Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

Volume 65 | Issue 3 Article 6

1975

The Glueck Social Prediction Table--An Unfulfilled Promise

Kurt Weis

THE JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW & CRIMINOLOGY
Copyright © 1974 by Northwestern University School of Law
Vol. 65, No. 3
Printed in U.S.A.

THE GLUECK SOCIAL PREDICTION TABLE—AN UNFULFILLED PROMISE

KURT WEIS*

In the field of criminology, and especially with regard to prediction studies, the work of Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck is of prime importance. As criminologists and researchers, the Gluecks remain unmatched in their studies concerning juvenile delinquency and its prevention. Rather than engaging in casual research, the Gluecks closely observed their cases and followed them up at extended intervals with exhaustive reports. In addition, they stimulated scholars in various countries to test, modify or validate their prediction tables, thus launching an era of international comparative criminology.

Predicting human behavior can best be done by describing the process and specifying the mechanisms by which it operates. Investigators have traditionally demonstrated an abiding faith in the paradigm which utilizes the scientific method in the hope that it will disentangle the causal network to produce fuller knowledge about the underlying factors involved in social disruption and dislocation. The Gluecks' studies emerge from this intellectual tradition. This article will not address the general applicability of the scientific method to the social sciences. Rather than questioning the basic assumptions of prediction research, this article will briefly mention the research philosophy that undergirds a Glueck prediction table and then discuss the value of the evidence that is presented to prove the validity of this table.

In *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*,[1] the Gluecks attempted to predict future criminally relevant behavior of children upon entrance at elementary school. The Gluecks compared 500 persistently delinquent boys with 500 non-delinquents. The boys were matched by pairs with respect to age, ethnic derivation, general intelligence (IQ) and residence in economically and culturally underprivileged areas. Intelligence, housing, poverty and the other factors mentioned were thus "neutralized" and excluded from the list of factors that could possibly be found to "cause" or to be positively or negatively related to delinquency. In an example of biased research, the Gluecks made this selection "because the great bulk of criminological writing at that time [1940] dealt with persons from the slum areas and emphasized poverty as a major 'cause' of crime." [2]

In spite of these inbuilt limitations in the research design, the Gluecks not only found intelligence not causally related to delinquency,[3] but also saw a "causal law" [4] emerge from their findings. When heavily criticized for thus interpreting their data and attributing causal significance to some factors, Sheldon Glueck replied, "[I]t is highly probable that what is involved is an etiologic *connection* between them; in other words, the delinquency not only follows the traits and factors that have been found to precede it, but follows *from* them." [5]

The way in which a model is generated is an arena for criticism separate from the utility of the model. Frequently criticized flaws in the research design and the analysis of the data will not be discussed here. Disagreement with etiological assumptions underlying a prediction table need not impair its utility. When an attempt to predict is made on the basis of statistically gathered and analyzed data, it may not prove necessary to understand the causal relationships. The etiological chain may even be the reverse, if, for example, some negative factors in the *Glueck Social Prediction Table*, rather than bringing about delinquency, actually were a direct outcome of the original delinquent behavior.[6]

* Associate Professor of Sociology, Institute of Sociology, University of Saarbruecken, West Germany; Research Associate, School of Criminology, University of California—Berkeley.

This paper will be presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology and the Inter-American Congress in Criminology, Caracas, Venezuela, November, 1974.

[1] S. GLUECK & E. GLUECK, UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY (1950).

[2] S. Glueck & E. Glueck, *Delinquents and Nondelinquents in Depressed Areas: Some Guidelines for Community Preventive Action*, 2 COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH J. 214 (1966).

[3] S. GLUECK & E. GLUECK, UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY 272 (1950); S. GLUECK & E. GLUECK, PREDICTING DELINQUENCY AND CRIME 116 n.7 (1959).

[4] S. GLUECK & E. GLUECK, UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY 281–82 (1950).

[5] S. Glueck, *Ten Years of Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency: An Examination of Criticisms*, 51 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 283, 296 (1960) (emphasis in original).

