RESULTS OF INTERCHANGE GRADUATE'S TEST ASSESSMENTS

May 2002

A TECHNICAL REPORT FOR THE ALCOHOL & DRUG CRIMINAL JUSTICE WORKING GROUP AND THE INTERCHANGE PROGRAM

REPORT PREPARED BY: MATT NICE SENIOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION ANALYST MULTNOMAH COUNTY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT GROUP 503-988-3364

http://www.co.multnomah.or.us/budget/eru/

Executive Summary

The InterChange program has two goals: reducing criminal behavior and reducing substance abuse. The following report describes InterChange initial program "outcomes"—changes in offender thinking among program graduates—intended to lead to outcomes of reduced criminal behaviors and substance abuse. Test results indicate that InterChange graduates experience significant reductions in criminal thinking and attitudes after treatment, as measured by the Pride in Delinquency (PID) and the multidimensional Criminal Sentiment Scale- Modified (CSSM) instruments. These findings are consistent with previously published reports of preliminary data. Future analyses should determine if these instruments are useful in predicting graduates' likelihood for future recidivism and substance abuse.

Specifically:

- An average pre-post test decrease of 42% in graduates' pro-criminal attitudes was found, as measured by the PID scale
- Overall, a 41% decrease in unfavorable attitudes towards laws, police officers, and the judges/courts was observed (as measured by the CSSM-LCP)
- Graduates showed a 47% average decrease in attitudes toward violating the law, (as measured by the CSSM-TLV)
- There was a 38% average decrease of identification with criminal for graduates (as measured by the CSSM-ICO)

Additional analyses found:

- Graduates' length of stay has steadily been declining—now 22.2 less days than earlier graduates
- Client motivation for IC appears to have waned
- Preliminary results indicate IC graduates have somewhat better problem-solving appraisal upon completion, as measured by the PSI

Serious limitations to the study were also identified:

- Less than 60% of graduates completed pre-post tests
- In nearly all cases, the service provider failed to provide crucial follow-up assessment data

Introduction

The InterChange program has two goals: reducing criminal behavior and reducing substance abuse. The program's target population is adult males under Department Community Justice supervision who have demonstrated a need for residential substance abuse treatment but who can also be safely housed in a minimum security facility outside of jail. The following report focuses on changes in criminal thinking among program graduates. These changes are intended to lead to the intermediate and long-term outcomes of reduced criminal behavior and substance abuse.

Criminal Thinking Patterns, Recidivism, and Substance Abuse

Reducing criminal thinking among this population is essential to realize decreases in recidivism and chronic substance abuse.¹ As such, reducing criminal thinking is key piece of the curriculum at InterChange.

Program staff assessed thinking by administering three pencil-and-paper surveys to InterChange residents: 1) the Pride in Delinquency scale, 2) the Criminal Sentiments Scale-Modified, and 3) the Problem Solving Inventory-Modified (a new measure discussed later). For the first two surveys, higher scores reflect the presence of greater criminal attitudes. Graduates' changes in criminal thinking are measured by comparing their scores on these surveys early in the program (pre-test) to their scores at the end of the program (post-test). Unfortunately, less than 60% of graduates completed both tests, so results are limited to those who completed both sets of tests.² Additional post-tests were designed to be given approximately six months after graduation. In nearly all cases, the service provider failed to provide this data.³

In several cases graduates were involved in multiple episodes—some due to prior InterChange failure others for "booster sessions."⁴ Each episode may include a pre- and post-test for each of the instruments. The analyses

¹ Wanberg, Kenneth W. and Harvey B. Milkman. 1998. *Criminal Conduct and Substance Abuse Treatment: Strategies for Self-Improvement and Change.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

² At the time of this report there were 104 InterChange graduates (from Discharge Summary 10/01). While a majority completed pre-tests failure to perform post-test was not uncommon.

³ As of November 2001, a new service provider was contracted for aftercare services. Curriculum and training are expected to be the same as the previous provider, thus retaining similarity and continuity of services. At the time of this report, the new contractor was providing required data.

⁴ 15% of graduates received two InterChange episodes.

contained herein only examined the pre-test/ post-test results for the 1^{st} episode.

The Pride in Delinquency Scale

The Pride in Delinquency Scale (PID) asked the respondent to imagine that they have just committed a series of ten criminal acts and rate how proud (+10) or how ashamed (-10) they would be to have committed each act. One hundred points are added to the total score, in order to avoid negative scale scores. (Appendix A includes a copy of the Pride in Delinquency Scale).



