the special education classes. As shown in Table 5 below, this hypothesis was not supported by the data. There were no significant differences in attitude change in either a positive or negative direction on any of the scores or subscores when the mean amount of change was considered for the total groups.

TABLE 5

MEAN AMOUNT OF ATTITUDE CHANGE

SSHA

df - 80	DA	AM	SH	TA	EA	SA	SO
<u>Total Groups</u>							
Exp.	-0.75	-0.52	-1.02	+0.78	-0.52	+0.58	-0.45
Con.	+9.17	-0.74	-1.17	+0.57	-0.69	-0.26	-0.60
<u>t</u>	- .009	- .007	- .004	+ .007	- .004	+ .009	- .008
<u>P</u>	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

The second hypothesis predicted that of those students enrolled in the special education classes, boys show less attitude change in a positive direction than girls. As revealed in Table 6, this hypothesis was not supported by the data. Rather, the reverse direction for both males and females proved to be the case. The following subscores and scores showed significant change in attitudes, the females changing significantly in a more negative direction after 60 days of special education than the females who did not have special education classes. However, the males who were enrolled in special education classes showed significant change in a number of attitudes in a positive direction.

(1) Females in experimental group changed in a negative direction ($p < .01$) more than females in control group on Delay Avoidance, Study Habits, Teacher Approval, Study Attitudes and ($p < .001$) on Education Acceptance and School Orientation. There was not a significant change in Work Methods.

TABLE 6

THE MEANS OF AMOUNT OF ATTITUDE CHANGE FROM PRETEST TO POSTTEST-SSHA

RESULTS OF t TESTS

Females df - 37		Males df - 41				Total Group df - 80	
	Delay Avoidance	Work Methods	Study Habits	Teacher Approval	Education Acceptance	Study Attitudes	School Orientation
<u>Females</u>							
Exp.	-3.45	-2.35	-5.80	-4.50	-3.95	-7.80	-13.60
Con.	+0.79	-0.74	-1.00	+0.39	-0.37	+0.10	+ 0.32
$\underline{t}$	-2.86	-1.61	-3.23	-2.96	-4.26	-3.19	- 8.18
$\underline{P} <$	.01	NS	.01	.01	.001	.01	.001
<u>Males</u>							
Exp.	+1.95	+1.30	+3.75	+6.05	+2.90	+8.95	+12.70
Con.	-0.35	-0.74	-1.17	+0.65	-0.96	-0.56	- 0.60
$\underline{t}$	+0.88	+0.64	+3.80	+5.29	+1.88	+7.26	+ 9.18
$\underline{P} <$	NS	NS	.001	.001	NS	.001	.001

(2) Males in experimental group changed in a positive direction ($p < .001$) more than males in control group on Study Habits, Teacher Approval, Study Attitudes, and School Orientation. There were not significant changes in Delay Avoidance, Work Methods, and Education Acceptance.

It is indicated that Work Methods was the only subscore on which there was no significant attitude change in either direction for Females, Males, and Total Group. Four subscores, namely, Study Habits, Teacher Approval, Study Attitudes and School Orientation showed significant amounts of attitude changes on both Males and Females when tested separately but they tended to cancel each other out to give no significant changes when tested together, because of the direction of change.

Experimental Hypotheses Concerning Perceptions of Life

Thirty subjects were interviewed, fifteen from the experimental group and fifteen from the control group, in the manner described in Chapter II and Table 7 reveals the number of positive and negative responses on Life Perceptions. The rating scale used for evaluation and a transcribed interview selected at random are found in Appendix B. Only total Life Perception responses were used to check trial hypotheses three, four, and five, since total life in general was the consideration. Table 9 reveals the number of positive and negative responses on Life Perceptions concerning life while in detention and these responses were used to check trial hypothesis six.

TABLE 7

RESPONSES ON LIFE PERCEPTION INTERVIEWS

SUBJECTS	POSITIVE RESPONSE			NEGATIVE RESPONSE		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
<u>Experimental Group</u>	5	3	8	4	3	7
<u>Control Group</u>	4	1	5	5	5	10
<u>Total Life Perceptions</u>	9	4	13	9	8	17

The third hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the frequency of positive and negative responses to total Life Perception by those students enrolled in special education classes and those social deviates who were not enrolled in the special education classes. As shown in Table 8, this hypothesis is supported (chi-square = .000, $df = 1$, $p > .05$, not significant). This table shows that on the rating scales, the experimental group did not perceive total life differently from the control group when the frequencies of positive and negative responses were statistically analyzed.

The fourth hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the frequency of positive and negative responses to total Life Perception by those female students enrolled in special education classes and those female social deviates who were not enrolled in the special education classes. As revealed in Table 8, this hypothesis is supported (chi-square = 1.666, $df = 1$, $p > .05$, not significant). This indicates that according to the application of the statistical analysis, the females in the experimental group did not perceive total life differently than the females in

the control group.

TABLE 8
TOTAL LIFE PERCEPTIONS
RESULTS, CHI-SQUARE TEST

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

	Observed Frequencies		Expected Frequencies		X ²	Results
	Pos.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.		
<u>Females</u>						
Exp.	3	3	2	4		
Con.	1	5	2	4	1.500	NS
<u>Males</u>						
Exp.	5	4	4.5	4.5		
Con.	4	5	4.5	4.5	.224	NS
<u>Total</u>						
Exp.	7	8	6.5	8.5		
Con.	6	9	6.5	8.5	.040	NS

The fifth hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the frequency of positive and negative responses to total Life Perception by those male students enrolled in special education classes and those male social deviates who were not enrolled in the special education classes. As shown in Table 8, this hypothesis is supported (chi-square = 1.272, df = 1, $p > .05$, not significant). This table shows that the males in the experimental group responds to total Life Perception in this evaluation

in the same way as the males in the control group.

The sixth hypothesis stated that students enrolled in the special education classes give a greater frequency of positive responses to the category called Life Perception While in Detention than those social deviates who were not enrolled in special education classes. As revealed in Table 9, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis above is supported (chi-square = 9.600, df = 1, $p < .01$, significant). This table reveals that the experimental group perceived Life While in Detention in a significantly more positive way than the control group. Those enrolled in special education classes gave a significantly greater number of positive responses about Life While in Detention than those social deviates who were not enrolled.