[6] It is important to note the subtle difference from

Of the four predictive devices that originally emerged from the *Unraveling* study, the Gluecks recommended the use of their *Social Prediction Table* (see Table I). This table can be more easily applied than the other devices because it does not require the highly specialized and not readily available psychological and psychiatric services the other tables would presuppose. Moreover, its correlation coefficient in relation to the other tables and to delinquency is the highest.[7] Of all prediction tables, this *Social Prediction Table* has experienced the highest number of validation studies, apart from such efforts as the parole prediction tables actually used in a few jurisdictions. The Gluecks have repeatedly assured their readers that control studies have proved their *Social Prediction Table* valid and that two prospective follow-up experiments brought further confirmation.[8]

The first American studies were undertaken almost immediately after the publication of *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* in 1950. In these studies the table was applied to samples of delinquents only in order to determine the extent to which the table would have identified them. The results of almost a dozen of these studies were published. The samples consisted of delinquent groups of between fifty and 150. The reported percentage of correct identifications averages from approximately 80 to 90 per hundred.

It is important to note that the samples of delinquents differed in many ways from the cases on which the table was originally constructed. In some studies the table was applied to girls instead of boys, while in others different variables were obtained. For example, delinquents were younger, of different ethnic origin, higher intelligence, better economic status, or grew up in neighborhoods that were less disadvantaged than those on which the *Unraveling* study was based.

TABLE I

A

ORIGINAL SOCIAL FACTOR PREDICTION TABLE

Social Factors	Weighted Failure Score
1. *Discipline of Boy by Father:*	
Overstrict	71.8
Lax	59.8
Firm but kindly	9.3
2. *Supervison of Boy by Mother:*	
Unsuitable	83.2
Fair	57.5
Suitable	9.9
3. *Affection of Father for Boy:*	
Indifferent or hostile	75.9
Warm (including overprotective)	33.8
4. *Affection of Mother for Boy:*	
Indifferent or hostile	86.2
Warm (including overprotective)	43.1
5. *Cohesiveness of Family:*	
Unintegrated	96.9
Some elements of cohesion	61.3
Cohesive	20.6

B

FOUR-CLASS SOCIAL PREDICTION TABLE

Total of Weighted Failure Score	Chances of Delinquency (%)
Under 200	8.2
200–249	37.0
250–299	63.5
300 and over	89.2

Some researchers, however, have difficulties in understanding the limitations of their findings. One study, for example, included fifty delinquent girls but not a single non-delinquent girl. Yet, the report of this study praises the fact that "100 per cent of the fifty girls were correctly identified as delinquents or non-delinquents."[9] Considering the absence of any delinquent in the study, this result is as outstanding as it is misleading. Unfortunately, it is also representative of other studies.

It is obvious that a table which is meant to distinguish between delinquents and non-delinquents cannot be tested and validated by studies that have focussed exclusively upon delinquents. The inherent disadvantage in such studies is that, by

the Gluecks in the statistically sound approach of Mannheim and Wilkins: "We shall make no claim to unravel causes of recidivism and we do not claim that even those factors we find to be most highly associated with failure are in any part a cause of such failure." H. MANNHEIM & L. WILKINS, PREDICTION METHODS IN RELATION TO BORSTAL TRAINING 43–44 (1955).

[7] S. Glueck & E. Glueck, *Early Detection of Future Delinquents*, 47 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 174, 181 n.13 Table 1 (1956).

[8] *See, e.g.*, E. Glueck, *Efforts to Identify Delinquents*, 24 FED. PROBATION 49 (September, 1960); S. Glueck, *Ten Years of Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency: An Examination of Criticisms*, 51 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 283 (1960); S. Glueck & E. Glueck, *The Uses and Promise of Prediction Devices*, INT'L J. OF SOCIAL PSYCHIATRY 1 (Congress Issue, 1964). Successful validation studies are also reported in Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Israel, Japan, Puerto Rico and the Philippines.

[9] Thompson, *Further Validation of the Glueck Social Prediction Table for Identifying Potential Delinquents*, 48 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 175, 184 (1957).

definition, they cannot shed any light on the problem of "overprediction." "Overprediction" refers to those inaccurate predictions that falsely identify actual future non-delinquents as becoming delinquent. Insofar as the prediction of delinquency means predicting a label rather than a behavior, the application of this label may imply the negative consequences of a self-fulfilling prophecy. A retrospective study undertaken at the Dallas Child Guidance Clinic gives a clear illustration of the problem of "overprediction." According to this study, by using the Glueck table, not only 92 per cent of the delinquent, but also 77 per cent of the actually non-delinquent cases would have been predicted as future delinquents.[10]

The problem of overprediction has been frequently addressed in the literature. Critics argue that a table which is based on a construction sample of which 50 per cent were delinquents must not be applied to another sample with a significantly different rate of delinquents among its population. The Gluecks were correct in using two samples with an equal population of delinquents and non-delinquents to discover factors that can best distinguish between delinquents and non-delinquents. But after determining these factors, the scores in the tables have to be readjusted to the percentage distribution of delinquency in the actual population in order to minimize the statistical error. This distribution will vary depending on whether the table is applied at random to first-graders in a suburban school or in a high delinquency slum area, to pupils in a high crime area who were singled out by their teachers for causing severe problems, or to juveniles already institutionalized.

