2-1-1961

A Study of Selected Factors in Predicting Parole Success or Failure

Walter F. Kleinsasser
University of Omaha

A STUDY OF SELECTED FACTORS IN PREDICTING PAROLE SUCCESS OR FAILURE

by

Walter F. Kleinsasser

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Sociology

University of Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

February 1961

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF EXHIBITS

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The problem of juvenile delinquency is increasingly demanding more and more attention of the American public. Periodic reports compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, published annually, continue to reveal an increase in the rate of delinquent behavior. In fact, according to the final juvenile court reports for 1952 to the United States Children's Bureau, juvenile-court delinquency cases rose 29 per cent between 1948 and 1952.[1] Budgets also are constantly being increased to combat this major problem, yet it is probably true that man is still the least understood of all earthly beings. This study in parole prediction is undertaken with the hope that it will make a positive contribution to the existing body of knowledge regarding the rehabilitation of the juvenile delinquent.

One of the major steps taken to combat juvenile delinquency in modern times was the inception of the juvenile court in Chicago in 1899. Since then various devices have been utilized. Among these are probation, the indeterminate sentence, parole, classification systems, and youth authorities. It is to be noted that all of these forward looking measures depend for their efficiency on the "reasonable predictability

---

[1] T. Lynn Smith, Social Problems (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1957), p. 167.

of human behavior under given circumstances."[2] Yet all of these devices were adopted long before this indispensible basis for their success -- predictability -- was available.

In the area of predictability, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, who are well known for their research in the field of delinquency and criminology, believe that the concept of predictability is the most fruitful idea that has emerged in the history of criminology. They state:

> The determination of the traits and factors most markedly differentiating children who remain nondelinquent from those who become delinquent, and delinquents and criminals who respond satisfactorily to one or another of the methods of peno-correctional treatment from those who recidivate is a truly rational approach to the problem of criminal justice.[3]

Statement of the Problem

It was the purpose of this study to devise an instrument that will determine (a) the degree of parole readiness of the inmates of the state training schools and (b) the amount of supervision required to insure successful parole adjustment. The case histories of the parolees of the State Training School in Nebraska during 1955-1957 provide the data for this study.

Significance of the Study

For about two years the writer served as parole supervisor for boys from Douglas County, Nebraska. These boys had been committed to

---

[2] Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Predicting Delinquency and Crime (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 1.

the State Training School at Kearney, Nebraska, and had subsequently been released from the school on parole status. Past experience revealed that many of these boys from this institution returned to the community and made successful adjustments while some experienced difficulty in meeting even the minimum requirements in conforming to the rules of society.

This focuses the attention on the urgent need there exists for an objective method of determining which parolee will require additional and extensive supervision and attention, and which, if any, can succeed with a minimum amount of supervision. The need for such a method is readily seen by the fact that most supervisors or caseworkers carry such large caseloads that intensive casework service for each client is impossible.[4]

While the prediction technique has customarily been considered as a device for selecting for parole those prisoners who are most likely to make a successful adjustment on parole, it also shows great potential as a device for determining the amount and the kind of supervision and guidance individual parolees require. That is, boys who are "good risks" could be given a minimum of supervision and guidance allowing the supervisor to devote more time to the "poorer risks."

---

[4]For example, the average caseload for the Douglas County, Nebraska, parole supervisor is 100-120 cases. In general, qualified caseworkers giving intensive casework service carry an average of about thirty cases. (Excerpt from a letter dated June 21, 1960, from Mrs. Helen Riley, Child Welfare Supervisor, Douglas County Assistance Bureau, Omaha, Nebraska.)

Causation

This study is based on two basic theoretical assumptions: first, that etiology is multiple and varied, that is, that numerous "causes" bring about the end result of the variety of acts classed as "delinquent" and that the product of delinquency is the result of a series of preceding influences; secondly, that certain techniques and tests, such as psychological tests, psychiatric interviews, social histories, training school progress reports, parent-child relationships, mental tests, reveal correlative and/or causal involvements.

Parole as a Process of Release

A majority of the training schools use the word parole to describe the process of release. Other terms used include placement, discharge, after-care, trial placement, release, furlough. Because the term parole has a penal connotation and has more reference to the procedures of releasing adults, many training school administrators find the term objectionable.[5] However, for lack of a better term, the word parole will be used throughout this study.

Parole is French for "word" and is used in the sense of "word of honor."[6] Since first introduced in the United States, parole has constantly grown in popularity. Generally speaking, it is recognized today

---

[5]Elizabeth A. Betz, "Advances in Understanding the Offender," 1950 Yearbook, National Probation and Parole Association, pp. 75-78.

[6]Robert G. Caldwell, Criminology (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956), p. 658.

that a period of imprisonment should be followed by a period during which the offender can be guided, assisted, and supervised in his efforts to lead an orderly life; parole is, therefore, an essential part of the rehabilitation program in a good correctional system. Although tentative movements toward shortened sentences coupled with some form of supervision had developed earlier, the first definite attempt to apply parole came with the opening of the Elmira Reformatory in New York, which was authorized in 1869 and opened in 1876.[7] Parole did not originate in America but its greatest development is found in this country. Dr. S. G. Howe, of Boston, was the first man to use the word "parole" in the sense of conditional release.

Parole and the indeterminate or indefinite sentence go hand in hand. However, existing indeterminate sentences are in a sense fixed sentences in that most, if not all, training schools have an upper and lower limit of years of confinement.[8] As long as this is true, the parole boards must cope with the puzzling problem of whether it is better in the long run (a) to release all offenders sometime before the expiration of the maximum limit thereby affording some supervision during the transition to complete freedom but subjecting society to the risk of their committing new crimes during the period when they might have been

---

[7]Ruth Shonle Cavan, Criminology (second edition; New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1958), p. 540.

[8]In Nebraska the minimum term is three months. A boy is automatically released upon reaching his twenty-first birthday.

safely incarcerated; or (b) to keep them institutionalized for the full term and release them at its conclusion without any supervision.

In Nebraska most boys gain their release from the training school by means of parole. A small number are released upon reaching their twenty-first birthday. Others are transferred to other state institutions including the reformatory, mental hospital, and feeble-minded home, from which they gain their release.

Parole as a Period of Treatment

Parole is a conditional release of an offender from an institution after he has served a part of his sentence imposed by the court. Since the purpose of the parole is, or should be, to bridge the gap between the closely ordered life within an institution and the greater freedom of normal community living, the importance of parole as a period of treatment is immediately apparent.

In commenting upon the parole period as a time of treatment and rehabilitation, Rappaport says:

> No juvenile delinquent has ever been helped by being made to remember and look back. Real help for him must come from hope and belief in him -- belief that he can make a better and more satisfying life for himself. And in doing this he will need help. An effective program for boys and girls returning home from state training schools must be as modern and functional as the new bridges and buildings our communities are building. Such an After-Care Supervision program is the bridge back towards community living, the opportunity for the delinquent child to make "a fresh beginning," "to make the best of the present moment" towards rebirth.[9]

---

[9]Mazie F. Rappaport, "The Possibility of Help for the Child Returning from a State Training School," Journal of Social Work Process, 1954.

During the critical period of parole the delinquent must realize that no one can take over for or from him what he must be responsible for -- his own behavior. The problem for the parole supervisor is to find the balance between tight supervision and independence which will make it possible for the troubled youth to take over more and more responsibility for his own behavior.

Parole and Prediction

Cautious use of predictive devices should act as a spur to general improvement in sentencing, treatment, and releasing practices and to a search for more promising devices. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to suppose that, during treatment, the better selection of appropriate sentences should lead to a more reflective and therefore more economical administration of justice.

Despite these apparent advantages objections have been raised in regard to prediction devices. For example, Thomas J. McHugh speaks rather disparagingly of predictive instruments. He states:

> For many years an extraordinary amount of research has been conducted on parole prediction without practical or significant results. While this research may have some value as an aid to parole selection, the really important factor in parole is parole supervision and it is this area which should receive emphasis in research above all others. The effectiveness of any parole system depends upon the effectiveness of its methods of supervision and no formula or set of tables will ever be a satisfactory substitute. The idea of prediction is somehow inconsistent with the principles of individual treatment which has grown more pronounced in recent years.[10]

---

[10] Thomas J. McHugh, "Advances in Understanding Parole Offenders," 1950 Yearbook, National Probation and Parole Association, p. 168.

The premise that supervision is very important in parole makes a study of this kind significant. Not that supervision can be replaced by a formula but that closer supervision can be offered those who need it most. It is true that statistical prediction has the limitation of predicting for a group of cases rather than for a specific individual. However, because of its objectivity, together with the intimate knowledge that the parole supervisor has of his client, a predictive instrument can be valuable in that the supervisor need not depend solely upon his subjective feelings to determine the amount of supervision each case requires.