TABLE 9
PERCEPTION OF LIFE WHILE IN DETENTION
RESULTS, CHI-SQUARE TEST

Subjects	Observed Frequencies		Expected Frequencies		χ^2	Results
	Pos.	Neg.	Pos.	Neg.		
<u>Total</u>						
Exp.	9	6	5	10	9.600	significant $p < .01$
Con.	1	14	5	10		

The results show, then, that in the personal interviews, the subjects, as a total group and when separated as females and males, who attended special education classes did not perceive total life any differently than those who did not attend. However, there was a significant

difference in the way those who attended special education classes perceived Life While in Detention, in a positive direction.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Since the first appearance of social deviance as a social problem of youth in the literature in the early 1800's, its causes and effects have been discussed. Social agencies of state and federal governments have found it more expedient to set up Judicial Courts to adjudicate youth who "act out" and build prisons and juvenile homes to detain them than to study the problem and attempt to prevent it. Only around 1940 did the Children's Bureau begin to keep statistics on juvenile delinquents and research before that time was based on conjecture because of inadequate facts.

Social deviation with reference to schools as an important problem in education is not found in the literature until the early 1950's. Kvaraceus concluded (1945) that school data on social deviates points to unwholesome, unsatisfactory, unhappy, and frustrating situations in which these youngsters find themselves both in and out of school. This conclusion tends to summarize many previous findings related to culture involving economic stress, poor housing, impoverished experiences, inadequate family relationships, and ethnic background as factors which co-exist with social deviation.

It was Beck (1964) who studied social deviation in an educational

setting and found that social deviates can respond to a curriculum especially designed to meet their emotional needs and enrich their experiences where the neighborhood or family is not adequate.

Glueck and Glueck (1964) pointed out the need to study specifics in social deviation since general relationship between social deviation and school failure has been well established. Only Eisentein's (1968) study was similar to this study which tested the value system of social deviates in a neighborhood crisis and it does not deal with an educational setting. No other studies were found which tested a specific like attitudes toward school orientation or Life Perception of social deviates.

This study was undertaken to see if subjects living in juvenile homes and attending special education classes changed in attitudes toward school orientation more than subjects like themselves who did not attend special education classes. Did special education classes change the attitudes of social deviates toward school orientation including Study Orientation, Delay Avoidance, Work Methods, Teacher Approval and Education Acceptance while they were detained?

As a companion to this study, personal interviews revealed the way the subjects perceived life in general in order to assess the way the subjects felt about their world of experiences and as a validity check on the results of the study of attitude change about school orientation. Did the subjects enrolled in special education classes perceive life in general any differently from those who were not enrolled? Did special education classes make life any different for those who attended school during the detention period than those who did not attend?

Conclusions

In answer to the question, Did special education classes change attitudes toward various facets of school orientation?, the writer must conclude that the answer is yes. This conclusion holds true, however, only when females and males are studied separately. It also must be concluded that the special education classes apparently had a negative effect on the females while it appears that the special education classes had a positive effect on the attitudes toward school of the males.

The personal interviews to determine how the subjects perceived life served as a companion study to the study of attitudes toward school orientation, as they allowed the writer to look at the subjects from another perspective in relation to the problem of the study.

The results of the interviews served as a validity check on the sample of social deviates chosen for both the experimental and control groups. Since factors of living conditions, age, intelligence, sex, proportion of males and females, and ability to read were all controlled, and the results of the interviews indicated that the subjects in both groups perceived Total Life alike, it follows that assumptions two and three stating that subjects in the special education classes and subjects not in the special education classes may be considered a normal population of social deviates. It is concluded, then, from the results of the interviews that any significant differences found in testing trial hypotheses is more likely due to the special education classes.

It appears that the special education classes did make a difference for the students enrolled in their perception of Life While in

Detention. Life was evidently more bearable for those who were having school experiences. From the writer's observation of the environment, it might be concluded that this was due in part to the emotional and physical release because of the activity experienced at school. Those who were not chosen to attend school were subjected to longer periods of confinement during the day. However, the fact that all experienced confinement part of the day and the only observable difference in environment was school attendance points to the conclusion that the education experiences of the experimental group were positive and made life better for subjects in detention who were allowed to attend school.

The writer also observed by listening to the taped interviews that most of the subjects expressed unhappy circumstances in family relationships, trauma related to themselves, and grave incidents relating to physical and emotional survival. From these observations, it is concluded that special education classes did not counteract the negative responses to Total Life Perception but did make a difference on Life Perception While in Detention.

Implications for Further Research

The results of the attitude survey toward school orientation revealed that further research on social deviates should be done on males and females separately without pooling the data of the two groups. Apparently, male social deviates vary so widely from female social deviates in attitudes that further research should study them as two separate entities.

In order to deal with experimenter confounding such as teacher

differences in the various classrooms, programmed instruction during the waiting period between the pretest and posttest appears to be an implication for an improved study of attitudes toward school.

Although the groups of social deviates studied scored, as was expected, below the national norm on the SSHA, the survey should be administered enough times and to a wide enough age span to be standardized on social deviates.

The life perception interviews produced a great deal of information which was not used to check trial hypotheses in this particular study. These interviews and similar techniques might well be used to study such variables as the self concept of the social deviate and how it is related to school failure or success.

A study to determine what kind of person can help social deviates to have positive life perception and positive attitudes toward school in a special education classroom is also implied. Since this study showed males changing in a positive direction while in detention in attitudes toward school and females changing in a negative direction while in detention in attitudes toward school, studies of differences in the environment of males and females would appear to be in order.

The above conclusions concerning females and males should be studied in relation to differences in maturation, cultural expectations, and femininity-masculinity indices as well. Although this study dealt with subjects in relation to school and detention, the need to study the subjects in relation to other social and personal attitudes would definitely add to the way social deviates think and feel about life in general.