Among the attempts to validate a prediction table, it is necessary to differentiate between retrospective and prospective studies. This need arises because retrospective studies, by their nature, do not predict. Rather, they focus on past events. Only prospective validation studies are concerned with models which resemble the actual decision-making process. Thus, only prospective studies can truly validate a prediction table.

Since the *Social Prediction Table* is intended to identify future delinquents at the time of their school entrance, the appropriate testing mechanism would be established as follows. Tabulations would be made on children when they entered school. Then, when the child was no longer subject to the jurisdiction of juvenile courts, there would be check-ups to determine if the table correctly distinguished between delinquents and non-delinquents.

Two such prospective validation studies have been undertaken thus far, one in New York City and one in the District of Columbia. The statements that the *Glueck Social Prediction Table* has been validated usually refer to these two studies.[11] Thus, it is necessary to deal with these studies in depth.

In 1953 the New York City Youth Board without any selectivity applied the table in a delinquency area to 301 first-grade boys between the ages of 5½ and 6½ years. Children were followed up to the age of seventeen and it was discovered that "The prediction table yielded an overall accuracy of 84.8 per cent in spotting potential delinquents and 97.1 per cent accuracy in selecting potential non-delinquents." [12] A special feature of this study was that 130 of the sample were white, 130 were black, and forty-one were Puerto Rican, whereas the original sample of the *Unraveling* study consisted of 1,000 Caucasian boys.

The actual results of the New York study are as follows (see Table II). Of the total of 301 boys, forty-four (15 per cent) had become delinquent and 257 (85 per cent) were non-delinquents. Of these forty-four delinquents twenty-eight (64 per cent) were correctly identified by the table. Twenty-five boys of the total of 301 could not be identified because the table predicted that they had an almost even chance of becoming delinquent or non-delinquent. Thirty-three boys were spotted by the table as delinquents. Five out of these thirty-three boys (15 per cent) were actually non-delinquents. These two percentages of 64 per cent correctly identified delinquents and 15 per cent non-delinquents predicted as becoming delinquent, are the significant figures of the New York study. As a result, there are two critical questions to ask of a predictive device which seeks to identify future delinquents: how many of the delinquents does it identify and what is the probability that a negative prognosis will turn out false?

It is always difficult to predict a rare event. If a certain type of behavior is known to occur in half

[10] Michael & Coltharp, *Application of Glueck Social Prediction Scale in the Identification of Potential Juvenile Delinquents*, 32 AMERICAN J. OF ORTHOPSYCHIATRY 264 (1962). It is interesting to note that the Gluecks have not made any mention of this information.

[11] S. Glueck, *Ten Years of Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency: An Examination of Criticisms*, 51 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 283, 301 (1960).

[12] Craig & Glick, *Application of the Glueck Social Prediction Table on an Ethnic Basis*, 11 CRIME & DELINQUENCY 175 (1965).

TABLE II

RESULTS OF THE NEW YORK CITY YOUTH BOARD STUDY

1. The Prediction in the Score Groups

Predicted Behavior		Actual Behavior	
Rating (Probability of Delinquency)	Total Group	Delinquents	Non-Delinquents
8.6 (low)	243 (=100%)	7 (= 2.9%)	236 (=97.1%)
58.2 (almost even)	25 (=100%)	9 (=36.0%)	16 (=64.0%)
89.0 (high)	33 (=100%)	28 (=84.8%)	5 (=15.2%)
Total	301 (=100%)	44 (=14.62%)	257 (=85.38%)

2. Correct and False Predictions

Actual Behavior		Correctly Identified	Falsely "Identified"
Delinquents	44 = 100%	28 = 63.6%	7 = 15.9%
Non-Delinquents	257 = 100%	236 = 91.6%	5 = 2.0%
Total	301 = 100%	264 = 87.7%	12 = 4.0%

