

Summer 1962

Toward Improving the Identification of Delinquents

Eleanor T. Glueck

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

Eleanor T. Glueck, *Toward Improving the Identification of Delinquents*, 53 *J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci.* 164 (1962)

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.

TOWARD IMPROVING THE IDENTIFICATION OF DELINQUENTS*

ELEANOR T. GLUECK

The author is a Research Associate in Criminology at the Harvard Law School. A frequent contributor to this *Journal*, Dr. Glueck is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a Trustee of the Judge Baker Guidance Center.

Can it be determined whether a given child of pre-school age is likely to become a juvenile delinquent, or whether a child already manifesting minor symptoms of delinquency is likely to become a true delinquent? The studies of Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck with respect to these and related questions are well known to students of juvenile delinquency. In the following article, Dr. Eleanor Glueck reports upon recent efforts to improve the Social Prediction Table devised by the Gluecks for use in the prediction of delinquency. Of particular interest are the new prediction tables presented herein. These relate to (1) the more specific identification of those who, under the earlier "five-factor" prediction table, fall into the group having an even chance of becoming delinquents, (2) the screening of children already manifesting symptoms of delinquency, and (3) the use of a new three-factor prediction table, making it easier to gather and classify the necessary data.—EDITOR.

THE SOCIAL PREDICTION TABLE

The purpose of this paper is to report upon certain steps which have been taken to improve the Glueck Social Prediction Table developed from the data in *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*.¹ This Table is based on five social factors reflecting parent-child relationships found sharply to discriminate the 500 "true" juvenile delinquents studied² from the 500 nondelinquents with whom

the delinquents had been matched case by case, for age, ethnic derivation, general intelligence (I.Q.), and residence in urban underprivileged areas. These social factors are *discipline of boy by father, supervision of boy by mother, affection of father for boy, affection of mother for boy, and family cohesiveness*. (See Table I-A.)

Although there were discriminating factors other than the five included in the Social Prediction Table, the aforementioned five were selected because they were clearly operative in the lives of children *before* school entrance. Since *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* was a retrospective study, many of the factors embraced in it (such as gang membership, school retardation, and truancy from school) obviously did not become operative until later in the life span of the boys.³

Our aim is to heighten the capacity of the Social Prediction Table in order to differentiate: (a) at

* Revised from an address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology in Denver, Colorado, December 30, 1961.

¹S. & E. T. GLUECK, *UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1950) (hereinafter cited as *UNRAVELING*).

²We label as "true" delinquents those who commit acts of a kind which had they been committed by persons beyond the statutory juvenile court age would have been recognized as felonies (larceny, burglary, sex offenses, robbery, arson, firesetting, etc.) and/or who have a history of repeated minor offenses (such as malicious injury to property, destruction of property, trespassing, evading fare, stealing rides, ringing false alarms, throwing missiles, stoning trains, breaking windows, running away from home, assault and battery). In *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* we did not label as "true" delinquents boys who up to the time of their inclusion in that study had committed only one or two minor acts (such as violating a city ordinance or town by-law) or boys who very occasionally in the face of exciting temptations stole a toy in a ten-cent store, sneaked into a subway or motion picture theatre, played hookey, and the like. See *UNRAVELING* Table XIII-13, at 161. Whether any of these pseudodelinquents actually develop into serious or persistent minor offenders later in their lives (they ranged in age from 11-17 when we first selected them for investigation) is another question and can be answered only by intensive follow-up of the nondelinquents of *Unraveling*. The follow-up on both the delinquents and the nondelinquents will continue to age 32.

³The Social Prediction Table was constructed by summing the delinquency scores for the particular subcategory of each of the five factors which characterized the individual boy. For example, if a boy was overstrictly disciplined by his father he was scored 71.8, because 71.8% of all the boys of *Unraveling* who had been overstrictly disciplined by the father were in the persistent delinquent group. If the same boy was found to have been unsuitably supervised by his mother, he was assigned the score 83.2; if his father was indifferent to him, the assigned score was 75.9; if his mother did not love him, he rated a score of 86.2; and, finally, if he had been reared in an uncohesive family, he was scored 96.9. The sum of these scores resulted in a total score of 414.0. Table I-A was derived by distributing the total scores of all the delinquents and all the nondelinquents into graduated score classes. For further details concerning the method of constructing the Social Prediction Table, see *UNRAVELING* 259-64.