The conclusions of this study leads the writer to believe that

attitude measurement and life perception measurement of social deviates should also be studied on subjects in a living arrangement where the environment is less structured in order to rule out the trauma effect of confinement.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this investigation was to assess the attitudes of social deviates living in detention toward school orientation and to determine how these same deviates perceived life. Such assessment was made in order to determine if special education classes in three detention homes in DeKalb, Fulton, and Clayton Counties in Georgia made any difference in attitudes over a period of 60 days and if the students enrolled in special education classes perceived life any differently from social deviates who were not enrolled but who also lived in detention.

Ninety social deviates were administered the pretest which was Form H of the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes by Holtzman and Brown. This survey contained six subscores in addition to a School Orientation score. Eighty-two subjects completed the posttest. Twenty females and twenty males made up the experimental group who attended special education classes. Nineteen females and twenty-three males made up the control group who did not attend special education classes. The amount of attitude change was found to be significant in a positive direction for males in the experimental group and in a negative direction for females in the experimental group. When the females and males were considered as a group, the amount of change was not significant since the direction of change caused the groups to cancel each other.

Personal, tape recorded interviews were held with a random sample of the subjects in each group and positive and negative responses to Life Perception were rated and statistically checked for significant differences between the experimental and control subjects. It was found that students in the special education classes did not perceive life in general any differently from those not enrolled, but they did perceive life more positively as related to Life While in Detention.

It was recommended that further research deal with programmed instruction in order to lessen experimenter effects, that the trauma of detention might have effected subject response, and that observations of the environment in the detention homes suggest further research which evaluates the kind of persons who can help social deviates, the self-concept of the social deviates themselves, and that females and males appear to vary so much in this study, that the implications are that they should be studied separately and not as a total group.

REFERENCES

- Beck, Bertram. "The School and Delinquency Control." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1955, 11, 60-61.
- Boyd, G. R. "Classroom Adjustment of the Underchosen Child Through Changes in Teacher's Attitudes and Behavior." Troy State College, 1960. Report No. CRP-672, Contract Nonr CEC-672 (8376).
- Brownell, Samuel M. "Delinquency - An Important Problem in Education." School Life, Jan., 1954.
- Cavan, Ruth Shonle (Ed.). Readings in Juvenile Delinquency. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1964.
- Cruickshank, William M., Johnson, G. Orville. Education of Exceptional Children and Youth. (2nd ed.) New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Eisentein, F. P., Eisentein, M. L. "Testing a Value System in a Neighborhood Crisis." United Community Centers, Brooklyn. Children, 1968, 15, 4, 49-54.
- Elliott, Delbert S. "Delinquency, School Attendance and Dropouts." Social Problems, 1966, 13, 3, 307-314.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Glueck, Sheldon, Glueck, Eleanor. Delinquents and Nondelinquents in Perspective. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Glueck, Sheldon, Glueck, Eleanor (Eds.) Ventures in Criminology, Selected Recent Papers. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Graham, Earl Ellis. "The Breeding of Delinquents." Offender Therapy, 1963, 7, 3, 61-66 and 68.
- Harrison, Leonard V., Grant, Pryor M. Youth in the Toils. New York: Macmillan, 1939.

- Hathaway, S. R., Monachesi, E. D. Adolescent Personality and Behavior: MMPI Patterns of Normal, Delinquent, Dropout, and Other Outcomes. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.
- Heinemann, Robert B., Bernstein, Marilyn. The Fourth R, A Return to Learning for Sidetracked Adolescents. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.
- Horney, K. The Neurotic Personality of Our Time. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1937.
- Hulbert, Archer Butler. "The Habit of Going to the Devil." Atlantic Monthly, 1926, 138:804-6.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Kirchner, Corrine, Wilder, David S. "Study of Attitudes." Adult Education Association of USA Report, 1959.
- Kuder, G. F., Richardson, M. W. Psychometrika, 1937, 2, 151-160.
- Kvaraceus, William C. "Study of Student-School Relationship, Study of Student-Teacher Role in Urban Schools." Proceedings of Annual Invitational Conference on Urban Education, Ferkouf Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, 1966.
- Kvaraceus, William C. Juvenile Delinquency and the School, New York: World Book Company, 1945.
- Landis, Judson R., Simon, Dinita, Reckless, Walter, C. "Implementating Two Theories of Delinquency: Value Orientation and Awareness of Limited Opportunity." Sociological Society Review. 1963, 47, 4, 408-416.
- Mandel, Nathan G. "Recidivism Studied and Defined." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology. 1965, 56, 1, 59-66.
- Murray, Thomas R. Aiding the Maladjusted Pupil. New York: David McKay Company, 1967.
- Redl, Fritz (Ed.) When We Deal With Children, A Collection. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Rice, A. H. Report of President's Commission, Nation's Schools. 1967, 80, 6.
- Rose, Gordon. Schools for Young Offenders. London: Tavistock Publications, 1967.
- Simons, Alfred E., Burke, Nelson S. "The Probable Syndrome of Educational Experiences which Precipitates Delinquency." Journal of Negro Education. 1966, 35. 1, 27-34.

- Tannenbaum, Abraham J. "Student's School Attitude Scale." Center for Urban Education Report. New York, 1966.
- Telford, Charles W., Sawrey, James M. The Exceptional Individual. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Toby, Jackson, Toby, Marcis. "A Study of Student Teacher Relationship, School Roles and Social Relation." 1961. Report No. CRP-526.
- Trost, Fred J. "Delinquency-Group Dynamics and the School." Family Life Coordinator. 1961, 10, 4, 82-84.
- Vaz, Edmund W. Middle-Class Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Wattenberg, William W. "Social Deviancy and the Disadvantaged." Published in Conference on the Disadvantaged Report, 1967.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

APPENDIX A

RAW SCORES

 DELAY AVOIDANCE
 (Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
102F	28	26	- 2
103F	15	10	- 5
105F	8	18	+10
106F	15	7	- 8
108F	14	15	+ 1
109F	18	13	- 5
112F	19	18	- 1
113F	21	28	+ 7
115F	45	43	- 2
116F	23	14	- 9
118F	21	16	- 5
121F	33	20	-13
124F	33	28	- 5
126F	22	19	- 3
131F	10	8	- 2
132F	28	26	- 2
133F	40	34	- 6
135F	8	4	- 4
138F	22	20	- 2
140F	28	15	-13
Mean	22.55	19.1	- 3.45