Definition of Terms Used

Delinquency: The law of the state of Nebraska states:

> A delinquent child shall mean any child under the age of 18 years: (a) who has violated any law of the state, or any city or village ordinance; (b) who by reason of being wayward or habitually disobedient is uncontrolled by his parents, guardian, or custodian; (c) who is habitually truant from school or home; or (d) who habitually so deports himself so as to injure or endanger the morals or health of himself or others.[11]

For the purpose of this study, a juvenile delinquent is a minor who has been found delinquent by the presiding judge according to the above statute, and who, in order to serve the best interests, has been committed to the State Training School and the Board of Control.[12]

---

[11]Revised Statutes of the State of Nebraska (as amended) 1943, Sec. 43-201.

[12]*Ibid.*, Sec. 43-201.

The law further reads that: "Every child committed to the State Training School shall remain there until he arrives at the age of twenty-one years unless sooner paroled or legally discharged."[13]

The hypothetically average subject included in this study would appear as follows: he is a boy who was committed at fifteen years of age, who has served fifteen months in the training school, and about twelve months on parole.

Parole: Parole and pardon are terms greatly misunderstood, not only by the general public but even by prisoners and correctional authorities. The basic differences are as follows:

> Parole is the release of an offender from a penal or correctional institution, after he has served a portion of his sentence, under the continued custody of the State under conditions that permit his reincarceration in the event of misbehavior. Properly conceived, parole contains none of the elements of executive clemency, as in the case of pardon. It has no connection with forgiveness, nor is it designed as a reward for good conduct in the institution. The basic purpose of parole is, or should be, to bridge the gap between the closely ordered life within the prison walls and the freedom of normal community living.[14]

Successful Cases: All offenders who completed their parole period without becoming further involved with the law and who gained their release as a result of satisfactory behavior, shall be considered successful.

---

[13] Ibid., Sec. 84-472.

[14] The Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures, Vol. 4, Parole (Washington: U. S. Department of Justice, 1939), p. 4.

Failures: Parolees who became involved in offenses which necessitated confinement in jail, return to the training school, or sentencing to the State Reformatory shall be termed failures.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Much has been written regarding crime in recent years with a special emphasis on juvenile delinquency. It would be impossible and unnecessary to review the wealth of material on the broad scope of juvenile delinquency, so only a summary of the studies concerning parole prediction will be included here.

While some of the studies included in this review of literature were devised for adults and do not apply directly to juveniles, they are included because they reveal the various types of studies that have been made and the methods used to construct them.

Basically two techniques, each of them with numerous variants, dominate the field: the Burgess technique, using a large number of predictive factors without any weighting, and the Glueck technique employing only a small number of factors and a weighting system. A chronological description of all the important studies of the past thirty-five years which attempt to predict by means of experience or prediction tables follows.[15]

Probably the first attempt to predict parole success or failure

---

[15] The term experience table is more accurate than prediction table, which is commonly used, since the table is simply a device for summing up the experience acquired with past parole failures and successes.

scientifically was made by Warner,[16] at the invitation of Mr. Sanford Bates, then Commissioner of Correction of the State of Massachusetts.

This paper published in 1923 was more important because of the thought-provoking effects it had on subsequent studies than for its positive findings, which were negligible. Warner picked 680 prisoners of the Massachusetts State Reformatory, who had appeared before the Board of Parole between 1912 and 1920. Of these, 300 were parole successes, 300 parole violators and 80 who had not yet been paroled. Information available in their files was then collected under sixty-four headings and the three groups were then compared with regard to these factors. In addition, the nine criteria used by the Massachusetts Reformatory for determining whether or not to grant parole were also taken into consideration. The nine criteria used were: (1) amount of reformation accomplished during the stay in the institution, (2) his conduct in the institution, (3) parole employment, (4) proper home surroundings during parole, (5) ability to tell the exact truth when interviewed by the board, (6) seriousness of offense, (7) previous court record, (8) impressions made at appearance before the board, and (9) behavior on former parole.

Warner then tried to show that in the light of his comparative figures for parole violators and nonviolators the criteria as used by the board appeared to be without foundation. That is, the board did not

---

[16] S. B. Warner, "Factors Determining Parole from the Massachusetts Reformatory," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1923, pp. 172-207.

adequately weight the factors. For example, the board regarded the commission of a sexual crime as militating against release on parole whereas actually two-thirds of paroled sex offenders proved successes, against an overall success rate of only one-half. On the other hand, Prisoners committed for larceny and breaking and entering were readily paroled, despite a violation rate of 57 per cent.

Another weakness in the existing release procedures that Warner discovered was the fact that for most of the information on family background, nationality, education, circumstances at time of crime, residence and education, the board relied on the answers obtained from the prisoners themselves.

Warner concluded that none of the sixty-four factors on which information was available, with the exception of the psychiatric report, showed any significance as criteria of success or failure and that little improvement was possible without changing both the method of obtaining information and the nature of the information obtained. It is worth noting that Warner did not place the blame of failing to obtain better criteria on the board, but on the "present undeveloped state of the science of criminology."

Warner's study was immediately criticized by Hornell Hart[17] for

---

[17]Hornell Hart, "Predicting Parole Success," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XIV (November, 1923), pp. 405-414.

failure to apply tests to determine statistical significance.[18] Hart felt that "proper" utilization of information already at the disposal of the Massachusetts Board of Parole would result in improved parole results. To prove his point he presented a table showing that there were a considerable number of factors where prisoners falling in the favorable subclass of the factor would have a high chance of success on parole.

Hart also advocated that all the factors found to be statistically significant be combined into a prognostic score for each prisoner. Hart suggested that to devise such a system, the inter-correlations between the various items tabulated by Professor Warner, as well as their correlations with parole violations would have to be studied, so as to devise the best possible weighting system for scoring pertinent facts. The results of this procedure could then be used to establish the risk of violation for each score or score interval. The finished product might appear as follows:

Score Group	Violators (Per cent)
5-10	3
4	7
3	17
2	29
1	46
0	75

[18] For example: Pearsonian coefficient of mean-square contingency ("C") used to determine the degree of relationship between a factor and behavior during or after treatment or chi square to determine statistical significance.

A weakness in Hart's study is that he accepted the prisoner's own story when it suited him, but rejected it when it seemed to conflict with previous criminological findings.[19] While Hart did not construct a weighted scoring system himself, he indicated the possibility of devising one. This was a major factor in setting the stage for the first important prediction study by Professor Ernest W. Burgess of the University of Chicago.

In order to ascertain the relationship between the indeterminate sentence law and the parole system, Burgess[20] working jointly with Judge Andrew A. Bruce and Dean Albert J. Harno, attempted to answer two questions:

1. What specific facts about the prisoner and his past history as stated in the record could be related to the fact that he had, or had not, violated parole?

2. What, if any, additional facts significant in the light of his record on parole might also be secured?

Information was gathered from the parole records of one thousand men from each of the State Penitentiaries at Joliet and Menard, Illinois, and a similar number from the State Reformatory at Pontiac, Illinois, on

---

[19]Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, op. cit., quoted from Dr. Hermann Mannheim and Leslie T. Wilkins, Predicting Methods in Relation to Borstal Training (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1955).

[20]Andrew A. Bruce, Ernest W. Burgess, and Albert J. Harno, The Workings of the Indeterminate Sentence Law and the Parole System in Illinois (Springfield: Illinois State Board of Parole, 1928), Chapters 28 and 30.

the following twenty-two factors: (1) nature of offense, (2) number of associates in committing offense for which convicted, (3) nationality of the inmate's father, (4) parental status, including broken homes, (5) marital status of the inmate, (6) type of criminal, as first offender, occasional offender, habitual offender, professional criminal, (7) social type, as ne'er-do-well, gangster, hobo, (8) county from which committed, (9) size of community, (10) type of neighborhood, (11) resident or transient in community when arrested, (12) statement of trial judge and prosecuting attorney with reference to recommendation for or against leniency, (13) whether or not commitment was upon acceptance of lesser plea, (14) nature and length of sentence imposed, (15) months of sentence actually served before parole, (16) previous criminal record of the prisoner, (17) his previous work record, (18) his punishment record in the institution, (19) his age at time of parole, (20) his mental age according to psychiatric examination, (21) his personality type according to psychiatric examination, and (22) psychiatric prognosis.

Each factor was divided into a number of categories; for example, type of offense into larceny, robbery (theft from a person), burglary (breaking and entering), fraud and forgery, sex offenses, murder and manslaughter, and all other offenses. When the over-all rate of parole violation was compared with the rate for each of the factors, it was found to be higher for certain categories and lower for others.

To make the differences in the rate of violation found for the various categories of each of the twenty-two factors usable for practical

purposes, Burgess attributed an arbitrary weight of one point to each factor. Thus a parolee whose violation rate for, say, twelve factors was found to be below the over-all rate for his institution was given twelve favorable points, while the factors for which his violation rate was above the over-all rate were ignored since he did not consider them to be prognostic of parole success.