Figure 1. Differences in PID pre-post test scores for graduates

Figure 1 shows that InterChange graduates exhibited a statistically significant decrease in pro-criminal attitudes, as measured by the Pride in Delinquency scale (p. < .001; N = 62 pairs of scores).⁵ An average pre-post decrease of 42% in pro-criminal attitudes, as measured by the Pride in Delinquency was found. Moreover, the InterChange graduates did not significantly differ from InterChange non-graduates for whom Pride in Delinquency pre-test scores were available. This means that the men who dropped out of the InterChange program were just as inclined to hold pro-

 $^{^{5}}$ A two-tailed paired *t*-test was used to assess statistical significance between means in pre-post test scores. An independent *t*-test was used to assess statistical significance between differences in graduates' and non-graduates' pretest scores. Alpha (α) was set at .05.

criminal beliefs at the program onset as the men who went on to graduate from the program. These results are consistent with preliminary reports.⁶

The Criminal Sentiments Scale - Modified

The Criminal Sentiments Scale measures pro-criminal attitudes along three dimensions: Identification with Criminal Others (ICO), Tolerance for Law Violators (TLV), and Attitudes Toward the Law, Courts, and Police (LCP). In addition, three sub-dimensions are also being reported herein: attitudes towards Law, Courts, and Police (see Appendix B.) The instrument contained 41 questions, where higher dimension scores indicate greater criminal sentiment. Across all dimensions and sub-dimensions, significant reductions in criminal sentiments were identified between graduates' pre-post test scores (see Figure 2). While more information is presented in this report, overall results are consistent with preliminary reports.⁷



Figure 2. Differences in graduates CSSM (sub) dimensions pre-post test scores

⁶ Reduction in Pro-Criminal Attitudes Among InterChange Graduates, Laurie Drapela, April 11, 2001.

⁷ Reduction in Pro-Criminal Attitudes Among InterChange Graduates, Laurie Drapela, April 11, 2001. Note, due to errors associated with earlier scaling, the CSSM was rescaled. Therefore, absolute values may differ from earlier reports, but end results do not.

Attitudes towards law, courts, and police (including sub-dimensions) This section of the questionnaire asked the respondent to rate their level of agreement with statements about laws, police officers, and the judges/ courts. This section contained 25 questions.

Based on pre-post test comparisons (Figure 3), graduates of InterChange experienced significant reductions in unfavorable attitudes across the LCP dimension and its subdimensions (N = 62, p < .001). Overall, a 41% decrease in unfavorable attitudes about laws, police officers, and the judges/courts was observed.

Figures 3a-3d (right and below) depict the differences in prepost test sub-dimensions of graduates. An average pre-post test decrease of 44% in procriminal sentiments towards laws, as measured by the CSSM, was observed.







Figure 3a. pre-post test differences in Law sub-dimension

An average pre-post test decrease of 37% in pro-criminal sentiments towards courts, as measured by the CSSM, was observed.



Figure 3b. pre-post test differences in Courts sub-dimension

An average pre-post test decrease of 43% in pro-criminal sentiments, as measured by the CSSM, was observed for the police sub-dimension.



Figure 3c. pre-post test differences in Police sub-dimension

Interestingly, persons who dropped out of InterChange held greater unfavorable attitudes towards law, courts, and police initially (i.e., during pre-testing) than did persons who graduated from InterChange (Figure 4).⁸ In other words, males who dropped out of the program viewed laws, police officers, and the judges/ courts less favorably than men who completed the program (p. <.05).





Tolerance for Law Violators (TLV)

This dimension assesses the level of tolerance for breaking the law by asking the respondent to respond to a series of statements about breaking the law. This section contained ten questions.



Figure 5. Pre-post test differences in Tolerance for Law Violators dimension

⁸ In this analysis "graduates" consisted of all InterChange graduates with pre-tests (N = 85), regardless of whether a post-test was performed. Graduates with post-tests (n = 62) and those without post-tests (n = 23) were compared, and no statically significant differences in scores was found.

Figure 5 illustrates InterChange graduates' 47% average pre-post test decreases in attitudes toward violating the law, as measured by the CSSM (N = 62, p. < .001). Unlike scores of LCP and its sub-dimensions (c.f., above), InterChange graduates did not differ statistically on pre-test attitudes toward violating the law. Thus, the men who dropped out of the program were no more tolerant of law-violators than those who graduated.