RAW SCORES
 DELAY AVOIDANCE
 (Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Males</u>			
101M	18	16	- 2
104M	1	4	+ 3
107M	21	15	- 6
110M	16	18	+ 2
117M	16	18	+ 2
119M	10	22	+12
120M	17	17	0
122M	17	24	+ 7
123M	19	22	+ 3
125M	8	0	- 8
127M	13	7	- 6
129M	12	19	+ 7
130M	14	22	+ 8
134M	25	18	- 7
137M	12	8	- 4
141M	18	28	+10
142M	19	10	- 9
143M	8	21	+13
144M	14	12	- 2
145M	16	32	+16
Mean	14.70	16.65	+ 1.95
Group Mean	18.62	17.88	- 0.75

RAW SCORES
WORK METHODS
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
102F	29	17	-12
103F	9	15	+ 6
105F	13	17	+ 4
106F	11	5	- 6
108F	21	22	+ 1
109F	9	16	+ 7
112F	15	8	- 7
113F	19	26	+ 7
115F	43	36	- 7
116F	10	11	+ 1
118F	15	20	+ 5
121F	38	37	- 1
124F	30	30	0
126F	28	17	-11
131F	8	7	- 1
132F	30	24	- 6
133F	39	39	0
135F	14	5	- 9
138F	20	17	- 3
140F	32	17	-15
Mean	21.65	19.3	- 2.35

RAW SCORES

WORK METHODS
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Males</u>			
101M	18	14	- 4
104M	6	6	0
107M	23	11	-12
110M	17	10	- 7
117M	25	24	- 1
119M	21	23	+ 2
120M	33	27	- 6
122M	20	30	+10
123M	15	32	+17
125M	26	17	- 9
127M	16	13	- 3
129M	8	19	+11
130M	13	25	+12
134M	28	21	- 7
137M	13	14	+ 1
141M	27	33	+ 6
142M	15	24	+ 9
143M	14	13	- 1
144M	6	8	+ 2
145M	16	22	+ 6
Mean	18.00	19.30	+ 1.30
Group Mean	19.82	19.30	- 0.52

RAW SCORES

STUDY HABITS
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
102F	57	43	-14
103F	24	25	+ 1
105F	21	35	+14
106F	26	12	-14
108F	35	37	+ 2
109F	27	29	+ 2
112F	34	26	- 8
113F	40	54	+14
115F	88	79	- 9
116F	33	25	- 8
118F	36	36	0
121F	71	57	-14
124F	63	58	- 5
126F	50	36	-14
131F	18	15	- 3
132F	58	50	- 8
133F	79	73	- 6
135F	22	9	-13
138F	42	37	- 5
140F	60	32	-28
Mean	44.2	38.4	- 5.80

RAW SCORES
STUDY ATTITUDES
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Males</u>			
101M	48	43	- 5
104M	32	43	+11
107M	42	30	-12
110M	27	35	+ 8
117M	45	53	+ 8
119M	34	36	+ 2
120M	59	63	+ 4
122M	66	69	+ 3
123M	38	50	+12
125M	38	44	+ 6
127M	34	42	+ 8
129M	21	32	+11
130M	20	63	+43
134M	53	59	+ 6
137M	56	48	- 8
141M	50	78	+28
142M	36	47	+11
143M	33	31	- 2
144M	22	28	+ 6
145M	25	64	+39
Mean	38.95	47.90	+ 8.95
Group Mean	45.32	45.90	+ 0.58

RAW SCORES

TEACHER APPROVAL
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
102F	29	23	- 6
103F	14	20	+ 6
105F	27	17	-10
106F	26	6	-20
108F	17	10	- 7
109F	24	16	- 8
112F	23	14	- 9
113F	20	22	+ 2
115F	40	41	+ 1
116F	12	8	- 4
118F	29	31	+ 2
121F	45	34	-11
124F	41	41	0
126F	28	15	-13
131F	4	5	+ 1
132F	42	32	-10
133F	40	44	+ 4
135F	19	11	- 8
138F	21	20	- 1
140F	39	40	+ 1
Mean	27.0	22.5	- 4.50

RAW SCORES

TEACHER APPROVAL
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Males			
101M	22	21	- 1
104M	20	32	+12
107M	18	15	- 3
110M	14	15	+ 1
117M	29	30	+ 1
119M	18	20	+ 2
120M	33	35	+ 2
122M	33	36	+ 3
123M	22	22	0
125M	20	26	+ 6
127M	18	24	+ 6
129M	8	24	+16
130M	10	30	+20
134M	25	26	+ 1
137M	33	26	- 7
141M	22	40	+18
142M	14	26	+12
143M	15	14	- 1
144M	8	20	+12
145M	8	29	+21
Mean	19.50	25.55	+ 6.05
Group Mean	23.25	24.02	+ 0.78

RAW SCORES

EDUCATION ACCEPTANCE
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
102F	32	18	-14
103F	7	13	+ 6
105F	10	10	0
106F	17	7	-10
108F	21	21	0
109F	22	15	- 7
112F	20	13	- 7
113F	29	36	+ 7
115F	44	36	- 8
116F	14	17	+ 3
118F	29	29	0
121F	45	32	-13
124F	36	32	- 4
126F	29	18	-11
131F	11	3	- 8
132F	39	33	- 6
133F	38	44	+ 6
135F	13	6	- 7
138F	19	19	0
140F	32	26	- 6
Mean	25.35	21.40	- 3.95

RAW SCORES

EDUCATION ACCEPTANCE
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Males			
101M	26	22	- 4
104M	12	11	- 1
107M	24	15	- 9
110M	13	20	+ 7
117M	16	23	+ 7
119M	16	16	0
120M	26	28	+ 2
122M	33	33	0
123M	16	28	+12
125M	18	18	0
127M	16	18	+ 2
129M	13	8	- 5
130M	10	33	+23
134M	28	33	+ 5
137M	23	22	- 1
141M	28	38	+10
142M	22	21	- 1
143M	18	17	- 1
144M	14	8	- 6
145M	17	35	+18
Mean	19.45	22.35	+ 2.90
Group Mean	22.40	21.88	- 0.52