TABLE I-A

IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL JUVENILE DELINQUENTS
BASED ON FIVE FACTORS OF SOCIAL BACKGROUND*

Score Class	Delinquency Rate	Nondelinquency Rate	Total Number of Cases
Less than 200	8.2%	91.8%	293
200-250	37.0	63.0	108
250-300	63.5	36.5	192
300 and Over	89.2	10.8	297
Predictive Factors**			Delinquency Scores
DISCIPLINE OF BOY BY FATHER			
Firm but Kindly.....			9.3
Lax.....			59.8
Erratic or Overstrict.....			71.8
SUPERVISION OF BOY BY MOTHER			
Suitable.....			9.9
Fair.....			57.5
Unsuitable.....			83.2
AFFECTION OF FATHER FOR BOY			
Warm (including overprotective).....			33.8
Indifferent or Hostile.....			75.9
AFFECTION OF MOTHER FOR BOY			
Warm (including overprotective).....			43.1
Indifferent or Hostile.....			86.2
COHESIVENESS OF FAMILY			
Marked.....			20.6
Some.....			61.3
None.....			96.9

*UNRAVELING 261-62, Table XX-3, at 262.

** For definitions, see *id.* at 261; PREDICTING DELINQUENCY AND CRIME 245-55.

school entrance, the children likely to develop into *persistent* delinquents from those not headed for delinquent careers; and (b) among youngsters already evidencing symptoms of delinquent-like behavior, those who are *true* delinquents from those who are not.

One of the major questions that has to be answered in determining the applicability of the Social Prediction Table is whether a screening device, constructed *retrospectively* on one group of persistent juvenile offenders and their matched nonoffenders, will select among 5½ to 6 year old boys of similar (and, hopefully, of dissimilar) socioeconomic, ethnic, and intellectual status those who are *likely to develop* into serious or persistent juvenile offenders as contrasted with those who are *not*. Testing on a variety of samples is

necessary before the Table can be regarded as more than an "experience table," describing the presence of the weighted cluster of five factors among the delinquents and nondelinquents of *Unraveling*. The progress of such testing on groups already manifesting delinquent-like symptoms, as applied *retrospectively* to other samples of confirmed offenders, as well as on groups of young children before the manifestation of overt symptoms of delinquent-like behavior (with follow-up to compare their predicted and their actual behavior) is reported elsewhere.⁴

IMPROVEMENTS AND SAFEGUARDS FOR USE OF PREDICTION TABLE

The value of experimental applications of the Social Prediction Table lies not only in determining the range of its usefulness but also in resolving any difficulties that may emerge in the course of applying it. Although none of the checkings of the Table has been carried on by us, the experimenters have at times turned to us for assistance in clarifying definitions of terms and resolving problems associated with the rating of cases. From this we have learned much that has alerted us to the need of placing additional safeguards around the use of the Table. Some of the difficulties that developed are mentioned in my article "Efforts to Identify Delinquents."⁵

Unanticipated difficulties have arisen because of variations in the training and experience of those applying the Table, and from occasional inadequacies in the collection of the necessary data. In one inquiry, for example, questions arose as to the particular subcategory of a factor into which to place a boy, and disagreements emerged among the investigators as to the rating of some of the factors. One problem concerned the factor *affection of parents for boy*, which psychoanalytically-oriented observers interpret in accordance with Freudian depth psychology and others on the basis of surface manifestations of parental affection. Still other problems arose in regard to the rating of *discipline of boy by father* (as well as *affection of father for boy*) in instances in which the father or a father-substitute had never been a part of the family group or had left the home while the boy was still very young. Questions were also raised regarding the assessment of *family cohesive-*

⁴ E. T. Glueck, *Efforts To Identify Delinquents*, 24 FED. PROB. 49 (1960); E. T. Glueck, *Spotting Potential Delinquents: Can It Be Done?*, 20 FED. PROB. 7 (1956).