Identification with Criminal Others (ICO)

There was a 38% decrease in graduates' average pre-post test scores for the Identification with Criminal Others (ICO) portion of the Criminal Sentiments Scale (Figure 6). The difference between these scores is statistically significant (N = 62, p < .001). The section contained six questions.



Figure 6. Differences in pre-test scores for graduates and non-graduates

Like scores of TLV InterChange graduates did not differ from InterChange non-graduates in terms of pre-test survey results on criminal identity. In this case, men who left the program before graduating weren't any more criminally oriented than men who remained and eventually graduated.

Cohort Comparisons

The first 50 InterChange graduates are currently being followed in a longitudinal outcomes study to evaluate long-term program effectiveness. Because InterChange has gone through formative changes, a comparison of earlier and later cohorts was performed to evaluate for graduate and/or programmatic differences. The 104 graduates were split into two cohort groups for comparison on demographic, general programmatic changes, and instrument testing scores. The first 50 graduates are identified herein as Cohort1. The long-term outcomes of Cohort1 will set the stage for the program assumptions of effectiveness for later graduates. The remaining 54 graduates are identified as Cohort2. Cohorts were compared on age, lengths of stay (by episodes), number of episodes, the pre-post test CSSM (and subscales) and the PID. Results were significant (p = .05) or near-significant (p < .1) on several measures.

Length of stay. Because several clients have had more than one episode (and even graduation) length of stay was examined in both the first episode and a total of all treatment episodes (e.g., booster sessions, fail and return to treatment, etc.). Figure 7 illustrates the length of stay in the first treatment episode (coded Episode 1) and in a total of treatment episodes (All Episodes) was significantly longer for Cohort1 than Cohort2, an average of 15.2 and 22.2 more days, respectively (N= 104, p < .01). In addition, Cohort1 was more likely to engage in multiple treatment episodes than was Cohort2, nearing significance.⁹



Figure 7. Differences in lengths of stay by cohorts

9 Chi-square (df=2) = 5.257, p = .072. Note that two cells had expected counts under 5.

Program management stated two reasons for the reduced time in treatment found between cohorts, both which were based on the program's initial design. Research on treatment programs of this nature suggested that a three to six-month stay was needed for successful long term outcomes. Following the release of initial data on length of stay, program managers engaged clinical staff in close scrutiny of client's progress through the program and actively encouraged moving clients to the next, less intensive level of care as soon as clients were able to successfully manage a transition. In addition, goal completion became the standard for graduation, over length of time in treatment.¹⁰

Cohort pre-test differences. Results found near significant differences in Criminal Sentiments Scale (CSSM) pre-test scores, suggesting entrance criteria and/or processes for clients may have changed over time. Figure 8 depicts Cohort1 with less initial criminal sentiment (mean 5.18) in the Courts subscale, than did Cohort2 (6.66), (N = 85, p =.06).

Pre-test differences were opposite in the Identification with Criminal Others (ICO) subscale of the CSSM. Cohort1 clients had higher pre-test ICO criminal sentiment scores (nearing significance) than Cohort2, with an average score of 4.2 and 3.3 respectively (see Figure 9). One possible reason for the pre-test differences is a change in entrance criteria and/or processes. There were no differences in any post-treatment test scores, suggesting that the treatment program did not significantly change.







Figure 9. Differences in ICO pre-test scores by cohort

¹⁰ Interviews with former and current InterChange program managers (Wayne Scott and Edie Wooldridge).

Again, program management was asked to explain why Cohort1 graduates had less negative attitudes towards Courts but a greater Identification with Criminal Others than Cohort2. Management stated that when the program was first introduced, clients were extremely motivated to enter InterChange and almost no coercion was needed. These clients were longtime criminal addicts, which may explain why Cohort1 had greater Identification with Criminal Others. After Cohort1 graduated, the word "got out" to other potential IC clients that the program was hard, and greater coercion was applied by the PO's, the Courts and IC to get them into the program. The Courts subscale measures the client's perceived honesty and fairness of the courts. Greater coercion to enter the program leveraged by the courts may explain why Cohort2 scored greater negative attitudes towards the courts than did Cohort1.

Personal Problem Solving Inventory (PSI) - Modified

The PSI assesses an individual's awareness and evaluation of his problemsolving abilities and style, thus providing a global appraisal of the individual problem solver (appraisal is not synonymous with performance).¹¹ The PSI-Modified is a 28-question inventory scored on a three-point Likert scale anchored from agree to disagree (see Appendix C). The instrument was introduced after InterChange began, and available data is limited to 2001. Like other assessments, the PSI was given upon IC entrance and again after graduation.