RAW SCORES
STUDY ATTITUDES
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
102F	61	41	-20
103F	21	33	+12
105F	37	27	-10
106F	43	13	-30
108F	38	31	- 7
109F	46	31	-15
112F	43	27	-16
113F	49	58	+ 9
115F	84	77	- 7
116F	26	25	- 1
118F	53	60	+ 7
121F	82	66	-16
124F	77	73	- 4
126F	57	33	-24
131F	15	8	- 7
132F	81	65	-16
133F	78	88	+10
135F	32	17	-15
138F	40	39	- 1
140F	71	66	- 5
Mean	51.7	43.9	- 7.8

RAW SCORES
STUDY HABITS
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Males			
101M	36	33	- 3
104M	7	10	+ 3
107M	44	26	-18
110M	33	28	- 5
117M	39	42	+ 3
119M	31	45	+14
120M	50	49	- 1
122M	37	54	+17
123M	34	54	+20
125M	34	17	-17
127M	29	20	- 9
129M	20	38	+18
130M	27	47	+20
134M	53	39	-14
137M	25	22	- 3
141M	45	61	+16
142M	34	34	0
143M	22	34	+12
144M	20	20	0
145M	32	54	+22
Mean	32.60	36.35	+ 3.75
Group Mean	38.40	37.38	- 1.02

RAW SCORES

STUDY ORIENTATION
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
102F	118	84	-34
103F	45	58	+13
105F	58	62	+ 4
106F	69	25	-44
108F	73	68	- 5
109F	73	60	-13
112F	77	53	-24
113F	89	112	+23
115F	172	156	-16
116F	59	50	- 9
118F	89	96	+ 7
121F	153	123	-30
124F	140	131	- 9
126F	107	69	-38
131F	33	23	-10
132F	139	115	-24
133F	157	161	+ 4
135F	54	26	-28
138F	82	76	- 6
140F	131	98	-33
Mean	95.9	82.3	-13.6

RAW SCORES
STUDY ORIENTATION
(Experimental Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Males			
101M	84	76	- 8
104M	39	53	+14
107M	86	56	-30
110M	60	63	+ 3
117M	84	95	+11
119M	65	81	+16
120M	109	112	+ 3
122M	103	123	+20
123M	72	104	+32
125M	72	61	-11
127M	63	72	- 1
129M	41	70	+29
130M	47	110	+63
134M	106	98	- 8
137M	81	70	-11
141M	95	139	+44
142M	70	81	+11
143M	55	65	+10
144M	42	48	+ 6
145M	57	118	+61
Mean	71.55	84.25	+12.70
Group Mean	83.72	83.28	- 0.45

RAW SCORES

DELAY AVOIDANCE
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
201F	25	18	- 7
202F	23	12	-11
203F	16	12	- 4
204F	30	22	- 8
205F	12	17	+ 5
206F	11	18	+ 7
207F	12	18	+ 6
208F	15	14	- 1
210F	17	22	+ 5
211F	6	13	+ 7
213F	8	11	+ 3
214F	24	26	+ 2
227F	5	16	+11
228F	18	26	+ 8
230F	16	10	- 6
232F	8	40	+32
235F	27	24	- 3
236F	13	2	-11
241F	23	3	-20
Mean	16.26	17.05	+ 0.79

RAW SCORES

DELAY AVOIDANCE
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Males			
209M	22	16	- 6
212M	10	8	- 2
215M	22	12	-10
216M	6	13	+ 7
217M	23	17	- 6
218M	20	20	0
219M	5	4	- 1
220M	22	21	- 1
221M	11	11	0
222M	14	5	- 9
223M	12	13	+ 1
224M	25	30	+ 5
225M	19	19	0
226M	23	26	+ 3
231M	10	15	+ 5
233M	21	15	- 6
234M	22	31	+ 9
237M	14	15	+ 1
240M	40	29	-11
242M	30	20	-10
243M	18	23	+ 5
244M	18	25	+ 7
245M	12	23	+11
Mean	18.22	17.87	- 0.35
Group Mean	17.33	17.50	+ 0.17

RAW SCORES

WORK METHODS
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
201F	23	25	+ 2
202F	21	10	-11
203F	17	13	- 4
204F	21	31	+10
205F	20	5	-15
206F	14	13	- 1
207F	19	12	- 7
208F	20	12	- 8
210F	17	27	+10
211F	16	14	- 2
213F	13	12	- 1
214F	15	20	+ 5
227F	14	15	+ 1
228F	25	14	-11
230F	19	13	- 6
232F	14	36	+22
235F	16	12	- 4
236F	9	14	+ 5
241F	12	13	+ 1
Mean	17.10	16.37	- 0.74

RAW SCORES

WORK METHODS
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Males</u>			
209M	24	21	- 3
212M	19	17	- 2
215M	16	14	- 2
216M	10	11	+ 1
217M	21	14	- 7
218M	30	15	-15
219M	15	11	- 4
220M	34	40	+ 6
221M	12	9	- 3
222M	29	22	- 7
223M	14	17	+ 3
224M	20	27	+ 7
225M	7	14	+ 7
226M	18	29	+11
231M	13	28	+15
233M	13	10	- 3
234M	24	25	+ 1
237M	18	19	+ 1
240M	41	40	- 1
242M	39	37	- 2
243M	9	9	0
244M	32	20	-12
245M	19	11	- 8
Mean	20.74	20.00	- 0.74
Group Mean	19.10	18.36	- 0.74

RAW SCORES

STUDY HABITS
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
201F	48	43	- 5
202F	44	22	-22
203F	33	25	- 8
204F	51	53	+ 2
205F	32	22	-10
206F	25	31	+ 6
207F	31	30	- 1
208F	35	26	- 9
210F	34	49	+15
211F	22	27	+ 5
213F	21	23	+ 2
214F	39	46	+ 7
227F	19	31	+12
228F	43	40	- 3
230F	55	23	-32
232F	22	76	+54
235F	43	36	- 7
236F	22	16	- 6
241F	35	16	-19
Mean	34.42	33.42	- 1.00

