

1958

Juvenile Delinquency Proneness--A Study of Predictive Factors Involved in Delinquent Phenomena

Joseph K. Balogh

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Joseph K. Balogh, Juvenile Delinquency Proneness--A Study of Predictive Factors Involved in Delinquent Phenomena, 48 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 615 (1957-1958)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

(this is actually a punitive element) combined with protection against detrimental contacts within the institution and a program of resocialization in view of their later return to free society. The inmates spend only part of their time in individual cells. There, they sleep and eat. But, for the other periods, they are allowed to step outside and to stay in workshops, in recreation rooms or in the courtyard under supervision of the personnel. Whenever possible, work is combined with vocational training; time and again, offenders of that category pass vocational examinations and receive certificates.

The opposite group, those sentenced to short terms (three months or less) spend them, in the rule, in solitary confinement. The Prison Administration does not believe that any real treatment could be applied during these terms. The regime of the workhouses remains rather indefinite; but the ministry is working on a plan according to which those sentenced to this punishment would undergo an "inner selection" and be distributed among the most appropriate institutions with specialized regimes.

MISCELLANEOUS

A few general remarks should conclude this description of a few types of "punitive treatment" as used in the Netherlands. The amount of food to be served to the inmates is exactly specified by the ministry of justice, on the basis of expert advice; the rations depend on the age of the inmates, their mental state and on whether they work on strenuous jobs or not. The offenders are weighed at the time of confinement and again one month later; in the vast majority of cases, the second figure is higher than the first which proves that food is adequate.

Great attention is granted to the medical treatment of the offenders; emphasis is shifting from curative to preventive treatment. All offenders sentenced to more than three months receive twice a year an X-ray examination to detect TB; those sentenced to shorter terms are submitted to the van Pirquet test and those among them who react positively still receive the X-rays. All offenders sentenced to more than three months are subject to the Wassermann test. Those found to be alcoholics (their percentage is about 10 percent) are offered the possibility to undergo a special treatment which, eventually, may be continued after

release. Prisoners with chronic sicknesses are concentrated in a special institution.

Much of what can be really achieved depends upon the quality of the officers and the staff. In this regard mention may be made of the Central Training School for Prison Officers in The Hague. There, the officers receive their basic training and refresher courses. The governors, assistant governors and social workers receive the necessary theoretical background by attending at courses on sociology, criminology, psychology, psychiatry, criminal psychology, law, and so on. The institution is also the place where the spiritual advisors hear specialists in the field of penology. The present writer had the privilege to deliver three lectures at this school; the lectures were followed by stimulating discussion periods.

4.

After having read this survey of the "punitive treatments" used in the Netherlands, one could say that hardly one is absolutely new or unknown. This is partly true, but partly false. The major fact is the rational arrangement of the individual items into an efficient system. No efforts are wasted on unnecessary treatments, and the choice of the most promising treatment is not left to chance decisions of uncoordinated agencies.

Of course, the system is by no means perfect. The leaders know this and try gradually to adapt what exists to patterns derived from contemporary scientific views in the fields of criminology and penology and to experience gathered "on the job".

As elsewhere, the greatest handicap is the existence of still solid and inhabitable buildings erected during a period when penology was based on views quite at variance with those prevailing today. There are however two advantages: one, the low level of criminality which liberates the Dutch prison system of the plague of overcrowding which is destructive of every rational effort in the US; and, two, the lack of resistance against rational penal reform on the part of the public which in Holland is much more inclined to rely on experts than in the US.

No foreign experience can be ever used *in toto*. Therefore, one could not suggest to transfer, to the American scene, the prison system described above. But in that system (as well as in those of a few other, penologically progressive countries) one may perceive the embodiment of some basic principles gained first in scientific discussion (since

the 80's of the nineteenth century) and, then, by the application and gradual remodeling of new ideas in the countries just mentioned. If and when America is ready to realize that her penal system combines a number of advanced devices (e.g., probation) with almost incredible survivals of the "good old days" (e.g., the actually independent county jails), then a careful scrutiny of outstanding foreign models can and will be used as an instrument for improvement.

Among these devices, that of remodeling the prison system on the principle of centralization and systematization is of paramount importance. Of course, for constitutional reasons, the federal system must stay apart although greater cooperation with the States would be desirable. The rest must be combined into systems with, in principle, the States as units. This means that in each state all penal institutions (and other devices of penal treatment) must be directed by one and only one Board of Correction; the autonomous county jail must go. Many States are however too small to build up efficient prison systems. States with less than, say, five million inhabitants should enter into compacts with each other or, if this is geographically and culturally more expedient, with one of the adjacent more populous states, with the objective of building up regional prison systems. The structural form could be in the image of the New York Port Authority.