⁵ *Supra* note 4, at 55-56.

ness in instances in which a boy was reared solely by the mother or a mother-substitute.

These and other difficulties led to the consideration that one or another of the five factors could be dispensed with if data or skills were insufficient to make an accurate assessment of all of them. Correlations were systematically pursued between the total five-factor scores for each boy in *Unraveling* and every possible combination of four, three, and two factors. Only the combinations with coefficients of correlation of .90 and over were considered. These factor combinations had correlation coefficients ranging from .932 for a two-factor Table to .987 for a four-factor Table.⁶ Therefore, in instances in which the five-factor Table could not be used, an appropriate abbreviated Table could be substituted. For example, the inconsistent ratings of *affection of mother for boy* or *affection of father for boy* by workers of differing psychological "persuasions" were eliminated by confining the scoring to the three remaining factors: *supervision of boy by mother*, *discipline of boy by father*, and *family cohesiveness*. The difficulty of rating *discipline of boy by father* in a situation in which the father had not been an integral part of the family group was met by use of a two-factor Table (*supervision of boy by mother*, *family cohesiveness*).⁷

BETTER IDENTIFICATION OF BOYS IN "EVEN CHANCE OF DELINQUENCY" GROUP

What I have thus far said briefly summarizes our efforts to improve the Social Prediction Table and to place additional safeguards around it. But the most important step toward reducing errors in the classification of children as true delinquents or nondelinquents has only recently been undertaken. This is directed toward the problem of more specific identification as delinquents or nondelinquents of youngsters classified as having about an even chance of becoming delinquent or remaining nondelinquent. This problem has rightly given concern to other predictionists and to some critics of predictive devices. To determine whether this might be accomplished, a redistribution of the cases of *Unraveling* was undertaken to identify the particular score class in which approximately half the boys

⁶ See S. & E. T. GLUECK, *PREDICTING DELINQUENCY AND CRIME* Tables IX-1 to IX-1e, at 233-35 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1959) (hereinafter cited as *PREDICTING DELINQUENCY AND CRIME*), for all possible combinations with high predictive potential.

⁷ *Ibid.*

TABLE I-B

REDISTRIBUTION OF SCORE CLASSES IN TABLE I-A TO DETERMINE SCORE CLASS WITH EVEN CHANCE OF DELINQUENCY OR NONDELINQUENCY

Chance of Delinquency (Score Class)	Delinquency Rate	Nondelinquency Rate	Total Number of Cases
LOW CHANCE (Less than 200).....	8.2%	91.8%	293
ABOUT EVEN CHANCE (200-300).....	54.0	46.0	300
HIGH CHANCE (300 and Over).....	89.2	10.8	297

TABLE I-C

MORE SPECIFIC IDENTIFICATION ON BASIS OF NEW CLUSTER OF SOCIAL FACTORS OF POTENTIAL JUVENILE DELINQUENTS AMONG 299 BOYS (IN TABLE I-B) HAVING AN EVEN CHANCE OF DELINQUENCY OR NONDELINQUENCY

Chance of Delinquency (Score Class)	Delinquency Rate	Nondelinquency Rate	Total Number of Cases
LOW CHANCE (Less than 75).....	12.1%	87.9%	58
ABOUT EVEN CHANCE (75-125).....	58.2	41.8	177
HIGH CHANCE (125 and Over).....	81.3	18.7	64
Predictive Factors*			Delinquency Scores
DISCIPLINE OF BOY BY MOTHER			
Firm but Kindly.....			6.1
Lax, Overstrict, or Erratic.....			73.7
REARING BY PARENT SUBSTITUTE			
No.....			38.0
Yes.....			79.3

*For definitions, see Table III-A.

were delinquents and half were nondelinquents. This proved to be the category 200-300.⁸ (See Table I-B.)