3. Prediction of the Entire Sample

Correctly identified	264 = 87.7%
Falsely "identified"	12 = 4.0%
Not Identified	25 = 8.3%
Total	301 = 100.0%

4. Prediction according to the Majority of Cases

Predicting all 301 as non-delinquents would be correct for	257 = 85.4%
Actually correct predictions in the study	264 = 87.7%
Difference	7 = 2.3%

of a given population, then an all-encompassing announcement of either the occurrence or non-occurrence of this behavior would be correct in 50 per cent of the cases. If the behavior has a more than even chance to occur, then the best results without the use of a prognostic device would be achieved by predicting the most common behavior for all cases. The smaller the margins become, the greater the accuracy in predicting the most probable outcome for all cases. In New York, a blanket prediction of non-delinquency, by far the most frequent behavior, would have been correct for 257 out of 301 cases (85.4 per cent of the cases). The use of a Glueck prediction table improved this result by only seven cases (2.3 per cent) (see Table II (4)).

It should be noted that as far as predictions actually made, the table yielded an accuracy of 97.1 per cent by having only seven delinquents in the total groups of 243 boys for whom non-delinquent behavior was predicted (see Table II(1)). An accuracy of 84.8 per cent was then achieved by having only five non-delinquents (15 per cent) among the thirty-three boys who were identified as delinquents. Utmost accuracy in the proportions within an identified group is the first prerequisite of a valid predictive device. Nevertheless, since the goal of the whole undertaking is the early identifi-

cation of potential delinquents, this accuracy is not of importance except for the percentage of cases for which this goal was accomplished, and the amount of possible harm done to non-delinquents at the same time.

It is also important to note the manner in which the difficulties of this study were mastered. The New York City Youth Board study started out by applying the original five-factor table and by using a prediction table with four score groups (see Table I). Because of the many broken home situations, information on factors concerning the father was often unavailable. After scoring 27.9 per cent of all boys as potential delinquents—a rate which was "out of proportion" [13] to the known delinquency rate in that area—the raters re-evaluated and corrected the initial scores of all boys with no father or a father substitute.

It was suggested that in cases in which a parent had left home before the child was three years of age and there was no substitute parent, the factor "discipline of missing parent" should be rated as "lax," "affection" should be rated as "indifferent," "supervision" should be rated as "unsuitable," and "cohesiveness of family" should be rated as "fair."[14] However, after the re-evaluation, the table still "overpredicted."[15] Furthermore, it was determined that too many cases were crowding around the borderline eventuating a more or less even chance of becoming delinquent.

In addition to these difficulties, the raters' "rate of reliability on the factors of affection proved to be extremely low."[16] The issue of rater reliability on the Glueck scale was the theme of an unpublished doctoral thesis in which it was shown that because their "expectations" of family life were marked divergent,[17] raters judge differently depending on whether they are northern- or southern-educated, and whether they are white or black social workers.

At the initiation of the New York study, many families were misclassified in respect to family cohesiveness and other relations because it was not known that some black families were more appropriately described as consanguineous rather than conjugal. If the father was missing from the home, the mother was often regarded by her own children as an older sister and the grandmother was viewed as mother and head of the family.[18]

In the New York study, two raters scored each case independently and then met with the research director. If the two raters disagreed, a third and sometimes a fourth rater was used.[19] The cases on which the raters differed as to predictive score class were sent to Dr. Eleanor Glueck for final rating.[20] If this is true, it is necessary to stress the uniqueness of the New York study. The study made such a great effort to reach correct results that it is very unlikely that with increased use of such tables the same care and precision could be duplicated.

Because of the many incomplete families, the frequent disagreement of the raters on some factors, and the fact that the table had a tendency to "overpredict," new tables were constructed on the basis of the findings of the *Unraveling* study. Thus, apart from the original five-factor table, new tables were constructed consisting of four factors with only "affection of mother for boy" eliminated. Also, new tables were constructed with only three factors based on: "discipline of boy by father," "supervision of boy by mother," and "cohesiveness of family;" "supervision of boy by mother," "affection of father for boy," and "cohesiveness of family;" "discipline of boy by father," "affection of father for boy," and "cohesiveness of family;" "supervision of boy by mother," "discipline of boy by mother," and "rearing by parent substitute;" or on "supervision of boy by mother," "discipline of boy by mother," and "cohesiveness of family." Even a two-factor table consisting of "supervision of boy by mother" and "cohesiveness of family" was constructed and used in homes in which other information was unavailable.[21] The coefficient of correlation with the Total Score of the original

[13] Craig & Glick, *Ten Years' Experience with the Glueck Social Prediction Table*, 9 CRIME & DELINQUENCY 249, 257 (1963).