The individual cases were then scored and a table of "Expectancy Rates of Parole Violation and Nonviolation" was constructed for the various scores or score intervals. This revealed that the Expected Rate of Violation for men having, for example, sixteen to twenty-two favorable points to be 1.5 per cent, and for men with only two to four favorable points, 76 per cent. Despite the apparent accuracy of this table, Burgess cautioned that it was merely illustrative of the possibilities of the method and not adapted for immediate use. Burgess was also aware of the fact that although statistical prediction was now feasible, exclusive reliance could not be placed on it at the expense of intensive study of the actual case.

As mentioned earlier the Burgess method has become one of the two most widely used techniques in parole prediction. However, it has also been criticized on the following grounds, summarized by Vold.[21]

(a) Only the material contained in official records was used.

(b) Only conduct during the official period of parole was considered.

---

[21]George B. Vold, Prediction Methods and Parole (Minneapolis: The Sociological Press, 1931), p. 16.

(c) Some of the categories used to differentiate between violators and nonviolators were overlapping and too subjective. This applies in particular to Burgess' category of "social type" which was divided into subclasses such as "hobo," "ne'er-do-well," "mean citizen," "gangster," etc.

(d) There was no check upon the reliability or consistency of the findings by reclassification or similar tests.

(e) A system of scoring was used that assigned equal weight to every one of the twenty-two factors, whereas it was evident from the tables produced that certain factors were more strongly correlated to success or failure than others.

Criticisms (a) and (b) question the reliability and completeness of the material used as the basis of the statistical work, while the others are criticisms of the statistical techniques employed.

In a study entitled "Success and Failure on Parole Can be Predicted,"[22] Clark Tibbitts studied three thousand parolees from the Illinois State Reformatory. The subjects were divided into two classes: (1) two thousand boys who served a maximum one year parole period, and (2) one thousand boys who rounded out the full year but the full period extended beyond that year.

Tibbitts, using the twenty-two factors recorded below, attempted to ascertain the correlation between the presence or absence of the

---

[22]Clark Tibbitts, "Success or Failure on Parole Can be Predicted," Journal of Criminal Law, XXII (May, 1931), pp. 11-50.

individual factors and outcome of the parole. (1) Nature of offense, (2) number of associates in committing offense for which convicted, (3) nationality of inmate's father, (4) type of criminal, as first offender, occasional offender, habitual offender, professional criminal, (5) social type, as ne'er-do-well, gangster, hobo, (6) size of the community, (7) type of neighborhood, (8) resident or transient in community when arrested, (9) statement of trial judge and prosecuting attorney with reference to recommendation for or against leniency, (10) whether or not commitment was upon acceptance of lesser plea, (11) nature and length of sentence imposed, (12) previous criminal record of the prisoner, (13) his previous work record, (14) his punishment record in the institution, (15) his age at time of parole, (16) his mental age according to psychiatric examination, (17) his personality type according to psychiatric examination, (18) psychiatric prognosis, (19) length of time served before parole, (20) employment status at commitment of crime, (21) type of neighborhood into which paroled, and (22) first job on parole.

The first eighteen factors were borrowed from Burgess' study and the last four, 19-22, were added by Tibbitts. While Burgess allowed only for consideration of favorable factors, Tibbitts considered both favorable and unfavorable elements in prison life. Despite these differences both studies achieved almost identical results in predicting parole success and failure.

The most ambitious attempt to construct prediction tables for juvenile delinquents and criminals has been made by Sheldon and Eleanor

Glueck. The Gluecks began their research in criminology and delinquency in 1925. The prediction tables have been a by-product rather than the main objective of their researches, which have dealt primarily with evaluating, through follow-up studies, the effectiveness of the various forms of peno-correctional treatment for both juvenile and adult offenders.[23] In Predicting Delinquency and Crime[24] the Gluecks made their first attempt to develop a "network" of predictive instruments. Sixty-two tables were included in the volume as illustrative of the potentialities of predictive devices.

In contrast to the Burgess method mentioned earlier, the Glueck method employed in a prediction table only those few factors (usually five) that had been shown through follow-up studies to bear a high relationship to subsequent behavior. The method used to construct the prediction tables were as follows:

The first step was to relate each factor encompassed in the particular inquiry to the behavior of the offenders during or following the form of peno-correctional treatment for which the device was desired. In the earliest studies the Pearsonian Coefficient of Mean-square Contingency ("C") to determine the degree of relationship between a factor

---

[23]See Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Five Hundred Criminal Careers (New York: Knopf, 1930); Five Hundred Delinquent Women (New York: Knopf, 1934); One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1934); Later Criminal Careers (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1937); Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1940); Criminal Careers in Retrospect (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1943).

[24]Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Predicting Delinquency and Crime (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 188-255.

and behavior during or after treatment was relied upon to select the factors. Later in their work a simpler method was used.[25] According to this method those factors in which significant differences (P 0.01 as determined by the computation of the chi-square) occurred between the delinquents and their matched nondelinquents in the subclasses of each factor. Other considerations in selecting the five factors were: (a) mutual exclusiveness, (b) relative independence, and (c) availability of data.

After the factors were selected the Gluecks set down the percentage of offenders actually misbehaving within each subclass of a factor. For example, in Exhibit A appear the five factors and their subcategories which were selected as the basis for a table for predicting the behavior of juvenile delinquents on parole; also shown are the percentage incidence of parole violation for each of the categories.

The third step was to determine the highest and lowest violation scores obtainable on the five factors involved. The sum of the smallest percentages in the subcategories of the five factors resulted in the "lowest possible parole violation score." Similarly the sum of the five largest percentages of the subcategories of the five factors gave the "highest possible parole violation score." Thus, as seen in the exhibit the minimum score is 276.7 and the highest possible score is 396.5.

---

[25] Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1940), Chapter XX.

EXHIBIT A[26]

FACTORS PREDICTIVE OF BEHAVIOR OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS

DURING PAROLE

Predictive Factors and Subcategories	Percentage Incidence of Parole Violators
Birthplace of Father	
Foreign Countries other than Ireland	64.3
United States	77.9
Ireland	89.7
Birthplace of Mother	
United States, Poland, Russia, Lithuania, Italy	66.9
Foreign Countries other than Poland, Russia, Lithuania, Italy, Ireland	72.7
Ireland	86.7
Discipline by Father	
Firm but Kindly	40.3
Erratic	63.9
Overstrict or Lax	74.1
Discipline by Mother	
Firm but Kindly	50.0
Erratic	61.3
Overstrict or Lax	73.8
School Misconduct	
None	55.2
Some	72.2

[26]Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Predicting Delinquency and Crime (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 27.

The fourth step consisted of establishing the score classes in equidistant intervals between the minimum and maximum score limits.

Then each individual in the group was scored on the five factors and placed in the appropriate score class. The number of cases falling into each score class were then converted into percentages. The resulting distribution of percentages was used as the basis for the predictive instrument.

The final step consisted of examining the percentages to determine which combination of score classes provided the most accurate prediction.

Several important contributions have been made to the subject of prediction by George B. Vold of the University of Minnesota.[27] Vold undertook the study of parole prediction, recognizing the principle of the cumulative effect of individually insignificant factors. The object of the investigation was to answer these questions:

What information, in the parole records, accumulated by the parole board, is important as an indicator of probable conduct on parole? How may the board know, in any given case, whether it is taking a serious chance or acting on a relative certainty in the matter of an inmate's probable conduct on parole?

In his book Prediction Methods and Parole he used the records of 542 men discharged from the Minnesota State Prison and of 650 men discharged from the Minnesota State Reformatory during the periods 1922 to

---

[27] Vold, op. cit.

1927. Information was gathered on factors classified as follows: (1) factors involving the circumstances and conditions of the trial and commitment, (2) factors involving circumstances and conditions of the social background, (3) factors involving the traits, habits, and characteristics of the individual, (4) factors associated with the period of stay in the institution, and (5) factors associated with the period of parole. The author concluded that, while no single factor appeared to be of outstanding importance, few, if any, appeared to be without any significance. Contrary to most studies, Vold found that parole violations showed no tendency to be more frequent in the earlier part of the parole period but occurred fairly uniformly throughout the whole year.

An interesting aspect of Vold's study is his comparison of the efficiency of the Burgess technique of utilizing all available factors without weighting them with the Glueck technique of using only the most significant factors. Since very little difference was found between the results obtained by the two techniques, and in view of the greater laboriousness of the Glueck method of scoring, no further use of it was made by Vold.[28]

An example of a prediction study not based on follow-up research

---

[28] In Criminal Careers in Retrospect, p. 219, the Gluecks point out that this criticism refers only to the original construction of the tables, whereas their application in view of the smaller number of items, involves less work than the Burgess method.

was made by Ferris F. Laune.[29] In seeking for some method for predicting probability of success on parole which would include an estimate of a prisoner's personality and attitudes, the question of the "hunches" of the other inmates was considered. In a prison it is quite generally believed that an inmate can size up his fellow inmate and estimate with some degree of accuracy his future conduct. If this is true, reasoned Laune, the official who could through some means analyze an inmate on the same basis as is used by his fellow inmates would be enabled to make a more accurate prediction.