Second, the closely connected devices of systematic differentiation of the prisons and centralized distribution of offenders among them should be applied. Here, the gigantomania of the past decades seems to pose an insuperable obstacle: one

could not demand that the giant penitentiaries be torn down and replaced by a large number of smaller institutions. But whenever new buildings are contemplated, they should be planned in such a way as to harbor only one (in some cases, two) homogeneous groups of offenders, well differentiated from others. The large institutions in existence should be remodeled on the principle of their articulation into small and semi-autonomous sections each of which would be devoted to the treatment of a specified group of offenders. Of course, certain services (for instance, preparation of food and medical—but not psychiatric—services) could properly remain centralized in the framework of the superinstitution. The distribution of offenders among the institutions and eventually their sections should be carried out by a highly qualified agency forming part of the Board of Correction. Eventually, the decisions should be prepared by careful examination of the offenders as done in the Utrecht Observation Clinic.

The differentiation of institutions should exactly correspond to the particular types of treatment available or contemplated. In the elaboration of the particulars, quite a few devices offered by the Dutch penal system could be adapted to American conditions.

All these reforms would cost money in the beginning; but the decline of criminality, especially of persistent criminality which probably would ensue, would result in large economies some time later and, what is more important, would preserve for normal life at large many individuals who, today, go under largely because of the inadequacy of the American prison system.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PRONENESS

A STUDY OF PREDICTIVE FACTORS INVOLVED IN DELINQUENT PHENOMENA

JOSEPH K. BALOGH

The author is presently Associate Professor of Sociology and Criminology at Bowling Green State University. He was at one time a member of the Departments of Sociology at Hillsdale College and St. Lawrence University. He received his Doctor of Philosophy degree from the University of Pittsburgh in 1945, and has done post-doctoral work at Yale University, Columbia University, and the University of California. Dr. Balogh has conducted many studies on juvenile delinquency and penology.—EDITOR.

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In recent years there has been a great deal of interest created concerning the behavior of our teen age population. While theories of punishment relative to human behavior on the associational level are very old, nevertheless, scientific applications and critical objective studies are still conspicuously absent. The lack of scientific studies to predict anti-social behavior is one of the great academic challenges of our time. It has been very appropriately stated by Carr that we are living in an ox-cart age when the treatment and study phases of the juvenile delinquency problem are concerned. There is too much arm-chair theorizing regarding this problem but not enough of the applied.

The magnitude of this problem can no longer be minimized, but it must also be remembered that viewpoints obtained from alarmists can also be exceedingly destructive. Today there is a considerable amount of guess work plus an occasional prayer involved in the eradication of this problem.¹ The type of thinking involved does not appear to be objective. Carr analyzes this approach very ably when he states the following:²

Now the interesting thing is that millions of people like you don't yet see the crucial difference between the way they handle their motor cars and the way they handle their children. The crucial difference is the difference between fact-mindedness and myth-mindedness; the difference between a cause-and-effect approach to a difficulty and a traditional, what-do-I-think-ought-to-be-done approach. Like the famous

character who didn't know he was talking prose, the average man is blissfully unaware that he has three totally different ways of dealing with reality.

Many students of delinquency look upon this type of human deviation as one of a mechanical nature which for all intents and purposes it is not. Delinquent behavior is not an invariant certainty but only a stated degree of probability.³

This particular study is an attempt to further validate or invalidate the Kvaraceus Scale. In the Kvaraceus Scale, the writer is directly concerned with the element that "the total scale score based on all differentiating items distinguish between the two groups (delinquents and non-delinquents) with sufficient sensitivity to merit consideration and use as a scale of delinquency-proneness or vulnerability."⁴ In other words, how closely does the Kvaraceus Scale "measure what it purports to measure?"⁵ Implicit in this definition is the assumption that the measuring instrument embodies an appropriate operational definition or empirical meaning of a theoretical construct."⁶

The empirical approach to validity is important in all research programs since it indicates "the degree of improvement in prediction of behavior in a specific situation which results from the information obtained by a measurement procedure."⁷ It is important to remember that any validation

³ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁴ WILLIAM C. KVARACEUS, *KD PRONENESS SCALE AND CHECK LIST, MANUAL OF DIRECTIONS* (Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Company, 1950), p. 3.