[14] E. Glueck, *Spotting Potential Delinquents: Can it be Done?*, 20 FED. PROBATION 7, 9 n.12 (September, 1956).

[15] Craig & Glick, *Ten Years' Experience with the Glueck Social Prediction Table*, 9 CRIME & DELINQUENCY 249, 257 (1963).

[16] *Id.*

[17] Prigmore, *An Analysis of Rater Reliability on the Glueck Scale for the Prediction of Juvenile Delinquency*, 54 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 30 (1963).

[18] Gordon, *Five Signs on the Highroad*, 46 Saturday Review 49, 51 (1963).

[19] Craig & Glick, *Ten Years' Experience with the Glueck Social Prediction Table*, 9 CRIME & DELINQUENCY 249, 255 (1963).

[20] Whelan, *An Experiment in Predicting Delinquency*, 45 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 432, 437 (1954).

[21] For the genesis of these tables, see E. Glueck, *Improving Identification of Juvenile Delinquents*, 53 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 164, 166 (1962). For the tables, see S. GLUECK & E. GLUECK, PREDICTING DELINQUENCY AND CRIME 233–35, Tables 1x-1a to 1x-1e (1960).

five-factor table was lowest for the two-factor table, but still 0.932.

After experimentation with these eight tables, it resulted that the three-factor table which had been introduced toward the end of the study, yielded the highest rate of accuracy in predicting delinquency (see Table III).[22]

If a study abandons its original table after five years, because it does not satisfy its requirements, and if experiments with many new tables result in the creation of a new and better table, the new table is certainly valuable. Nevertheless, this new table should not be termed a revision and validation of the original table. One could imagine that in 1950 after completion of the *Unraveling* project, eight prediction tables were constructed. Then, a validation sample was tested and one table verified the results, whereas the others did not. Nevertheless, this cannot predict which table would be better in the next sample.

The Gluecks have consistently argued that the new New York three-factor table was based solely on the data of *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. This three-factor table correctly identified 87.7 per cent of the total New York sample. However, Eleanor Glueck noted that this three-factor table correctly identified only 72.5 per cent of all boys of the original *Unraveling* study.[23] If the New York study is still viewed as a true prospective validation study, the result is that a prediction table increased its predictive power in correct identifications by more than 15 per cent—from 72.5 per cent in the construction sample to 87.7 per cent when applied to a validation sample.

In the framework of the Maximum Benefits project in the District of Columbia, the original five-factor table was applied to 179 elementary school children who had been referred by their teachers for "serious" behavior problems between 1954 and 1957. The ages of the children ranged from five to fourteen years. Each case of child and parent was studied by a social worker, by a psychiatrist, and whenever possible by a psychologist, a nurse and a pediatrician.[24] Such rigorous use of teams of experts can rarely be expected in the routine application of the table.

TABLE III

THE NEW THREE-FACTOR TABLE FROM NEW YORK

Predictive Factors	Weighted Failure Score
1. *Supervision of Boy by Mother*	
Suitable	9.9
Fair	57.5
Unsuitable	83.2
2. *Discipline of Boy by Mother*	
Firm but kindly	6.1
Erratic	62.3
Overstrict	73.3
Lax	82.9
3. *Cohesiveness of Family*	
Marked	20.6
Some	61.3
None	96.9
Score Class	**Chances for Delinquency**
Less than 140	8.6%
140–200	58.2%
200 or over	89.0%

The original sample of 179 included both sexes and the racial categories of Caucasian and Negro. It was possible to follow up 151 of these cases to the age of eighteen when the juvenile court in the District of Columbia loses jurisdiction. One interim report based on this study found that the five-factor scale could not discriminate sufficiently between delinquents and non-delinquents since 42 per cent of the predictive scores fell into the even-chance group. Moreover, in 1962 all 179 cases were rescored with the help of the newly developed three-factor table from the New York study.[25] In this report, it is observed that the new table differentiates better and yields more accuracy in the predictive categories than the original table. However, twenty-six cases still remained in the even-chance category. Through the use of the new three-factor table, nine cases with an original rating of high chances of delinquency changed to low. On the other hand, four cases changed from a low to a high chance of delinquency. In all of these instances the changes were claimed to be correct. The even-chance group was eventually reduced to four cases. This reduction was achieved by applying a sub-

[22] This was the three factor table consisting of "Supervision of boy by mother", "discipline of boy by mother" and "cohesiveness of family."