Laune felt that his method met with some degree of success in predicting success on parole but readily admitted that the results would have to be checked. He declared his intentions to continue the study but subsequent parole prediction literature is silent on the matter. The method was too subjective and statistically too indefensible to be of scientific value.

After twenty years of experimentation and research in the application of parole prediction methods, Lloyd E. Ohlin, sociologist-actuary with the Illinois Division of Correction, published a monograph entitled Selection for Parole.[30] Dr. Ohlin's technique is largely derived from Burgess' pioneer study, also carried out on Illinois parolees. Since a

---

[29]Ferris F. Laune, "A Technique for Developing Criteria of Probability," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XXVI (May, 1935), pp. 41-45.

[30]Lloyd E. Ohlin, Selection for Parole (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1951).

routine prediction system was established as early as 1933 in Illinois, the principal stages in the construction of Ohlin's prediction or, as he prefers to call them, experience tables will be given.

Ohlin selected a sample of one thousand cases who had been discharged for a period of at least five years. The selection of predictive items was made from factors likely to be significant in view of the results of previous researches. In devising the prediction table Ohlin analyzed twenty-seven factors.

In devising the table currently used in Illinois and based on material from 4,941 parolees, the following twelve factors, out of twenty-seven on which information had been gathered, were retained: (1) type of offense, (2) sentence, (3) type of offender, (4) home status, (5) family interest, (6) social type, (7) work record, (8) community, (9) parole job, (10) number of associates, (11) personality, and (12) psychiatric prognosis.

The following fifteen factors were excluded from use because the subclasses lacked a sufficient degree of association with parole outcome, or statistical significance, or reliability or stability:[31] (1) time served, (2) age, (3) nationality and racial origin, (4) criminal record, (5) punishment record, (6) married status, (7) working at time of offense, (8) last institutional assignment, (9) criminal mobility, (10) neighborhood at offense, (11) use of alcohol, (12) venereal

---

[31]For a detailed discussion of the predictive items and the appropriate statistical tests to measure them the reader is referred to Ohlin, op. cit., Appendix B, pp. 105-112.

infection, (13) parole community, (14) parole neighborhood, and (15) mental rating.

For each factor Ohlin set up a series of subclasses which provided the basis of separation between parole successes or failures. The violation rate was obtained for each of the subclasses by dividing the number of violators by the total number of subjects in the subclass. For the factor "family interest," for example, the violations ranged from 5 per cent in the subclass "very active" to 40 per cent in the subclass "none," compared with an over-all number of violations of 28 per cent for the total of 4,941 cases. In this way each factor was marked as a favorable, neutral or unfavorable predictive item. For example, under "type of offense" homicide and sex offenses were rated as favorable, burglary as unfavorable. Other items (robbery, larceny, forgery, and miscellaneous) were rated as neutral. Each parolee was given one favorable point for every favorable subclass, one unfavorable point for every unfavorable subclass and a zero for every neutral subclass in which he fell. The subject's score was determined by subtracting all the unfavorable points from the favorable points. The neutral subclasses were ignored as having no predictive value. Following this, it was possible to construct the experience table showing the range in violation rates.[32] For persons having five to ten favorable points the parole violation rate was 3 per cent. For those having five to six unfavorable points the violation rate was 75 per cent.

---

[32]See Appendix A.

Ohlin states that:

> It was discovered that rather close adherence to the experience table could yield up to thirty-six per cent greater accuracy in making parole selections than if this information were ignored. It is thus apparent that integration of this prediction information with other knowledge available to the board can provide an appreciable increase in the percentage of successful cases selected for parole.[33]

The study made by Glaser was predicated on Ohlin's thesis: "The greater increase in predictive accuracy will undoubtedly depend on securing better factors rather than on refining the techniques and methods of prediction work." From this basis Glaser[34] formulated some new factors as follows: (1) most serious previous sentence, (2) age at first leaving home for six months or more, (3) number of years of schooling, (4) vocational capacity, (5) total criminal record, and (6) social development; and used them together with factors from Ohlin's study. These factors were tested on 4,448 inmates paroled during the decade 1940-49 from the Pontiac Branch of the Illinois State Penitentiary. This institution is for the "young and improvable." The mean age at parole was 24.1 years and the average time served was 3.6 years.

Among the home background factors considered, quality of home, while significant, was not as useful in parole prediction as were the circumstances of the first prolonged departure from home, i.e., training school, reformatory, or prison. Of less predictive utility was the

---

[33] Ohlin, op. cit., p. 88.

[34] Daniel Glaser, "A Reconsideration of Some Parole Prediction Factors," American Sociological Review, 1954, p. 335.

factor "home status" with subcategories of: superior, average, inferior, broken, institution, and left home. Schooling was positively correlated with parole success and the author states that it is anticipated that a reliable index of school "adjustment" would show even greater utility in selection for parole. Intelligence scores had less association with parole outcome than had schooling. Another positively significant factor was: inmates whose vocational capacity at parole was rated as adequately skilled.

Sex offenses and homicide and assault were most favorable, i.e., they showed the lowest rates of parole violation. Auto larceny and burglary were the most unfavorable, i.e., they showed the highest rates of parole violation. The above study is relevant to this investigation since it deals with the "young and improvable." However, the chief criticism is not that Glaser's study is deficient in itself but that it was devised for young adults rather than juveniles. For example, Glaser found that the circumstances of the first prolonged departure from home was more useful than the quality of the home. For the majority of juveniles in the present study, there was no prolonged departure from home prior to their commitment and it also seems logical to assume that "quality of home" and "home status" would have a greater influence in the lives of juveniles who are still in the home than in the lives of adult offenders who have broken home ties.

A new approach with interesting possibilities in understanding delinquents has been revealed in a study by Gough and Peterson.[35] These

---

[35]Floyd L. Ruch, Psychology and Life (fifth edition; Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1958), p. 140.

investigators have built a series of predictive test items around the central theory that the delinquent individual is unable to look upon himself as a social object and hence to set up a series of expectancies and critiques. In other words, the delinquent cannot see himself as others see him; he cannot evaluate his behavior in terms of its consequences in the lives of others and his own welfare. This study is typical of recent studies that have been designed to identify potential delinquents among young children at the time of school entrance.

In reviewing the above studies, many of the techniques, methods, and factors used are applicable to the present study. The fact remains, however, that there is still no predictive instrument geared specifically for predicting parole success or failure for juveniles in our correctional institutions such as our State Training Schools.

CHAPTER III

SOURCE OF INFORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUMENT

Subjects

The subjects selected for this study were fifty-one delinquent boys from Douglas County, Nebraska, who were on parole from the State Training School, Kearney, Nebraska, as of April 1, 1957, and all who were since released on parole, until June, 1958. Some cases had to be eliminated because the subjects were paroled to parents or relatives who had moved out of the state since the boy's commitment. Others were admitted to Father Flanagan's Home for Boys, Indian Missions, etc., and were under the direct supervision of those institutions. In addition, a few were not included because of the recency of their release. The fifty-one cases used in this study were boys with whom the writer is or was well acquainted through many personal contacts over a period of twenty-four months.

Sources of Information

Data for the study were derived from a variety of sources. The Nebraska State Division of Child Welfare granted permission for the use of the case records compiled by the Douglas County Child Welfare Department. Each of these records contained a complete social summary made at the time of the boy's commitment to the training school and included the family background, personal history of the boy, court records, school and psychological reports, and, in a few cases, psychometric reports. In

addition to this information, the record contained the intake information gathered from the boy by the training school personnel; the reports of progress made during the boy's incarceration; the subsequent parole plan and parole reports, as well as the correspondence in connection with the case. Each home was visited and numerous interviews were held with each boy, his parents, school authorities, employers, and others who had contact with him.

Compilation of the Instrument

The nine factors used in this study were all taken from Ohlin's original twenty-seven factors.[36] Since Ohlin's predictive instrument was devised for adults many of the factors were not applicable for juveniles. The thirteen factors thus eliminated (each being followed by the reason for elimination) are:

1. Age: All were minors with age difference of only three or four years.
2. Nationality and Racial Origin: Insufficient number of cases to warrant separate categories.
3. Punishment Record: No previous institutional punishment.
4. Marital Status: No cases.
5. Last Institutional Assignment: No cases.
6. Criminal Mobility: All cases residents of Omaha.

---

[36]Ohlin, op. cit., pp. 122-129.

7. Neighborhood at Time of Offense: All cases from a relatively similar type of neighborhood.

8. Use of Alcohol: Only three cases recorded.

9. Venereal Infection: No known cases.

10. Parole Community: Urban in all cases.

11. Parole Neighborhood: Urban in all cases.

12. Sentence: All indeterminate -- no minimum; maximum until twenty-one years of age.

13. Community: All offenders from an urban community.

Of the fourteen factors applicable to juveniles, two more had to be eliminated. These, together with the reason for elimination, are:

1. Psychiatric Prognosis: Information available in only a few special cases.

2. Number of Associates: Researcher failed to obtain the information at the time of the original compilation of the research data.