In order to be able in future applications of the Social Prediction Table more specifically to identify as probable delinquents or nondelinquents those now found to have an even chance of delinquency and nondelinquency, we have recently prepared a

⁸ The comparable score class in one of the three-factor Tables is 100-200, and in the two-factor Table, 75-125.

subsidiary screening device from among the factors of social background that most sharply differentiate the delinquents from the nondelinquents in the 200-300 score class.⁹

Although six factors met the necessary criteria,¹⁰ we selected two—*discipline of boy by mother and rearing by parent substitute*—omitting from present consideration *unsuitable supervision of boy by mother*, because this factor is already included among the five comprising the original Social Prediction Table.

Following our usual procedures for constructing a screening device, Table I-C was derived. (Note that information for one factor was not available for one boy.) Examination of the Table reveals that 58 of the 299 boys previously placed in a group that showed an even chance of delinquency and nondelinquency could now be placed in one in which 87.9% are classifiable as *nonoffenders*; while 64 boys could now be placed in a group in which 81.3% are classifiable as potential *delinquents*.

The question remaining is whether a means can be found to screen the 177 boys *still having an even chance of delinquency and nondelinquency* in order to designate them as “true” delinquents or probable nonoffenders. To arrive at this much-desired result, we first undertook a series of correlations between the remaining social background factors and the delinquents and nondelinquents in this group, but did not uncover any factors sufficiently discriminative to warrant their use in a subsidiary screening device.

In determining the next steps to be taken in order to ascertain which boys of the remaining

⁹The statistical work was executed at United Research Inc., Cambridge, Mass., under the supervision of Rose W. Kneznek.

10

Factors	%’s of Respective Factor Totals		Difference Between Dels. and Nondels.	P
	Dels.	Non-dels.		
Unsuitable Discipline of Boy by Mother	95.1%	56.9%	38.2%	.01
Unsuitable Supervision of Boy by Mother	43.8	22.5	21.3	.01
Rearing by Parent Substitute	33.3	14.5	18.8	.02
Physical Punishment of Boy by Father	63.6	45.1	18.5	.02
Indifference or Hostility of Mother to Boy	32.9	14.5	18.4	.02
Emotional Disturbance in Mother	40.7	24.6	16.1	.02

TABLE I-D

MORE SPECIFIC IDENTIFICATION ON BASIS OF FIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS OF 169 OF THE 177 BOYS (IN TABLE I-C) HAVING AN EVEN CHANCE OF DELINQUENCY OR NONDELINQUENCY*

Chance of Delinquency (Score Class)	Delinquency Rate	Nondelinquency Rate	Total Number of Cases
LOW CHANCE (Less than 220).....	14.6%	85.4%	48
ABOUT EVEN CHANCE (220-270).....	52.3	47.7	44
HIGH CHANCE (270 and Over).....	88.3	11.7	77

Predictive Traits**	Delinquency Scores
ADVENTUROUSNESS	
Absent.....	35.4
Present.....	75.3
EXTROVERSION IN ACTION	
Absent.....	37.8
Present.....	66.5
SUGGESTIBILITY	
Absent.....	35.5
Present.....	69.4
STUBBORNNESS	
Absent.....	39.0
Present.....	83.4
EMOTIONAL INSTABILITY	
Absent.....	26.5
Present.....	62.0

* See PREDICTING DELINQUENCY AND CRIME Table IX-3, at 238.

** For definitions, see *id.* at 245-55.

177 could be designated as potential delinquents, we gave consideration to the possibility of applying two discriminatory devices that we had previously published. One is based on five traits of basic character structure (as derived from Rorschach tests) and the other on five personality traits (as determined by a skilled psychiatrist). We abandoned application of the first one because the Rorschach data were not available for a sufficient number of the 177 boys; but we were able to utilize the screening Table based on the five personality traits (*adventurousness, extroversion in action, suggestibility, stubbornness, and emotional instability*),¹¹ data for which were available for 169 of the 177 boys.