RAW SCORES
STUDY HABITS
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Males</u>			
209M	46	37	- 9
212M	29	25	- 4
215M	38	26	-12
216M	16	24	+ 8
217M	44	31	-13
218M	50	35	-15
219M	20	15	- 5
220M	56	61	+ 5
221M	23	20	- 3
222M	43	27	-16
223M	26	30	+ 4
224M	45	57	+12
225M	26	33	+ 7
226M	41	55	+14
231M	23	43	+20
223M	34	25	- 9
234M	46	56	+10
237M	32	34	+ 2
240M	81	69	-12
242M	69	57	-12
243M	27	27	0
244M	50	45	- 5
245M	31	34	+ 3
Mean	38.96	37.65	- 1.30
Group Mean	36.90	35.74	- 1.17

RAW SCORES

TEACHER APPROVAL
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
201F	15	38	+23
202F	8	9	+ 1
203F	15	18	+ 3
204F	32	32	0
205F	18	5	-13
206F	14	9	- 5
207F	20	15	- 5
208F	27	25	- 2
210F	21	14	- 7
211F	5	9	+ 4
213F	15	10	- 5
214F	24	20	- 4
227F	15	7	- 8
228F	15	24	+ 9
230F	18	20	+ 2
232F	19	41	+22
235F	18	16	- 2
236F	17	14	- 3
241F	8	7	- 1
Mean	14.09	14.48	+ 0.39

RAW SCORES
TEACHER APPROVAL
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Males</u>			
209M	17	21	+ 4
212M	18	20	+ 2
215M	33	15	-18
216M	11	18	+ 7
217M	24	26	+ 2
218M	34	24	-10
219M	9	9	0
220M	20	31	+11
221M	23	16	- 7
222M	26	26	0
223M	9	6	- 3
224M	23	33	+10
225M	11	13	+ 2
226M	23	34	+11
231M	4	17	+13
223M	20	17	- 3
234M	28	29	+ 1
237M	24	14	-10
240M	39	41	+ 2
242M	23	28	+ 5
243M	14	10	- 4
244M	12	19	+ 7
245M	13	6	- 7
Mean	19.91	20.56	+ 0.65
Group Mean	18.62	19.19	+ 0.57

RAW SCORES

EDUCATION ACCEPTANCE
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Females			
201F	24	24	0
202F	9	8	- 1
203F	19	16	- 3
204F	28	29	+ 1
205F	22	7	-15
206F	9	12	+ 3
207F	25	19	- 6
208F	22	17	- 5
210F	14	16	+ 2
211F	7	11	+ 4
213F	17	15	- 2
214F	21	19	- 2
227F	9	12	+ 3
228F	20	29	+ 9
230F	15	17	+ 2
232F	11	35	+24
235F	22	13	- 9
236F	13	9	- 4
241F	19	11	- 8
Mean	17.16	16.79	- 0.37

RAW SCORES

EDUCATION ACCEPTANCE
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Males</u>			
209M	24	20	- 4
212M	17	15	- 2
215M	30	9	-21
216M	14	12	- 2
217M	25	26	+ 1
218M	33	33	0
219M	12	11	- 1
220M	22	28	+ 6
221M	27	25	- 2
222M	25	20	- 5
223M	12	5	- 7
224M	17	37	+20
225M	14	17	+ 3
226M	28	38	+10
231M	10	11	+ 1
223M	15	12	- 3
234M	29	34	+ 5
237M	20	17	- 3
240M	36	33	- 3
242M	38	29	- 9
243M	6	12	+ 6
244M	16	8	- 8
245M	20	16	- 4
Mean	21.30	20.35	- 0.96
Group Mean	19.43	18.74	- 0.69

RAW SCORES
STUDY ATTITUDES
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
201F	39	62	+23
202F	17	17	0
203F	34	34	0
204F	60	61	+ 1
205F	40	12	-28
206F	23	21	- 2
207F	45	34	-11
208F	49	42	- 7
210F	35	30	- 5
211F	12	20	+ 8
213F	32	25	- 7
214F	45	39	- 6
227F	24	19	- 5
228F	35	53	+18
230F	33	37	+ 4
232F	30	76	+46
235F	40	29	-11
236F	30	23	- 7
241F	27	18	- 9
Mean	15.48	15.52	+ 0.10

RAW SCORES
STUDY ATTITUDES
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Males</u>			
209M	41	41	0
212M	35	35	0
215M	63	24	-39
216M	25	30	+ 5
217M	49	52	+ 3
218M	67	57	-10
219M	21	20	- 1
220M	42	59	+17
221M	50	41	- 9
222M	51	46	- 5
223M	21	11	-10
224M	40	70	+30
225M	25	30	+ 5
226M	51	72	+21
231M	14	28	+14
233M	35	29	- 6
234M	57	63	+ 6
237M	44	31	-13
240M	75	74	- 1
242M	61	57	- 4
243M	20	22	+ 2
244M	28	27	- 1
245M	33	16	-17
Mean	41.22	40.65	- 0.56
Group Mean	38.05	37.78	- 0.26

RAW SCORES

STUDY ORIENTATION
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Females</u>			
201F	87	105	+ 18
202F	61	39	- 22
203F	67	59	- 8
204F	111	114	+ 3
205F	72	34	- 38
206F	48	52	+ 4
207F	76	64	- 12
208F	84	68	- 16
210F	69	79	+ 10
211F	34	47	+ 13
213F	53	48	- 5
214F	84	85	+ 1
227F	43	50	+ 7
228F	78	93	+ 15
230F	68	60	- 8
232F	42	152	+110
235F	83	65	- 18
236F	52	32	- 20
241F	62	34	- 28
Mean	67.05	67.37	+ 0.32

APPENDIX B

RAW SCORES
STUDY ORIENTATION
(Control Group)

Subject	Pretest	Posttest	Change
<u>Males</u>			
209M	87	78	- 9
212M	64	60	- 4
215M	101	50	-51
216M	41	54	+13
217M	93	83	-10
218M	117	92	-25
219M	41	35	- 6
220M	98	120	+22
221M	73	61	-12
222M	94	73	-21
223M	47	41	- 6
224M	85	127	+42
225M	51	63	+12
226M	92	127	+35
231M	37	71	+34
233M	69	54	-15
234M	103	119	+16
237M	76	65	-11
240M	156	143	-13
242M	130	114	-16
243M	47	55	+ 8
244M	78	72	- 6
245M	64	56	- 8
Mean	80.17	78.83	- 1.35
Group Mean	74.24	73.64	- 0.60

INTERVIEW GUIDE

The basic question to be kept in mind by the interviewer is, "How can the special education class possibly have made any difference in the way the delinquent perceives his life as a whole, including perception of before and after the experience, while he is living in the juvenile home for a period of sixty days?" In order to answer this question, it is necessary to know how he felt about his life before entering detention, how he feels about his life while in detention, and how he feels about his life in the future while he is in detention. The purpose of this interview is to check trial hypotheses in the study concerning life perception as it relates to the special education class.