⁵ MILTON G. SMITH, *A SIMPLIFIED GUIDE TO STATISTICS—REVISED AND ENLARGED* (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1950), p. 79.

⁶ MARIE JAHODA, MORTON DEUTSCH AND STUART W. COOK, *RESEARCH METHODS IN SOCIAL RELATIONS, PART ONE: BASIC PROCESSES* (New York: The Dryden Press, 1951), p. 109.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

¹ SHELDON AND ELEANOR GLUECK, *DELINQUENTS IN THE MAKING* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 194.

² LOWELL J. CARR, *DELINQUENCY CONTROL—REVISED EDITION* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), p. 9.

which attempts to predict behavior must rely on both a logical as well as an empirical definition even though both the logical as well as the empirical rely on one and the same thing, namely, prediction. Jahoda *et al* state that "there are instances in which one could assert that a measuring technique is logically valid, in the sense that it is an appropriate empirical definition of a theoretical construct, but empirically invalid in the sense that the construct is not relevant to the phenomenon one wishes to predict. . . . Similarly, there are instances when a measure, though empirically valid, would not be considered conceptually valid."⁸ Furthermore, it is well to remember that the empirical approach is of tremendous importance in the prediction of behavior in a specific situation through information obtained by quantification or measurement.

II. THE KVARACEUS KD PRONENESS SCALE

The Kvaraceus KD Proneness Scale is a systematic attempt towards delinquency control on a community wide level. Much of the thinking behind the formation of this Scale is the result of poignant observations made by noting differences between delinquents and non-delinquents as these differences have been reported in research literature.⁹

The construction of the KD Proneness Scale or, for that matter, any scale poses varying degrees of difficulty. The Kvaraceus Scale is based primarily on the "focal points" found in the many studies dealing with delinquency. It must be noted, however, that these "focal points" deal with significant differences. The scale is constructed along the lines of a series of "four choice multiple-choice" items. The following illustration is an example:¹⁰

3. Parents usually understand their children—
 29. Very well
 30. Quite well
 31. Not very well
 32. Not at all

Kvaraceus further states that "Several 'neutral' items involving food, color, and drink preferences were added to the Scale for rapport value, since they were free of any socially desirable or undesirable implications, in contrast to most of the other items in the Scale."¹¹ An example of this type is:¹²

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

⁹ KVARACEUS, KD PRONENESS SCALE AND CHECK LIST, p. 3.

¹⁰ KVARACEUS, KD PRONENESS SCALE, p. 3

¹¹ KVARACEUS, KD PRONENESS SCALE AND CHECK LIST, p. 3.

¹² KVARACEUS, KD PRONENESS SCALE, p. 3.

1. Of the following, the drink I like best is—

1. soda pop
2. milk
3. water
4. coffee

"(These latter items were also analyzed, and are scored in the present edition if, contrary to expectation, they showed differentiating value at the agreed-upon level of significance)."¹³

The Kvaraceus Scale poses two very important questions to the researcher:¹⁴

1. Do delinquents respond any differently to the individual items than do non-delinquents?

2. Does the total Scale score based on all differentiating items distinguish between the two groups (delinquents and non-delinquents) with sufficient sensitivity to merit consideration and use as a scale of delinquency-proneness or vulnerability?

In arriving at an evaluation of the item analysis, several parallel item-analysis studies were carried out by Kvaraceus. In these studies the "percentage of delinquent and non-delinquent children selecting each alternative was determined, the difference between the percentages of the two groups found, and the critical ratio of this difference determined."¹⁵ If the alternatives showed critical ratios of 1.96 or higher this was interpreted to be discriminating significantly between delinquents and non-delinquents at the 5 percent level of confidence. Each of these alternatives was retained and assigned a plus or minus value, "depending on the direction of the difference."¹⁶ A plus value was assigned to alternatives chosen more frequently by the delinquent group. Kvaraceus states that "Some items showed several alternatives with discriminating response."¹⁷

Items without a single discriminating response were not scored because there was no clear cut distinction between the delinquent and non-delinquent group. Kvaraceus, however, retains these items in the present Scale.

Kvaraceus employs the following categorical groups in setting up the Scale; namely, delinquent boys, public school boys and "high-morale boys"¹⁸

¹³ KVARACEUS, KD PRONENESS SCALE AND CHECK LIST, p. 3.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 4. "The high morale groups of boys and girls include those persons who were doing well scholastically and were leaders for good in a school. Usually they were members of the student council who were active in making the school a better place. They included persons who had a high degree of responsibility and dependability, who had a controlling influence for acceptable behavior in the school, who were generally