¹¹ UNRAVELING Table XX-10, at 265; PREDICTING DELINQUENCY AND CRIME 238.

The application of this Table to the 169 boys resulted in placing 48 into a group in which the chances of delinquency are about $1\frac{1}{2}$ in 10, and 77 into a group in which the chances of delinquency are 9 in 10—thereby leaving as not yet clearly identifiable only 44 of the original 890 on whom the Social Prediction Table had been constructed. (See Tables I-A, I-B, and I-D.)

I have no doubt that further refinement of the Table, if supplemented by intensive clinical examination focused on locating brain damage, pre-psychoticism, feeble-mindedness, and other pathologic conditions that might aid in prognosis, and by inquiries concerning the impact of neighborhood influences upon youngsters, would make possible the more specific identification even of this small group of boys as probable delinquents or nondelinquents.

SCREENING DEVICE FOR CHILDREN ALREADY MANIFESTING DELINQUENT-LIKE CONDUCT

Thus far, attention has been directed toward the more specific identification of potential delinquents at about $5\frac{1}{2}$ to 6 years of age. There is understandably much discussion about the wisdom of efforts to identify children as delinquents in advance of clear signs of delinquent-like behavior (i.e., fighting, stealing into movies, "acting up" in school, truancy, firesetting, joining gangs). However, the idea of trying to determine *after* a youngster begins to show some evidences of such antisocial behavior what his chances actually are of developing into a serious or persistent minor offender is more acceptable to many than is the proposition that societal intervention should begin *before* the onset of overt evidences of an antisocial development.

Regardless of the pros and cons of identifying children *in advance* of clear symptomatology, it does seem desirable to develop a screening device to be applied to children *already manifesting evidences* of delinquent-like conduct. Re-examination of the findings of *Unraveling* to see what data of a clearly *symptomatic* nature might be incorporated into a screening device has resulted in a Table based on differences between the true delinquents and the nonoffenders in their *recreational preferences and companionships, academic ambitions, attitudes toward further schooling, and truancy*. (See Table II-A.)

Examination of Table II-A, which was constructed on 857 boys of *Unraveling*, indicates that it is indeed a good discriminatory device; 373

TABLE II-A
IDENTIFICATION OF TRUE DELINQUENTS AMONG THOSE ALREADY MANIFESTING EVIDENCES OF DELINQUENT-LIKE BEHAVIOR*

Chance of Delinquency (Score Class)	Delinquency Rate	Nondelinquency Rate	Total Number of Cases
LOW CHANCE (Less than 200).....	3.2%	96.8%	373
ABOUT EVEN CHANCE (200-300).....	58.3	41.7	168
HIGH CHANCE (300 and Over).....	95.6	4.4	316
Predictive Factors**			Delinquency Scores
RECREATIONAL PREFERENCES			
Nonadventurous.....			35.3
Adventurous.....			82.9
AGE OF COMPANIONS			
Younger, Same Age, Varied Ages.....			38.1
Predominantly Older.....			81.2
ACADEMIC AMBITIONS			
Continue Schooling.....			28.5
Stop School as Soon as Possible.....			76.0
ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL			
Indifference or Ready Acceptance.....			30.2
Marked Dislike.....			85.7
TRUANCY			
None.....			5.5
Persistent or Occasional.....			89.8

* Based on five factors in social background of adolescents. See UNRAVELING 135-68. This table has not been previously published.

** For definitions, see UNRAVELING 135-68.

boys could be placed in a group with less than 1 chance in 10 of being true delinquents, while, at the opposite pole, 316 boys could be placed in a group having better than 9 in 10 chances of being true delinquents. However, 168 boys (score class 200-300) cannot as yet be clearly defined as delinquent, pseudodelinquent or nondelinquent. No doubt one or two subsidiary screening devices focused on the 168 boys would result in greatly reducing the proportion not yet clearly identifiable. Meanwhile it should be noted that the coefficient of correlation between the total scores of the original five-factor Table (Table I-A) and of this Table (Table II-B) is .949. (Since the initial presentation of this paper, the author has found that by applying Table III-A to the 168 boys, the number still not identifiable as potential