Below are the open-ended questions to be asked in the course of the tape-recorded interview. The rating scale which follows will allow the interviewer to determine in a subjective way the positive and negative responses of each subject toward the questions. Total positive and negative responses for the control group and the experimental group will be determined and analyzed with the chi square statistical test to see if there are significant differences in frequencies of positive and negative responses.

1. How did you get along before you came here?
 - a. What was life like?

b. Why are you here?

Expected responses concern positive and negative feelings about self, school, family, peers, authority figures.

2. How do you feel about being here now?

a. Is it better or worse than before?

b. Has anything changed for you?

Expected responses concern positive or negative feelings about rules, being locked up, special class, attendants.

3. What plans do you have for the future?

a. Do you look forward to next year?

b. What is coming next for you?

Expected responses concern positive or negative feelings about going on or not going on to school, work, family relationships, where home will be.

INDIVIDUAL RATING SCALE

Group _____

Subject No. _____

	Negative (-)	None (0)	Positive (+)
--	-----------------	-------------	-----------------

Perception of Life
before detention

Perception of Life
during detention

Perception of Life
after detention

TOTAL

All perceptions are verbalized by subjects while living in a Juvenile Home.

LIFE PERCEPTION INTERVIEWS

INDIVIDUAL RATINGS

(Experimental Group)

Subject	Life Perception before detention	Life Perception during detention	Life Perception after detention
107M	-	+	+
117M	-	-	-
118F	-	-	-
128M	-	+	-
130M	-	-	-
131F	-	+	+
132F	-	+	+
134M	+	-	+
136F	-	+	-
137M	-	-	-
138F	-	+	+
139M	-	+	+
140F	-	+	-
143M	-	-	-
145M	-	+	+

LIFE PERCEPTION INTERVIEWS

INDIVIDUAL RATINGS

(Control Group)

Subject	Life Perception before detention	Life Perception during detention	Life Perception after detention
207F	-	-	+
214F	-	-	-
225M	-	-	+
232F	-	-	-
233M	+	-	+
234M	+	-	+
235F	+	-	-
236F	-	-	-
237M	-	-	+
238M	+	+	+
239M	+	-	+
240M	-	-	-
241F	+	-	+
244M	-	-	-
245M	+	-	+

TRANSCRIBED INTERVIEW

The transcribed interview which follows was selected at random when subject 132F/s number was drawn from a box containing the numbers of all subjects interviewed and recorded by tape.

I. I really do appreciate your willingness to talk with me and helping me with my study. I believe you said you are from....., is that right? And your name is.....?

S. Right.

I. Do you want to tell me a little bit about how it was before you came here? You can tell me about home and school, well, what were things like before you came here?

S. Home--home was okay. I got everything I wanted. I had no reason to leave home. I got along good with my family, and I got along good with people, too, I guess, but at school, I just got in with the wrong crowd, I guess.

I. You had some friends who didn't want to go to school either?

S. Uh-huh. By myself I can't get into trouble. I guess I can get into trouble, but I just don't have the nerve to do something by myself, but then when I get with somebody else I say, "Well, yeah."

I. Some of your friends are here, too, aren't they? Did you get picked up together?

S. Yeah, me and.....We, my folks moved about a month ago. Mama and them moved to....., right up the street from the high school. I'll probably be going to.....high school when I get out. I just hope that will change me.

I. You hope it will change you?

S. Uh-huh. My P.O. says that, well, um, she really doesn't have anything to say about me skipping school, because I haven't been caught, and I haven't ever been down here for skipping. But, I asked her if she thought it would help any if I went to....., and she said that she didn't know--that I would just end up skipping again, and I would get back in with the wrong crowd, because there is always somebody there. She said I would have to learn how to say no.

I. You were on probation before you got picked up?

S. Uh-huh. I was here in October for run-a-way.

I. For running away from your home?

S. Uh-huh.

I. I wonder--you say home's pretty good, then, why did you want to run away from something pretty good?

S. I don't think I really wanted to run away. I think it was just people that tempted me. I don't know. I didn't run away because--in a way I guess I did it for the fun of it. Because at home it just seems like--well, I can have fun at home because they give me a lot of privileges, to be my age. But then, it seems that they're always there looking over me, and trying to take care of me, when I think I can take care of myself. I guess it was this guy they wouldn't let me date, and I wanted to date him. But he just got me in trouble. That's why I'm

here today, because of him. "Cause I wouldn't even have thought about running away if it hadn't been for him.

I. Both times?

S. Uh-huh.

I. How did you meet the boy?

S. Well, when we lived in....., three years ago, I was only twelve, then. But when I was twelve, I was just like a sixteen year old, I guess. Because I had the body of a sixteen year old, and I was sneaking around wearing makeup when I was twelve, and teasing my hair and everything, trying to make myself look older. But I was interested in boys, then. We lived up the street from this drugstore, and all the teenagers hung around there, and I went to the school across the street from there and a lot of my friends hung around up there. I was--my sister used to date him when she was fifteen and he was seventeen. He would get mad at her, because my sister's not like me. Don't matter how much she likes him--she'll just break up with him. And I'm not like that. If I like them all that much, I just can't quit. I just--it just tears me apart. They say they don't like me anymore, but I guess that's how much different we are. But I made a "damn"--then he went to Juvenile, and I'd come to see him sometimes. Then.....