Three additional factors were combined with related factors under the label of the latter. These combined factors are:

1. Criminal Record and Type of Offense.

2. Work Record and School Record.

3. Social type and (at least in part) Personality Rating.

Once the factors had been selected subclasses were established. Except for "Type of Offense," where property offenses were separated as a subclass distinct from all other types of offenses, two subclasses were

established for each factor, one with a positive and the other with a negative orientation. For the factor "Personality Rating" three subclasses were established along the positive to negative range.

The factor "Family Interest" can provide an illustration of this subclass formation. Social workers have subjectively seen that close home ties have a controlling, supporting, and easing effect in the transition from institutional life to life in the home community. Close family relationships help the parolee to feel that he is wanted and that society accepts him. A quantifiable aspect of this close relationship is the number of letters received from home. Thus, in this study, the home of a boy which sent an average of five or more letters per month was classified as positive and labelled actively interested, while a home yielding an average of four or less letters per month was classified as negative and labelled passively interested.

The nine factors and subclasses which were used in this study are here summarized and defined as follows:

I. Type of Offense: Official charge for which offender was committed.

   1. Theft: All crimes against property, including car theft.

   2. All Other: Including sex, drinking, robbery and assault and incorrigibility.

II. Type of Offender:

   1. First: Offender who was committed on his first official court appearance.

2. Recidivists: An offender committed on his second or third appearance before the judge, having been released to the parents on official supervision for previous appearances before the judge, also including offenders beyond the control of parents who are sentenced on the basis of a lengthy history of deviant behavior rather than for a specific act.

III. Type of Home: The classifications on this factor pertain to the dominant character of the offender's early home life.

1. Average Home:

a. Regular employment or income above subsistence level.

b. Consistent discipline and moral training.

c. Healthy husband-wife relationships.

d. Healthy parent-child relationships.

2. Inferior Home:

a. Subsistence level income.

b. Strained husband-wife relationships.

c. Alcoholism.

d. Abuse rather than discipline.

IV. Family Interest:

1. Active: Boy received average of five or more letters per month and three or more visits per year.

2. Passive: Average of three letters or less per month and less than three visits per year.

V. Mental Rating (I. Q.):

1. Average: Ninety and over.

2. Below average: Less than ninety.

VI. School Record (Precommitment):

1. Regular: Acceptable behavior and attendance according to the standards set by the school.

2. Problem: Guilty of truancy and/or other behavior problems as determined by the school standards.

VII. Parole Job or Schooling:

1. Adequate: Regular full time employment or school attendance.

2. Inadequate: Irregular in school or work, quitting jobs, being fired, truant, expelled.

VIII. Personality Rating:

The classifications on this factor were based on reports of the Psychological and Psychometric reports made at the Douglas County Youth Center before commitment and at the Training School during the incarceration. The classification is scored according to the following categories, whichever is appropriate.

1. Normal: Free from mental disorder; not insane or neurotic.

2. Unstable: A residual category between "normal" and "some gross defect."

3. Deviant: Some gross defect or serious personality deviation.

IX. Time Served:

1. Average or less: Ten to fifteen months.

2. Above average: Over fifteen months.

Validation of Subclasses

To validate objectively the positive and negative subclasses which had been selected to give the best possible separation between parole successes and failures, the fifty-one cases were classified as successes and failures for each factor. The successful cases were multiplied by two and the failures by one. The sum of the products was then divided by the number of cases reported in that particular category. Example:

Active Family Interest

Successes	20 (x2) =	40
Failures	6 (x1) =	6
		46 ÷ 26 = 1.77

Passive Family Interest

Successes	8 (x2) =	16
Failures	17 (x1) =	17
		33 ÷ 25 = 1.34

The resultant exponent validated the positive-negative order of the subclasses, the higher exponent indicating the greater degree of parole success.

Validation of Factors

The factors themselves were then tested by chi-square. This was done to determine the chance of getting the observed degree of association through random sampling from a universe where there is no association. Convention sets the maximum P at the five per cent level of significance; therefore this was selected as the criterion to determine the inclusion or exclusion of the factors in the final instrument. Table II shows the result of the computations of chi-square.

Six of the significant factors were then systematically combined and analyzed by the chi-square technique to determine whether or not the relation between the combined background items and parole success were statistically significant as seen in Table III. The seven factors that met the criterion of a five per cent level of significance as determined by chi-square are: Type of Offense, Type of Home, Family Interest, Mental Rating, Precommitment School Record, Parole Job or Schooling, and Personality Rating.

Weighting the Subclasses

On the basis of the preceding validation of the significance of the factors and of their respective positive-negative subclasses, weights were assigned to each subclass. Each positive subclass received a weight of two while each negative subclass received a weight of one. The three subclasses of the factor "Personality Rating" received values of 3:00 to 1:00 on the same basis. The factors themselves were for this study treated as being of relatively equal value as predictors.

Testing the Instrument

The score of each of the fifty-one boys was computed on the instrument made up of the seven statistically significant factors and their subclasses. With the assigned score of two to one for six of the factors and three to one for the factor "Personality Rating" the highest possible score a boy could compile was fifteen points and the lowest possible score seven points. The method of computing the score is shown on the Sample Face Sheet of the Prediction Instrument in Appendix B.

Testing the Scoring System

After the instrument was completed the scores of the fifty-one cases were computed. These scores were then arranged in descending order according to the two classifications of success and failure. The scores were then tested by chi-square to determine the relationship between the individual's score and his ultimate parole outcome.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The findings of this study are presented in the following two ways: first in tabular form together with the general meaning of the table, and secondly by a discussion of the individual factors of the instrument together with the comments about these factors from previous studies.

The Tables

The validation and the statistical significance of the instrument were summarized and presented in tabular form.

Table I demonstrates the distinctiveness and validity of the subclasses chosen for each factor. (Method discussed on page 37.)

Table II reveals the statistical significance of the factors as demonstrated by chi square. A chi square of 3.841 and 6.635 is needed for significance at the 5 per cent and 1 per cent level respectively. The two factors "Type of Offender" and "Time Served" did not attain this significant level. The seven factors "Type of Offense," "Type of Home," "Family Interest," "Mental Rating," "Precommitment School Record," and "Personality Rating" were significant at the prescribed level.

Table III attempts to demonstrate the relationship between factors.

Following the computation of the statistical significance of the nine selected factors the factors were combined to determine whether or

TABLE I

ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF SUBCLASSES OF NINE SELECTED FACTORS

Factors and Subclasses	Successful	Failure	Total	Order of Importance
I. Type of Offense				
1. Stealing	23	12	36	1.64
2. All Other	5	10	15	1.33
II. Type of Offender				
1. First	13	11	24	1.54
2. Incorrigible	15	12	37	1.19
III. Type of Home				
1. Average	18	4	22	1.82
2. Inferior	10	19	29	1.34
IV. Family Interest				
1. Active	20	6	26	1.77
2. Passive	8	17	25	1.32
V. Mental Rating				
1. Average	19	9	28	1.68
2. Below Average	9	14	23	1.39
VI. School Record				
1. Regular	10	0	10	2.00
2. Problem	18	23	41	1.44
VII. Parole Job or Schooling				
1. Adequate	22	9	31	1.71
2. Inadequate	6	14	20	1.30
VIII. Personality Rating				
1. Normal	19	1	20	1.95
2. Unstable	9	12	21	1.43
3. Some Gross Defect	0	10	10	1.00
IX. Time Served				
1. Average or Less	18	12	30	1.60
2. Above Average	10	11	21	1.48

TABLE II

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF NINE SELECTED FACTORS

Factors	X^2	P
1. Type of Offense	5.69	.02
2. Type of Offender	1.03	.50
3. Type of Home	11.32	.001
4. Family Interest	10.40	.01
5. Mental Rating	4.15	.05
6. Precommitment School Record	10.17	.01
7. Parole Job or Schooling	8.31	.01
8. Personality Rating	26.39	.001
9. Time Served	.765	.50

TABLE III

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF COMBINED FACTORS

Factors	X^2	P
Type of Offense and Type of Home	17.619	.001
" " " " Family Interest	12.059	.01
" " " " Mental Rating	9.22	.15
" " " " School Record	15.514	.001
" " " " Parole Job or Schooling	12.55	.01
Type of Home and Family Interest	15.02	.01
" " " " Mental Rating	13.961	.01
" " " " School Record	16.691	.001
" " " " Parole Job or Schooling	16.918	.001
Family Interest and Mental Rating	11.403	.01
" " " School Record	16.942	.001
" " " Parole Job or Schooling	14.935	.01
Mental Rating and School Record	13.26	.01
" " " Parole Job or Schooling	15.434	.001
School Record and Parole Job or Schooling	16.303	.001

not the combined factors make better predictors of parole success than the single items. Only those single items which are statistically significant were used. While the combination must also display statistical significance it may not display any gain in significance.