TABLE II-B

MORE SPECIFIC IDENTIFICATION ON BASIS OF CLUSTER OF THREE SOCIAL FACTORS (SEE TABLE III-A) OF 165 OF THE 168 BOYS (IN TABLE II-A) HAVING AN EVEN CHANCE OF BEING OR BECOMING TRUE DELINQUENTS*

Chance of Delinquency (Score Class)	Delinquency Rate	Nondelinquency Rate	Total Number of Cases
LOW CHANCE (Less than 75).....	6.7%	93.3%	30
ABOUT EVEN CHANCE (75-125).....	53.3	46.7	45
HIGH CHANCE (125 and Over).....	78.9	21.1	90
Predictive Factors**			Delinquency Scores
SUPERVISION OF BOY BY MOTHER			
Fair or Suitable.....			29.7
Unsuitable.....			83.2
DISCIPLINE OF BOY BY MOTHER			
Firm but Kindly.....			6.1
Lax, Overstrict, or Erratic.....			73.7
REARING BY PARENT SUBSTITUTE			
No.....			38.0
Yes.....			79.3

* It is possible to get as good a result by applying Table I-D to the 168 boys, but this is not recommended except for use by psychiatrists who may wish to explore the personality traits of certain boys.

** For definitions, see Table III-A.

delinquents or nondelinquents is now reduced to 45. See Table II-B.)

THREE-FACTOR SOCIAL PREDICTION TABLE

In the course of seeking ways of improving the Social Prediction Table, a new cluster of social factors has been found that might be substituted for the original Social Prediction Table. It comprises *supervision of boy by mother* (already in the original Table), *discipline of boy by mother*, and *rearing by affectionless parent substitutes*. The latter two factors are already incorporated in the first of the two subsidiary tables (Table I-C) designed to identify more clearly the true delinquents in the group having an even chance of delinquency and nondelinquency. The coefficient of correlation between the total scores for the original five-factor Table (I-A) and those for the new three-factor Table (III-A) is .972.

TABLE III-A

IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL JUVENILE DELINQUENTS ON THE BASIS OF A NEW CLUSTER OF THREE FACTORS OF SOCIAL BACKGROUND*

Chance of Delinquency (Score Class)	Delinquency Rate	Nondelinquency Rate	Total Number of Cases
LOW CHANCE (Less than 125).....	4.7%	95.3%	316
ABOUT EVEN CHANCE (125-175).....	47.9	52.1	236
HIGH CHANCE (175 and Over).....	85.9	14.1	429
Predictive Factors**			Delinquency Scores
SUPERVISION OF BOY BY MOTHER			
Fair or Suitable.....			29.7
Unsuitable.....			83.2
DISCIPLINE OF BOY BY MOTHER			
Firm but Kindly.....			6.1
Lax, Overstrict, or Erratic.....			73.7
REARING BY PARENT SUBSTITUTE			
No.....			38.0
Yes.....			79.3

* Note that data for the cluster of three factors were available for a larger number of boys (981 cases) than for the cluster of five factors (890 cases).

** Definitions:

SUPERVISION OF BOY BY MOTHER: *suitable*, if she personally keeps close watch over boy's activities at home or in the neighborhood, or provides for his leisure hours in clubs or playgrounds (if for good reason she is unable to supervise boy's activities, she makes provision for a responsible adult to do so); *fair*, if mother (although not working and not incapacitated) gives or provides only limited supervision to boy; *unsuitable*, if mother leaves boy to his own devices, without guidance, or in the care of an irresponsible person.

DISCIPLINE OF BOY BY MOTHER: (refers to usual or typical discipline of the boy on the part of mother or surrogate): *lax*, if mother is negligent, indifferent, allows boy to do as he likes; *overstrict*, if mother is harsh, unreasoning, demanding obedience through fear; *erratic*, if mother vacillates between strictness and laxity, is not consistent in control; *firm but kindly*, if her discipline is based on sound reason which the child understands and accepts as fair.