The PSI assesses three facets: Problem-Solving Confidence—a measure of problem-solving self-efficacy—(10 questions, a higher score indicating less efficacy), Approach-Avoidance Style—a tendency to approach or avoid problems—(13 questions, a higher score indicating greater avoidance), and Personal Control—believing one is in control of one's self while problem solving—(4 questions, a higher score indicating less control). Only the overall model is reported herein. The lower the overall score the better the problem-solving skills in general. The reliability coefficient for the overall model was equal to published reports ($\alpha = .90$).

At the time of this report, there were only 31 completed pre/post PSI tests. The <u>preliminary</u> results of pre-post tests finds a small, yet significant

¹¹ Heppner, P. P., & Petersen, C. H. (1982). <u>http://www.coe.missouri.edu/~heppnerp/about_psi_2-23-00.doc</u>

improvement in problem-solving ability (as denoted by the decrease in score, see Figure 10) for graduates, as measured by the PSI.¹²



Figure 10. Preliminary results of the pre-post tests using the Problem Solving Inventory

Conclusions

Results indicate that the InterChange graduates experienced significant reductions in criminal thinking and attitudes, as measured by the PID and the CSSM, from 37% to 47% respectively. The results are limited to graduates for who both pre-tests and post-tests were available (60%) and non-graduates for whom pre-test data was available.

In addition, preliminary results indicate that graduates somewhat improved their problems solving skills, as measured by the PSI. Again, the results are preliminary and limited to those graduates who also completed both pre- and post-tests.

Using a cohort analysis supported by management insight, it appears that the entrance process, and program itself have changed somewhat. Earlier clients were initially very motivated to enter the program, however this excitement appears to have worn off and now clients may be more likely to require a mandate to go into treatment. IC may be having a more difficult time getting clients into the program due to the "voluntary" nature of the program. Furthermore, total lengths of stay for program graduates have been steadily

¹² The effect-size is considered small (η^2 = 0.228).

falling. It is unknown what impact these changes will have on future graduate's long-term success.

Finally, future analyses need to determine if these instruments are useful in predicting graduates' likelihood for future recidivism and substance abuse. Clearly to date, those that graduate from the program score better on criminal thinking assessments; the question is whether these instruments are programmatically useful in predicting who will return to criminal activities and/or substance abuse. In other words, are they useful in assessing whether graduates are meeting the InterChange goals of reduced criminal behavior and reduced substance abuse?

Appendix	A :	The	Pride	in	Delinquency	Scale
----------	------------	-----	-------	----	-------------	-------

Multnomah Count	EC_EvalPID_A222C80D022702						
Multnomah County Test Type	InterChange Required	Date Admitted					
222 O Pre O Post	80						
Social Security Number	SID Number	Date Exited					
Client: First Name MI.	Last Name	Today's Date					

Instructions:

Listed below are some behaviors. You may or may not have done some of them in the past; this is not important. What you do is to imagine for a moment that you have just done each behavior. You are to rate how proud or ashamed you would feel if you actually did them. You are to rate your pride or shame according to the scale list on the instructions.

You give a positive number if you would be proud to do it and a negative number if you would be ashamed to do it. The bigger the number, the more proud or ashamed you would be . So if you gave it a +8, +9, or +10 you would be extremely proud to do it. If you gave it a -4, -5, or -6 you would be moderately ashamed to do it. If you gave it a +1 or +2 you would be just a little proud. If you would be neither proud nor ashamed you would be right in the middle and you would give it a 0.

Let me give you a few examples before we begin. Most people would give a +10 to saving the life of a drowning child, because they would be extremely proud to do a thing like that. Most people would give a -10 to murdering a young child, because they would be extremely ashamed to do a thing like that. Most people would give a 0 to waking up in the morning, because they wouldn't be proud or ashamed; they just get up and get going. Now remember, you are to rate each behavior how you feel about each of these things, not how most people would feel.