Table III shows the fifteen combinations that were created by using two significant background items at a time. Factor eight (Personality Rating) was excluded because of the larger number of categories.

By comparing Table II and Table III it can be noticed that two combinations "Family Interest and School Record" and "School Record and Parole Job or Schooling" made a gain in significance. A lesser gain was made by several other combined factors including: Type of Offense and Type of Home, Type of Offense and Family Interest, Type of Offense and School Record, Type of Offense and Parole Job or Schooling, Type of Home and School Record, Type of Home and Parole Job or Schooling, Family Interest and Mental Rating, Mental Rating and School Record, and Mental Rating and Parole Job or Schooling.

The interpretation of results in a cause and effect framework depends on logical analysis which must go beyond the statistical evidence.

Table IV shows the frequency distribution of the scores of the fifty-one subjects and the number of successes and failures for each of the respective score categories. The scores were derived from the use of the completed instrument in the following way.

After the relevant predictive items had been carefully selected, defined and weighted as described in the foregoing pages, a face

TABLE IV

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF THE SCORES
OF THE FIFTY-ONE OMAHA PAROLEES

Score	Successful	Failure	Frequency
15	4	0	4
14	5	0	5
13	7	0	7
12	5	2	7
11	3	3	6
10	3	6	9
9	1	6	7
8	0	3	3
7	0	3	3
Total	28	23	51

sheet[37] was devised on which the information of each subject was tabulated. The subclasses were weighted as described earlier in the study so that the first subclass under each factor was weighted two points and the second subclass was weighted one point.

The three subclasses under factor seven "Personality Rating" were assigned weights of three, two, and one respectively. The highest possible score achievable is fifteen and the lowest possible score is seven.

At eight degrees of freedom (Table IV) a chi square of 15.507 and 20.090 is needed for significance at the 5 per cent and 1 per cent level of confidence respectively. An examination of Table V reveals that the obtained chi square was 27.63. This is significant at the .1 per cent level of confidence and therefore could not be attributed to chance variation in a homogeneous population.

Table V then shows the high degree of consistency with which the instrument separated the successful and unsuccessful parolees.

The Individual Factors

As revealed by chi square the factors "Type of Offender" and "Time Served" which showed scores of 1.03 and .765 respectively are not statistically relevant and are therefore excluded from the study and from further individual treatment.

The other seven factors proved to be statistically significant by chi square. The factors "Type of Offense" and "Mental Rating" were

---

[37] See Appendix B.

TABLE V

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SCORE DISTRIBUTION
OF THE FIFTY-ONE OMAHA PAROLEES

	X^2	d.f.	P.
Scores	27.63	8	.001

significant at the 5 per cent level while "Type of Home," "Family Interest," "Precommitment School Record," "Parole Job or Schooling," and "Personality Rating" were significant at the 1 per cent level.

Type of Offense

Theft. Theft, as previously defined, includes all crimes against property, including car theft. It was the primary offense, being recorded thirty-six times. This high ratio is true on a nationwide scale according to reports to the United States Children's Bureau. It has also been confirmed by many local surveys and studies made by police and juvenile courts.[38] However, there is a trend of change apparent in that there is a decreasing number of crimes of this nature. This decrease is cited in a study by the Gluecks[39] as descending from 71.1 per cent to 31.5 per cent over the last fifteen years. In the thirty-six cases included in this study, twenty-three such offenders completed a successful parole period, while thirteen failed and were reincarcerated.

All Other Offenses. This category of offenders includes seven cases of incorrigibility, three cases of sex offenders, three cases of drinking, and one each of robbery and assault. The Gluecks[40] found that incorrigibility is peculiar to juveniles and decreases as the delinquent

---

[38]Herbert A. Bloch and Frank T. Flynn, The Juvenile Offender in America Today (New York: Random House, 1956), p. 41.

[39]Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up, pp. 86-88.

[40]Ibid.

grows older. This does not mean that the delinquents in their study terminated their delinquent behavior but rather that they possibly engaged in different types of behavior or perhaps were shrewder in their execution.

As pointed out by Krell,[41] sex offenses are much more prevalent among girl delinquents than among their male counterparts. This helps to explain the small number of such offenders in this study. Although the number of offenders committed for drinking is too small to develop any generalizations, it is worth noting that all three offenders failed in their parole adjustment.

Of the thirty-six boys guilty of theft twenty-three succeeded on parole and thirteen failed. Of the fifteen boys guilty of all other offenses only five were successful and ten were failures. The resultant chi square was 5.69. This is significant at the 2 per cent level.

Type of Home

Normally one would expect that offenders returning to "average" homes would be more successful than those returning to inferior homes. It has long been felt that inferior homes have a more harmful effect on the children than broken homes.

Probably the most common topic or consideration in literature dealing with delinquency is "the home." In speaking of delinquency and family relationships the Gluecks state:

---

[41]Patrick C. Krell, "A Study of Selected Characteristics of Committed Juvenile Delinquents in Omaha, Nebraska, 1955 and 1956" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Omaha, Nebraska, 1957), p. 17.

> First it should be noted that in sixteen per cent of the cases the parents were grossly incompatible in their conjugal relationships, even though they continued to live together; certainly the frictions engendered in such a situation must have had an unwholesome effect upon the children. In another twenty-two per cent the parents had been separated or divorced. Thus almost forty per cent of the youngsters were reared in an atmosphere of parental bickerings, dissatisfactions and unhappiness.[42]

Few social scientists will assign primacy to any one factor; however, there are those who state that if pressed to choose one and only one factor, they would point to the home as being at least partially involved.[43]

If the home is influential in causing delinquency, it is reasonable to suspect that there would also be a close relationship between the home and the boy's success or failure on parole. This was borne out by the present study. Of the twenty-two boys coming from average homes, eighteen made successful adjustments and only four failed. Of the twenty-nine boys coming from inferior homes only ten were successful and nineteen failed.

A further point concerning the home is stressed by Cormack, who, in speaking of today's psychological climate in "Youth in Our Changing Culture," states, "It is also an age in which many homes are 'broken' and some others ought to be." Social scientists have long hinted that a home of constant bickering, strife, alcoholism, etc., can be, and

---

[42]Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up, p. 9.

[43]Clement S. Mihanovich, Principles of Juvenile Delinquency (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1950), p. 66.

often is, a more harmful influence than a broken home.[44]

It is difficult to imagine a home broken by divorce and desertion as being free of strife, but where the disruption takes place early in the life of the offender, there is evidently less psychological damage than in the family that continues to function on an incompatible basis. In this study it was found that boys coming from broken homes made better adjustments than those coming from strife-torn homes.

Glaser found that the quality of the home, while significant, was not as useful in parole prediction as were the circumstances of the first prolonged departure from home. Where the home was rated average, or higher, economically, and no delinquency was reported, a violation rate of 30.7 per cent was found for 983 cases in contrast with 49.5 per cent violation at the other extreme, for 428 homes rated marginal economically and in which delinquency was reported. The fact that the home was broken by absence of a parent bore little relationship to parole outcome, but in cases where conflict with a parent substitute was reported, 49.5 per cent violated. These findings were interpreted as indicating a relative socializing influence of various home conditions.[45]

In this study the quality of the home is an important factor in the parole adjustment of a juvenile as revealed by a chi square of 11.32.

---

[44]Margaret L. Cormack, "Youth in Our Changing Culture," Child Welfare Journal, XXXVI, No. 9 (New York, New York, November, 1957).

[45]Daniel Glaser, op. cit., p. 335.

This means that the factor is significant at the .1 per cent level.

Family Interest

Two of the most readily quantifiable aspects for determining genuine parental and home interest are (1) the volume of mail a boy receives from his parents and other members of the home during his period of incarceration, and (2) the frequency of personal visits by members of the family. Because the latter is complicated by two secondary considerations, (1) the distance of two hundred miles between Omaha and Kearney, and (2) the low economic status of many of the families involved, the former is used in this study as being representative of home interest.

The importance of this factor can be seen by the positive correlation between family interest and parole adjustment. Table I shows that as the interest decreases, the failures increase. Interest or lack of interest as revealed by the number of letters is but an opening to the deeper and underlying area of the individual's basic wishes or desires.

Twenty boys coming from homes actively interested were successful on parole and six were failures. On the other hand only eight of those coming from homes passively interested were successful and seventeen were failures. The statistical computation for this factor reveals a chi square of 10.40 significant at the 1 per cent level.

Mental Rating

The term "Mental Rating" as used in this study means the Intelligence Quotient index. Intelligence test results were available for each

of the fifty-one offenders and in most cases the offender had been tested twice. Each boy is tested by the state examiner soon after his arrival at the training school, and many had earlier tests at the Douglas County Youth Center, the Omaha Public Schools, or a private testing bureau.