REARING BY PARENT SUBSTITUTE: may include step-parent, foster parent, or relative (grandparent, aunt, older sibling) but not person with whom boy spends only brief periods away from his own parents (or parent) in foster homes or with relatives, or in an institution. See UNRAVELING 124-25 for further explanation of this factor.

TABLE III-B

MORE SPECIFIC IDENTIFICATION ON BASIS OF FIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS OF 223 OF THE 236 BOYS (IN TABLE III-A) HAVING AN EVEN CHANCE OF DELINQUENCY OR NONDELINQUENCY*

Chance of Delinquency (Score Class)	Delinquency Rate	Nondelinquency Rate	Total Number of Cases
LOW CHANCE (Less than 220).....	8.1%	91.9%	74
ABOUT EVEN CHANCE (220-270).....	43.8	56.2	64
HIGH CHANCE (270 and Over).....	85.9	14.1	85

* See Table I-D for predictive traits and delinquency scores.

TABLE III-C

MORE SPECIFIC IDENTIFICATION ON BASIS OF FIVE BEHAVIORAL FACTORS OF 51 OF THE 64 BOYS (IN TABLE III-B) HAVING AN EVEN CHANCE OF DELINQUENCY OR NONDELINQUENCY*

Chance of Delinquency (Score Class)	Delinquency Rate	Nondelinquency Rate	Total Number of Cases
LOW CHANCE (Less than 200).....	0.0%	100.0%	19
ABOUT EVEN CHANCE (200-300).....	50.0	50.0	12
HIGH CHANCE (300 and Over).....	90.0	10.0	20

* See Table II-A for predictive factors and delinquency scores.

The obvious advantage of using the latter Table (and its subsidiary Tables III-B and III-C) instead of the original five-factor Table is the greater ease of gathering and classifying the data. An experiment in applying this new Table, as related to the subsequent behavior of youngsters predicted as delinquents or as nondelinquents, is necessary in order to contrast the results with those derived by the original Social Prediction Table.

CONCLUSION

The sum and substance of this brief presentation is that there are indeed ways of improving and sharpening screening devices for the early

identification of delinquents both before and after the onset of evidences of delinquent-like behavior. This brings us closer to the time when individual children can be identified with a small margin of error either as serious or persistent minor offenders, or as pseudo-offenders or non-offenders. We must, of course, test these newly developed devices on other samples of similar and differing ethnic origins, socioeconomic levels, intelligence levels, and age groups; on children from rural as well as urban areas; and on girls as well as on boys.

In general, the results of our efforts to make our Social Prediction Table more effective suggest that delinquency is not always associated with the "under-the-roof" environment, but is in some instances more closely related to personality makeup; and in the very small group of still unidentifiable boys, other primary associations must now be looked for.

Such findings provide a realistic frame of reference for the study of etiologic types (and also of treatment types) among delinquents. But before proceeding further, it would be well to consolidate the gains already made.

It is important not only to test and refine the screening tables but also to sharpen the definitions of the factors,¹² improve the methods of data-gathering, and objectify the factors utilized in the construction of the Tables. It would be advantageous also to devise short, carefully-structured interviews with parents, and one validation project has been experimenting along these lines.¹³ It might even be advisable to develop group tests to replace the personal interviews. Above all, it is important to remain open-minded about the uses of these and similar devices and to look upon predictive devices as research tools in a search for the etiology of delinquency, even though questions exist about the wisdom of attempts to identify delinquents in advance of the presence of overt evidences of delinquent-like behavior.

¹² Definitions have already been slightly modified as a result of the New York City Youth Board's inquiry. Experimenters wishing to apply this table are invited to communicate either with the author or with Mrs. Maude Craig, Director of Research, New York City Youth Board, 79 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N.Y.

¹³ The Maximum Benefits Project of the Commissioners' Youth Council of Washington, D.C. For description of the Project, see *Efforts To Identify Delinquents*, *supra* note 4, at 54.