	Extremely Ashamed					Neither Proud nor Ashamed									I	Extremely Proud					
Q1 Beating up a child molester.	-10 O	-9 O	-8 O	-7 0	-6 0	-5 O	-4 0	.3 0	-2 0	-1 0	0 0	1 0	2	3 0	4	5 O	6 0	7 0	8	9	10 O
Q2 Committing sexual assault	-10	-9	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	0	0	O	O	0	O	0	0	O	O	O
Q3 Breaking into a family's home when none is in and stealing jewelry and a VCR	o -10 O	.9 O	-8 O	-7 0	-6 O	-5 O	-4 0	-3 O	-2 O	-1 0	0 ()	1 0	2 0	3 O	4	5 O	6 ()	7 0	8 ()	9 O	10 O
Q4 Seeing a store being robbed and not calling the police.	-10	-9	-8	.7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	O	O	O	O	O	0	0	O	O	O
Q5 Driving home after a party when you have had too much to drink.	-10 O	-9 O	-8 O	.7 0	-6 0	.5 O	-4 0	-3 O	-2 0	-1 0	0	1 0	2 0	3 0	4	5 ()	6 0	7 0	8 0	9 O	10 O
Q6 Striking someone who insults you.	-10	.9	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	. 2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	○	O	0	0	0	O	0	O	0	0	O	O	O
Q7 Selling Cocaine.	-10	.9	-8	-7	-6	.5	-4	-3	-2	.1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	O	O	O	0	()	O	0	O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	O	0	0	0	O	O
Q8 Carrying a concealed weapon.	-10	-9	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	0	O	O	0	O	0	0	O	O	O
Q9 Pointing a shotgun at a store clerk and telling him/her to hand over all the money the till.		.9 O	-8 O	-7 O	-6 O	-5 O	-4 0	-3 O	-2	-1 0	0	1 0	2 0	3	4	5	6 0	7	8	9 O	10 O
Q10 Getting away from the police after a high speed chase.	-10	-9	-8	.7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	0	0	0	0	0	O	0	O	0	0	O	O	O

Distribution: Make one copy of the completed form for your files and send original form to DCJ Contract Unit Staff. Form Effective on 022702

Staff Signature _

Staff Name

Date

Multnomah Cou	-	Departm nical As			-	/ Jus	tice	EC Ev	alCCS	A222C80D0	022702
Multnomah County	Inte	rChange	· · · · · · ·		Bro	or Pa	c+7	Date A		-	
222	8				O Pre				/ [<u>1176</u>	
Social Security Number		ID Number	•		OPle	01	-051	Date E	xited		
							ו		1		
Client: First Name		Last Name						Today'	s Tes	⊥' └_ t_Date	
						<u> </u>	٦		/ [
Shade boxes like this: ●	∆ aroo	Undecided	Diesaraa			hade t	oxes li	ke this: ●		l lucile states	Disamos
	Agree O	Ondecided		COURTS			C		Agree	Undecided	Disagree
L1 Pretty well all laws deserve our respect.		U		C11 Almos					0	0	0
L2 It's our duty to obey all laws	0	0	0	C12 You ca		-			0	0	0
	0	0	0	C13 Lawye					0	0	0
L4 The law is rotten to the core	0	0	0	C14 The co					0	0	0
there only to help a small and selfish group)			C15 Judges C16 Court c					0	0	0
of people	0	0	0						0	0	0
L6 All laws should be obeyed just because				C17 Pretty	well anyt	thing ca	n be fixe	d in court if	f		
they are laws.	0	0	0	•		-	-		0	0	0
L7 The law does not help the average person,	0	0	0	C18 A judg	je is a go	Jou per	5011		0	0	0
L8 The law is good.	õ	õ	õ	TLV					Agree	Undecided	Disagree
L9 Law and justice is the same thing	ō	õ	ō	T26 Someti					0	0	~
L10 The law makes slaves out of most people	_			the lav T27 Most s			life le broke		0	0	0
for a few people on the top	0	0	0						0	0	0
POLICE	Agree	Undecided Dis	sagree	T28 You s	hould alv	ways ob	ey the la	w, even if i		-	•
P19 The police are honest.	0	0	0	кеерs T29 It's ok	•	-	g ahead i		0	0	0
P20 A cop is a friend to people in need	0	0	0						0	0	0
P21 Life would be better with fewer cops	õ	· Õ	õ	T30 Most	people w	ould co	mmit crin	nes if they			_
	Ŭ	Ŭ	Ŭ				t caught.		0	0	0
P22 The police should be paid more for their work.	0	0	0	T31 There		-	reason t		°	0	0
	-	_	-	T32 A hun					0	0	0
P23 The police are as crooked as the people they arrest	0	0	0	T33 It's ok					0	0	0
P24 Society would be better off if there were				you de T34 You s					0	0	0
more police	0	0	0						0	0	0
P25 The police almost never help people.	~	•	~	T35 You're	e crazy to	o work f	or a living	g if there's	an		
F25 The police almost never help people.	0	0	0					reaking the	~	0	0
ICO				law	<u></u>		<u></u>			O	Diagaroo
136 People who have broken the law have the	same	sort of ideas	about life	as me					Agree	Undecided	Disagree
137 I prefer to be with people who obey the law										0	0
138 I'm more like a professional criminal than									-	0	0
139 People who have been in trouble with the									-	0	ő
140 I have very little in common with people w										0	õ
I41 No one who breaks the law can be my frie	end								·· 0	0	0