The fifty-one I. Q. scores included in this study ranged from a low of 72 to a high of 131, with a median score of 90. Two divisions were used to group these scores according to the recommendations of the tests as follows: average, 90 and above; below average, 89 or less. A total of thirty, or 59 per cent, of the offenders had scores between 90 and 110; while twenty-one, or 41 per cent of the sample had scores below 90 and were classed as possessing lower than normal intelligence.

Perspective has changed radically over the past twenty years relative to the function of intelligence in contributing to delinquency. For quite some time most of the studies apparently confirmed the theory that delinquents were either defective in intelligence or borderline cases. We have come a long way from the sententious judgment of Henry Goddard who, in his analysis of causal factors in 1921, stated that feeble-mindedness and low intelligence were direct incitements to delinquent behavior.[46] Healy and Bronner,[47] in their 1926 study also

---

[46]Henry H. Goddard, Juvenile Delinquency (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1951).

[47]William Healy and Augusta F. Bronner, Delinquents and Criminals, Their Making and Unmaking (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1926).

asserted that in only 63 per cent of the cases they surveyed was normal intelligence involved.

In research which covered some of the same subjects included in this study, Krell[48] states that his findings tend to corroborate other findings and contentions that mental deficiency does not constitute a causal factor.

If a high I. Q. is a deterrent in preventing delinquency, as formerly believed, it is also logical to believe that those with greater mentality will profit from experience and refrain from delinquent behavior during parole. This was borne out in the findings of this study. Of the twenty-eight cases with average intelligence, nineteen were successful while only nine were failures. Of the twenty-three cases of below average intelligence, nine were successful and fourteen failed. A chi square of 4.15 for this factor shows that this can not be attributed to chance variation in a homogeneous population.

Precommitment School Record

Investigations of delinquents reveal considerable uniformity in such areas as consistent records of truancy, retardation, and marked dislike of school. Healy and Bronner have shown that approximately 40 per cent of the delinquents they investigated revealed a dislike of

---

[48] Patrick C. Krell, op. cit., p. 36.

school.[49] In a more recent study, the Gluecks[50] compared delinquents and non-delinquents from similar environments and found that 88.5 per cent of the delinquents showed marked dislike for or indifference to school as compared with 34.4 per cent of the nondelinquents. This antipathy toward school is due to various reasons such as inability to learn, resentment of authority, and economic reasons, though the last reason is probably offered as an avenue of escape from the disciplines of school life.

Since all those who attended school regularly before their commitment returned to make a successful parole adjustment, we shall limit our discussion to the remaining category. By "problem" we refer both to those delinquents who were consistently truant and/or guilty of more serious behavior problems including fighting, insubordination, etc., but who were still carried on the school rolls, and also those students described as "problems" who voluntarily dropped out or who had been put off the school rolls through the action of the school authorities. About half of these boys were expelled for truancy, disciplinary reasons, etc., while the remaining 50 per cent dropped school of their own accord. For a considerable number it was merely a matter of dropping school before being expelled by the authorities, but a few with satisfactory school records were able to cope with the school situation but left school for employment purposes.

---

[49]William Healy and Augusta F. Bronner, New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), p. 62.

[50]Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, p. 143.

A fact now shown by the categories in this study reveals that on an over-all basis, twenty-seven of the fifty-one offenders were enrolled in school at the time of commitment, and twenty-four had dropped school or had been expelled. These findings compare favorably with the study of one thousand boys brought before the Boston Juvenile Court and referred to the Judge Baker Foundation for examination. There it was found that:

> Fifty-nine per cent of them were still attending school. But in the forty-one per cent who had completed their formal schooling we get a picture of the educational limitations of all the boys. Of this group eleven per cent had left school in the fifth grade, sixteen per cent in the sixth, thirty-one per cent in the seventh, twenty-five per cent in the eighth, while only seventeen per cent began but did not finish high school. Although the reason for withdrawal from school in sixty-six per cent of the cases was represented to be economic need (supplement the family's meager resources), it would seem evident that this reason was not unmixed with a strong desire to escape the disciplines of school life. More significant perhaps was the fact that only fifteen per cent were not retarded. This would indicate not only lack of ability to do school work, but often reflects various intellectual and personality difficulties.[51]

On the basis of the findings of this study together with other studies it can be concluded that the precommitment school record is an important factor in predicting the future behavior of the offender on parole. The ten boys who were regular in their school attendance before their incarceration all returned to make a successful parole adjustment. Of the forty-one who had difficulty in their precommitment school experience eighteen were successful and twenty-three were failures. Statistically this reveals a chi square of 10.17 significant at the 1 per cent level.

---

[51]Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up, p. 10.

Parole Job or Schooling

"The purpose of the State Industrial School is for retention, discipline, industrial training and reformation of the male juvenile offender."[52] It is relatively simple to accomplish the aspects of retention, discipline and industrial training but admittedly very difficult to bring about reformation. To complicate matters further, it is extremely difficult to determine the degree of reformation accomplished. School authorities strive to exercise discretion to release boys as they give evidence of their readiness to take their place in conventional society. Despite the improvement in predictive instruments, only the test of time reveals the extent of reformation accomplished.

Probably the first criterion to reveal the degree of reformation is the boy's success or lack of success in adjusting to the school or employment life after his discharge from the school. Thus a boy who has shown increased emotional stability during his incarceration and is able to secure employment and maintain a satisfactory record upon his release is usually considered as reformed.

The two subclassifications under the two factors of "Precommitment School Record" and "Parole Job or Schooling" are used synonymously. Because the majority of the boys had "school status" prior to their commitment, while after their release the majority of boys had "employment status," thus a "regular" school record is comparable to an "adequate" parole job and school record.

---

[52] Nebraska Statutes, Article 4, Sec. 83-463.

The preponderance of offenders found in the adequate job classification is quite remarkable when one considers that only ten boys had regular school attendance before their commitment. On the other hand, only twenty boys had difficulty finding and keeping a job during parole compared to forty-one who had serious difficulties in their school adjustment before their commitment.

While it is true that the parolees are strongly urged to attend school or find employment there is actually little that can be done to bring it about unless they have a desire to be so occupied. It might even be stipulated that failure to attend school or hold a job is a parole violation punishable by a return to the training school, but unless the boy is also guilty of some other infraction of the rules, few agencies or parole supervisors would enforce such a stipulation. Furthermore, whatever pressure can be brought to bear by such threats is probably more than nullified by a critical employment situation or other factors.

Experience has shown that the boys who find and keep jobs have a high probability of making a successful parole adjustment. This does not mean that the job is the sole or even the most important factor active in a boy's rehabilitation, but probably is indicative that reformation has taken place. Nevertheless, it is still true that even well adjusted boys are more apt to be guilty of deviant behavior if idle, than if gainfully employed. While employment may not be considered a cure, it is at least a preventative.

This is corroborated by the fact that of the thirty-one boys classified as working or attending school regularly (adequate), twenty-two were successful and nine were failures. Of the twenty boys in the inadequate classification for this factor, six were successful and fourteen were failures. A chi square of 8.31 for this factor is significant at the 1 per cent level.

Personality Rating

The basic or underlying factor in regulating an individual's behavior is his emotional make-up. Evidence is overwhelming that a great many children are in trouble and need help in meeting daily problems. Carr[53] says it is perhaps a fair approximation to say that 4 per cent of the school population at any given time needs help in solving problems of adjustment. In other words, in 1950 in an estimated school population aged five to sixteen, inclusive, totaling over 30,000,000, about 1,200,000 children had adjustment problems. If these children do not get help many of them become delinquent, criminal, or mental cases. It is conceivable that unless help is given, the school situation could contribute to deviant behavior by expecting too much from these "sick" children.

An article by the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association states:

> Ultimately no man can be improved except by himself, and the degree of individual responsibility assumed by the offender and

---

[53]Lowell Juillard Carr, Delinquency Control (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950).

> his family will be decisive, notwithstanding all that society may do for them. . . . There is no substitute for self discipline, family responsibility, and the practice of a firm religious faith, whatever it may be. Responsibility and freedom are inseparable; to deny the one is to forfeit the right to the other. This does not mean return to the philosophy of "every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost." Good morals and good sense decry such an attitude. Rather we believe it is true that the battlefields having shifted largely from man against nature without, to man against his own evil nature within, the responsibility of each individual is greater than ever before to see to it that he renders his neighbor all the assistance he can in the lonely struggle between good and evil which goes on in the hearts of men.[54]

Psychological and in some cases psychiatric evaluations were available. Although the training school does not have a staff psychologist or psychiatrist, either or both are quite readily available. Boys who experience serious difficulties in their adjustment process at the school are often taken to various state hospitals, or to the Nebraska Psychiatric Unit in Omaha for further testing and evaluation. Therefore, those boys who are maladjusted receive extensive evaluations and treatment.