[23] E. Glueck, *A More Discriminative Instrument for the Identification of Potential Delinquents at School Entrance*, 57 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 27, 29 (1966). The author suggested adding two personality traits of "non-submissiveness of child to parental authority" and "destructiveness of child" to the three-factor table in order to improve it.

[24] Tait & Hodges, *Follow-up Study of Predicted Delinquents*, 17 CRIME & DELINQUENCY 202, 203 (1971).

[25] Trevvett, *Identifying Delinquency-Prone Children*, 17 CRIME & DELINQUENCY 186, 188 (1965).

TABLE IV

RESULTS OF THE WASHINGTON, D.C. STUDY

1. The Prediction in the Score Groups

Predicted Behavior		Actual Behavior	
		Delinquent	Non-Delinquent
Delinquent	134 (=100%)	102 (=76%)	32 (=34%)
Non-Delinquent	17 (=100%)	5 (=30%)	12 (=70%)
Total	151 (=100%)	107 (=71%)	44 (=29%)

2. Correct and False Predictions

Actual Behavior		Correctly Identified	Falsely "Identified"
Delinquents	107 (=100%)	102 (=95%)	5 (=5%)
Non-Delinquents	44 (=100%)	12 (=27%)	32 (=73%)
Total	151 (=100%)	114 (=75%)	37 (=25%)

3. Prediction according to the Majority of Cases

Predicting all 151 cases as delinquent would be correct for	107 (=71%)
Actually correct predictions in the study	114 (=75%)
Difference	7 (=4%)

sidiary table with five factors on personality traits to the twenty-six cases which had been left undecided. By 1963, with the help of the new three-factor table, an accuracy of 100 per cent was reported in predicting non-delinquency and of 81 per cent in predicting delinquency. Since by the time of that report only one of the children identified as delinquent, but not yet delinquent, had reached his eighteenth birthday, there was a chance that accuracy in predicting delinquents would still further improve. However, there is no final report on the Washington study following the aforementioned interim report of 1963–1967.

In 1971, however, a final report by other authors was published.[26] No mention was made in this report of any three-factor table. Rather, it gives the outcome of the follow-up study with reference to the original five-factor table (see Table IV). Of the 151 children, 107 had become delinquent, while forty-four were non-delinquent. 102 of the delinquents (76 per cent) were correctly selected by the table. However, of the 134 children identified as potential delinquents, thirty-two (24 per cent) did not actually become delinquent. This means that of the total of forty-four non-delinquents, thirty two (73 per cent) were falsely classified as delinquents. This last figure is nowhere mentioned, although the figure strongly indicates another instance of overprediction and is much more important than the statement that prediction of non-delinquency was correct in 70 per cent of the cases.

In conclusion, a control study which replaces the old prediction table by a new one, does not validate the old one. A table which is meant to identify delinquents as well as non-delinquents, cannot fully be validated if one of these two groups is excluded from the test population. The predictive power and efficiency of a prediction table should be proven by application in a prospective validation study. Two such studies were undertaken in the United States to validate the original *Glueck Social Prediction Table*, but they resulted in tables different from the ones they sought to validate.

For comparative purposes it would be advisable to come to an agreement as to which table to call the *Glueck Social Prediction Table:* the original five-factor table of *Unraveling Juvenile Delin-*

[26] Tait & Hodges, *Follow-up Study of Predicted Delinquents*, 17 CRIME & DELINQUENCY 202 (1971).

quency, the final three-factor table of the New York City Youth Board and the District of Columbia study, or any other table.

It was not the intention of this paper to follow the critics of the Gluecks whose pioneering work is fully appreciated and universally known, but to answer the question of whether the *Glueck Social Prediction Table* has been validated. Even on the basis of the statements and data given solely by the Gluecks and their disciples, the hopes and promises that have been accompanying the *Social Prediction Table* for the last two decades remain unfulfilled. The table has never been wholly validated. Nevertheless, the Gluecks may be credited with opening up an important field of criminological research and stimulating international comparative criminology particularly with reference to prediction studies.