Appendix B: The Criminal Sentiments Scale - Modified

 Staff Name______
 Staff Signature ______
 Date ______

 Distribution: Make one copy of the completed form for your files and send original form to DCJ Contract Unit Staff.
 Form Effective on: 022702

60158

Appendix C: The Personal Problem Solving Inventory (PSI) - Modified

	Multnomah County Department of Community Justice Client PSI										EC_EvalPSIA222C80D022702							
Multnomah County	InterChange	•					Pre c	nr Pa	net?		Admitte							
222	80						O Pre		Post									
Social Security N			SID Nu	mber	····· .				1031		Exited	L ' L	l					
	- - - - - - - - - -																	
Client: First Name] <u>[]</u>	MI.	MI. Last Name									Today's Date						
											/	□ /[
Instructions:	This inventory conta	ains a nur	nber of s	tatement	s which wi	ll help yo	ou evalu	ate h	ow you see y	ourself ir	n different ar	eas of yo	ur life.					
Please read each state	eMent and shade	the bo>	c under th	ne respoi	nse that be	est descr	ibes ho	w the	statement ap	oplies to	you.							
	n to a problem do complex problem,					- 61 pl		a Baran	the box ● he problem	Ö	ree Undeci)	Sagree O O					
	efforts to solve a p			184			e situa	tion.		0	C)	0					
1990 0 1990 0 1990 1990 1990 1990 1990	problem, I do not t	3. La		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		t wrong.		-21	Station and the	0	10. Con		0					
	le to think up diffe							1944		Care C			0					
A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER OF THE	to solve a proble	· · ·	Careful Meta Law	Sector Constraints				ould h	ave happen	ned. O			0					
p	problem, I think u	•		•						and the second		in the second	an den de la constan					
	ty to solve most pi					lous so	lutions			0			0					
	s I face are too co			to solve						0		A CONTRACTOR	0					
Q10 make decision Q11 When have a				1 think	of to solve	ait				0			0					
Q12 Sometimes I st	and the second se	Contraction of the	April 1		and seattle may be	2				0	1.18	and the second se	0					
Q13 When I have a	-		-	-			sten	0		0			0					
Q14 I generally go v	Contraction of the second second	in the second second second		2 C	coloning of	I U HOAL	otop.			0		en de la contra de l La contra de la contra	0					
Q15 When making a				-	ach possi	ble solu	tion.			0			0					
Q16 When I make p			1998 Y . 215			it i de de la la		work	ς.	0			0					
Q17 I try to predict t	-					8. J I				0		1.105	0					
Q18 When I try to th	nink up possible s	olutions t	o a prob	lem, I d	o not com	ie up wi	th very	man	y aternative	s. O	, c)	0					
Q19 In trying to solv	/e a problem, I thi	nk of pas	t problei	ms that	have bee	n simila	r.			0)	0					
Q20 Given enough ti	me and effort, I be	elieve I c	an solve	most p	roblems I	face.				0) C	>	0					
Q21 When faced with	Chiefe and the second second	A CONTRACTOR OF	10 - 10 - 10 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 -	ce that I	can hand	lle probl	lems th	nat ma	ay come up	. 0	C)	0					
Q22 I make snap ju	dgements and late	er feel ba	adly.				in the second second			0)	0					
Q23 trust my ability	Construction of the second sec									0) ()	0					
Q24 I have a metho				-						C) C)	0					
Q25 When confront contributing to	ed with a problem my problem.			out other	r things in		a run and	may	be	0) . C)	0					
Q26 Sometimes I ge my problem.				o consid	der more	than one	e way o	of de	aling with	С	o c	>	0					
Q27 After making a	decision, the outo	ome I ex	(pected i	usually r	matches t	he actua	al outc	ome.		0) ()	0					
Q28 When confront	ed with a problem	, I doubt	whether	l can h	andle the	situatio	n.			С)	0					
Staff Name_				Staff Si	gnature					D	ate		. 1					
-	ke one copy of the	completed				loriginal	form to	DCJ	Contract Unit	t Staff.	Form Effective	on :022702	, 					
Results of Inte	erChange Grad	duate's	Test /	Assess	sments							May 2	002					