I. What was he in Juvenile for?

S. He stole a car, he tried to get me to ride in it one time, but I didn't know it was stolen. When he went to jail I'd go to see him every Sunday. When he got out, he married one of my best friends. But that just still couldn't stop me. It mattered to me, but it just didn't seem like it did, because everytime he would call me--you know--well, my

phone--well, you know I have a phone in my bedroom, and when it rings mama and them, they don't run in there and answer it. They don't let none of my little sisters go in there--because my little sisters "don't even go in my bedroom unless I give them permission. But, when it rings, my mama just thinks its just some of my friends. But when he would call, I would just sit there and talk to him and talk to him, and he'd say, "Well, you meet me at so-and-so," and I'd say, "All right."

I. This was after he was married?

S. Uh-huh. He was married--this month will be a year. And he'd say, "You meet me," and I'd say, "All right." I'd tell my mama and daddy that I was going to spend the night with so and so and I'd go over to his house, and I'd stay there for a long, long time and about two o'clock in the morning, I'd go over to one of my friend's house.

I. You'd go to his house when his wife wasn't there?

S. Well, his wife--the thing about it--well,.....was only fourteen when they got married, she's fifteen now. But, 's mother had a baby by her boyfriend--the one she used to date, and that just ruined her whole family's reputation. Her mother just, well, I don't know if I'm right or not, but her mother's just got a bad reputation with men, and everything, and..... 's got a lot of that, too, since she's been married to.....She ain't but fifteen now, and she goes with guys forty years old, and.....said she had some kind of VD, and I don't know.....he just married her for spite. But I could care less, now.

I. You think that's over, now, with.....

S. Uh-huh. I put--I don't know--I went through trouble for him

for almost three years, and I'm tired of getting in trouble, cause my mama would always tell me, she'd say, "....., you must leave him alone--one thing, he's older than you are, another thing, he'll just get you in trouble, and the main reason, he's married." And then she'd say, "He's gonna have you where he wants you, one day. He's gonna have you sitting in training school."

I. You're just fifteen now?

S. I'll be fifteen in July.

I. Well, you certainly have lived a great deal for fifteen years, haven't you,.....? Well, how's it been for you while you've been here? How do you feel about being here in the juvenile home?

S. Well, I'd like to be at home, but it doesn't bother me as much as it did when I first come in--you know, when somebody first comes in here, they're so upset, but I have never been upset when I come in here. I always take it calm. And I never get upset. I get upset, but like when the police come tell me, "Well, you" it don't bother me, and it hurts to know I'm coming here, but I don't just break out crying, and everything--and I don't like to be by myself, cause when I'm by myself, all I can do is think. Just how much I hurt my mother, and everything--I just--in a way I want to go to plain school, but then,I was even going to kill myself one time. Once when I was with.....I say that he is dirty. When he ain't drinking....when he's sober, he never cussed me, but when he'd be drunk, he'd say, "Well, I'm going to call your mama and tell her you've been sneaking off with me." I'd just sit there and cry and cry, then he got up one night and told me that, and when he went in the other room, and there was this razor blade laying on

the mantle, and I fainted twice, and I got that razor blade and I was fixing to slit my throat, and then he come in there and grabbed it.

I. You fainted?

S. Uh-huh. But I don't ever think of it again. I hate him. I don't hate him. I don't hate him or anybody, but I just dislike him. He's dirty. He'll steal right in front of you.

I. Do you feel better, maybe, when you are over here at the juvenile home because you are away from him and you know you can't get to him or he to you?

S. Uh-huh.

I. It protects you, doesn't it?

S. Uh-huh. (long pause)

S. If I was on the telephone I'd say, "no." But if I see him face to face and he wanted me to run away with him, I can't say no.

I. When you're right there, it's impossible for you to say noAnd you feel protected from him in the home? While you've been here in the home,....., do you--you said it wasn't so bad?

S. Well, if they kept us locked up all the time it would be, but we're hardly ever locked up. And when I'm on restriction--Friday, I got off restriction--because of that marijuana and stuff, well, that was--it just--I don't know--it was because I was in a room by myself, and I don't like to be in a room by myself, because all I can do is think--think back on what all I've been through the last two or three years, because it just hurts, and I just sit there and cry. And what I did to my mama--I just hurt her so much.

I. What are your plans for the future,....., when you get

out of here? Have you been thinking about what you're going to do?

S. Me and chaplain discuss it, but chaplain's trying to--he's been talking to Chief....., trying to get me off on a suspended sentence, because chaplain thinks I can do better, my parents think I can do better, and I think I can. But the only problem is..... If he'd just stay away from me, and leave me alone, I could do just fine.

I. Well, do you think the move will help? Maybe you won't be in the same places, and you'll see new people.

S. Uh-huh.

I. So you'll be starting over at a new school?

S. And this time, I--it just seems like I'm starting a new life, if I, you know, go home, and there'll be so many new people. I won't know anybody, and nobody won't know nothing about me. They won't know I got suspended from school about four times.

I. You said earlier before our interview that you liked or like school while you are here.

S. Uh-huh. Well, I had my mind all made up about quitting school, when I got sixteen, and I just have one more year to go after this year, but it seems like subjects here.....

I. Now, you're beginning to think it all over again, huh?..... While you've been here, you've been thinking it all over again.

S. Uh-huh.

I. You think maybe you really have just tried to grow up too fast?

S. Uh-huh. Yeah, I think so, cause my sister, she started dating when she was fifteen, and I just tried to follow her cause I would get so

mad cause she would get to go places and I'd just have to set at home, 'cause I was--well, I was--I'm still too young to date. I'm not even gonna date anymore until I get about seventeen.

I. Where is your sister now?

S. She's--she's only seventeen. She lives at home.

I. Is she a senior this year?

S. No, she quit school when she was sixteen. She's going to night school in.....

I. Is she working, too?

S. Uh. She regrets it. She tells me all the time--I think she's helped convince me about quitting school, 'cause she used to tell me all the time, "If I could go over it again, I just wouldn't even think of quitting school," Cause she hated school, just like I did. She quit. And then my brother quit and then he went back.

I. Well,....., thanks a million for coming in and talking to me.

S. Okay.