It may seem somewhat paradoxical to rate a boy who was "flagrantly delinquent" as having a normal personality. This conclusion is substantiated, however, by the fact that nineteen of the twenty "normal" boys succeeded on parole; while on the other hand all the ten boys classified as having some gross defect in their personality make-up were found to be failures on parole. This is substantiated in a significant chi square of 26.39 for this factor.

---

[54]Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association, "Guides for Sentencing" (Handbook), Federal Probation (December, 1957).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the Social Science Research Council's Bulletin on "The Prediction of Personal Adjustment," published in 1941, the principal author, Paul Horst, made the well-founded criticism that "most 'prediction studies' end without ever attempting to predict." He stated it was not enough to show that a prediction formula worked well when applied to the original sample; its applicability to other cases had to be demonstrated.[55] At that time he was able to list only three such attempts to validate a previously established formula: one by Tibbitts, Vold, and an inconclusive study by Sanders.

Despite the number of prediction instruments that are available it is disappointing to note that little practical use has been made of them.

The failure to use these instruments is not due to the exaggerated claims of the theorists. On the contrary, in nearly every research study published thus far it has been stressed that the applicability of the experience tables to actual cases was dependent on their previous validation; and, secondly, that these tables were intended merely to supplement, but in no way to replace, the individual judgment of the courts and penal administrators.

---

[55] Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Predicting Delinquency and Crime, p. 174, quoted from Paul Horst, et. al., "The Prediction of Personal Adjustment," Social Science Research Council Bulletin 48 (New York, 1941).

Conclusions

On the basis of the completed study of the selected factors it can now be concluded that

1. There is a direct correlation between the score of a boy and his parole success; i.e., boys with a score of thirteen and above are good parole risks, while those scoring lower than thirteen become increasingly poorer risks.
2. There is an inverse correlation between the subject's score and the amount of supervision required.

In addition to the above conclusions the following generalizations can be made:

1. That the instrument as tested on the original sample appears to be reliable.
2. That while this study does not claim to provide conclusive evidence, it favors prediction tables based on a few factors.
3. That the factors "Type of Offense," "Type of Home," "Family Interest," "Mental Rating," "Precommitment School Record," "Parole Job or Schooling," "Personality Rating," contribute significantly to the prediction of parole success and failure.
4. That a family functioning on an incompatible basis can be, and often is, a more harmful influence than a broken home.
5. That parole failures increase as parental interest decreases.
6. That contrary to several other studies the findings of this study tend to reveal that the mentally deficient do not constitute a preponderance of the delinquent population.

7. That the precommitment school record is an important factor in predicting the future parole behavior of the offender.
8. That some reformation or maturing during the incarceration period is seen in the fact that only twenty boys had difficulty in finding and keeping a job during parole as compared to forty-one who had serious difficulties in their school and employment adjustments before commitment.
9. Psychological and psychiatric examinations appear to be helpful in selecting those emotionally capable of parole success.

Recommendations

Based on the preceding observations the following recommendations can be made:

I. Concerning the testing of the instrument:
That the instrument be further tested (1) by compiling experience tables for other comparable groups of parolees, (2) by applying it to a control group of delinquents when they first appear in court, and (3) by later comparing the actual experience with the early prediction.

II. Concerning the application or use of the instrument:
That if proved valid it be used (1) by juvenile courts as an aid in selecting the most appropriate corrective measure for each delinquent, (2) by training school officers to determine parole readiness of committed delinquents, and (3) by parole boards in determining the most effective form and amount of after care.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Betz, Elizabeth A. "Advances in Understanding the Offender," 1950 Yearbook, National Probation and Parole Association.

Block, Herbert A., and Frank I. Flynn. The Juvenile Offender in America Today. New York: Random House, 1956.

Bruce, Andrew A., Ernest W. Brugess, and Albert J. Harno. "Factors Determining Success or Failure on Parole," The Workings of the Indeterminate Sentence Law and the Parole System in Illinois. Springfield, Illinois: Illinois State Board of Parole, 1928.

Caldwell, Robert G. Criminology. New York: The Ronald Press, 1956.

Carr, Lowell Juilliard. Delinquency Control. New York: Harper Brothers, 1950.

Cavan, Ruth Shonle. Criminology. Second edition. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1958.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Criminal Careers in Retrospect. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1943.

_____. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1940.

_____. Five Hundred Criminal Careers. New York: Knopf and Company, 1930.

_____. Five Hundred Delinquent Women. New York: Knopf and Company, 1934.

_____. One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1934.

_____. Later Criminal Careers. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1937.

_____. Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1940.

_____. Predicting Delinquency and Crime. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Goddard, Henry H. Juvenile Delinquency. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1921.

Healy, William and Augusta F. Bronner. New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

_____. Delinquents and Criminals, Their Making and Unmaking. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1926.

McHugh, Thomas J. "Advances in Understanding Parole Offenders," 1950 Yearbook, National Probation and Parole Association. Chicago, Illinois.

Mihanovich, Clement S. Principles of Juvenile Delinquency. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1950.

Ohlin, Lloyd E. Selection For Parole. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1951.

Ruch, Floyd L. Psychology and Life. Fifth edition. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1958.

Smith, T. Lynn. Social Problems. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1957.

Vold, George B. Prediction Methods and Parole. Minneapolis: The Sociological Press, 1931.

B. PERIODICALS

Allen, Robert M. "A Review of Parole Prediction Literature," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XXXII (1941-42), pp. 548-554.

Burgess, E. W. "Is Prediction Possible in Social Work?" Social Forces, (June, 1929), pp. 535-545.

Cormack, Margaret L. "Youth in Our Changing Culture," Child Welfare Journal, XXXVI, No. 9 (November 1957).

Glaser, Daniel. "A Reconsideration of Some Parole Prediction Factors," American Sociological Review, XIX (1954).

Glueck, Eleanor T. "Status of Glueck Prediction Studies," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, XLVII (May-June, 1956), pp. 18-32.

Hart, Hornell. "Predicting Parole Success," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XIV (November, 1923), pp. 405-414.

Laune, Ferris F. "A Technique for Developing Criteria of Probability," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XXVI (May, 1935), pp. 41-45.

Powers, Edwin and Helen Witmer. "An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency," The Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951).

Rappaport, Mazie F. "The Possibility of Help for the Child Returning from a State Training School," Journal of Social Work Process, 1954.

Reiss, Albert J., Jr. "Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls," American Sociological Review (April, 1951).

Tibbitts, Clark. "The Reliability of Factors Used in Predicting Success and Failure in Parole," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, (March, 1932), pp. 844-853.

_____. "Success and Failure on Parole Can be Predicted," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XXII (May, 1931), pp. 11-50.

Vold, George B. "Prediction Methods Applied to Problems of Classification Within Institutions," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XXVI (1936), pp. 202-209.

Warner, S. B. "Factors Determining Parole from the Massachusetts Reformatory," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (1923), pp. 172-207.

C. MISCELLANEOUS

Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association. "Guides for Sentencing" (Handbook), Federal Probation (December, 1957).

Form Letter issued by Boys State Training School, Kearney, Nebraska.

Krell, Patrick C. "A Study of Selected Characteristics of Committed Juvenile Delinquents in Omaha, Nebraska, 1955 and 1956." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Omaha, Nebraska, 1957.

Revised Statutes of the State of Nebraska (as amended), 1943.

The Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures, Vol. 4, Parole (Washington: U. S. Department of Justice, 1939).

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

EXPERIENCE TABLE FOR 4,941 PAROLEES, JOLIET-STATEVILLE AND MENARD DIVISIONS, ILLINOIS STATE PENITENTIARY SYSTEM, PAROLED 1940-1945[56]

Score Group	Violation Rates Violators per 100 cases in each score group		
	Total Violators	Minor Violators	Major Violators
5 to 10	3	2	1
4	7	5	2
3	10	7	3
2	18	10	8
1	19	10	9
0	29	16	13
-1	40	25	15
-2	46	27	19
-3 and -4	56	34	22
-5 and -6	75	62	13

[56] Ohlin, op. cit., p. 58.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE FACE SHEET OF PREDICTION INSTRUMENT

Name _____ Birthdate _____ Race _____

I.	Type of Offense		
	(x) Theft	(2)	2
	( ) All other	(1)	
III.	Type of Home		
	(x) Average Home	(2)	
	( ) Inferior Home	(1)	2
IV.	Family Interest		
	(x) Very Active	(2)	
	( ) Passive	(1)	2
V.	Mental Rating		
	( ) Average	(2)	
	(x) Below Average	(1)	1
VI.	Precommitment School Record		
	( ) Regular	(2)	
	(x) Problem	(1)	1
VII.	Parole Job or Schooling		
	(x) Adequate	(2)	
	( ) Inadequate	(1)	2
VIII.	Personality Rating		
	(x) Normal	(3)	
	( ) Unstable	(2)	
	( ) Some Gross Defect	(1)	3
		Total	13

Expectancy Rates

13 and over - Good parole risk

11 - 12 - Borderline parole risk

10 and under - Poor parole risk