

1952

The relationship between pupil citizenship as rated by teachers and delinquent tendencies as shown by KD Proneness Scale and Check List scores

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/26047>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

Thesis

Patterson, Charles C.

1952

stored

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Thesis

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PUPIL CITIZENSHIP AS RATED
BY TEACHERS AND DELINQUENT TENDENCIES AS SHOWN BY
K D PRONENESS SCALE AND CHECK LIST SCORES

Submitted by

Charles C. Patterson

(B.E., Lyndon Teachers' College, 1947)

In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

1952

Boston University
School of Education
Library

FIRST READER: William C. Kvaraceus, Professor of Education.

SECOND READER: Dugald S. Arbuckle, Associate Professor of
Education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. William C. Kvaraceus for his guidance in the planning of this study; to Dr. Whittier L. Hansen for his assistance with interpretations; and to the teachers and pupils in Grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 in the Barre City Schools, whose cooperation made possible the procurement of data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM.	1
Statement of the Problem.	1
Source.	2
Justification.	3
Scope.	5
Definition of Terms.	9
Recapitulation.	10
II. REVIEW OF RESEARCH.	11
Areas of Vulnerability.	11
The School.	11
The Home.	28
The Community.	35
III. PROCEDURE AND PROCUREMENT OF DATA.	37
Research Procedure.	37
The K D Proneness Scale and Check List.	37
Procurement of Data.	40
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA.	42
Treatment of Data.	42
V. CONCLUSIONS.	58
Summary of Results.	58
Limitations.	61
Suggestions for Further Study.	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY	64
APPENDIX	

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem.

The object of this study is to determine whether or not the K D Proneness Scale and Check List^{1/} will select from a group the same pupils whom teachers designate as the "best" citizens and as the "poorest" citizens in their classrooms. This study will also seek to answer the following questions:

1. Are the "poorest" classroom citizens, as determined by teachers' selections, necessarily those pupils who exhibit the greatest number of delinquent tendencies as measured by the K D Proneness Scale and Check List?
2. Are the pupils whom teachers select as the "best" classroom citizens necessarily those pupils who, on the K D Proneness Scale, obtain scores which show their responses to be similar to those of 'high morale' groups?
3. What percentage of the teacher-selected "best" classroom citizens and "poorest" classroom

^{1/} Kvaraceus, William C., "K D Proneness Scale and Check List,"
Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, 1950, World Book Company.

citizens falls in the different groupings of the K D Proneness Scale and Check List?

4. What is the correlation between the K D Proneness Check List ratings of pupils by teachers and the scores earned by pupils on the K D Proneness Scale?

Source.

There is a definite need for teachers to recognize which children in their classrooms are merely demonstrating the natural aggressiveness of youth, and which children show evidence of traits which, if allowed to develop, will grow into actual delinquency.

The desire to determine whether traits of delinquency are in sufficient evidence in the classroom to make the average teacher aware of them as danger signals pointing toward poor citizenship was the basis on which this study commenced. From this grew the desire to find out whether teachers recognize the most delinquency-prone children in their classrooms as the "poorest" citizens, or whether they consider a different type of child as the poor citizen; whether children who exhibit a great many delinquent tendencies react to the classroom situation in a manner which teachers term 'acceptable'; whether some children who are only slightly susceptible to delinquency are apt to be the non-conformists in the classroom; and whether teachers are prone to be so aware of these non-conformists as the greatest

classroom problems that they either partially or totally ignore the threat to the children who exhibit evidence of a large number of delinquent tendencies.

Justification.

While most writers agree that there is no definite cause or pattern of causes from which a diagnosis of definite delinquent behavior may be predicted, there seems to be general agreement that there is a very definite group of causation factors that may or may not result in delinquent behavior on the part of children subjected to their stress and strain. In a study of delinquency as it existed in Passaic, New Jersey, Kvaraceus^{1/} discussed the factors which combine to produce delinquency. He concluded that delinquency "represents an individual reaction which others exposed to generally similar stimuli may not share." However, there seems to be somewhat general agreement in the literature that there are certain factors in the environment which, in the right combination of interplay with the factors within the individual, result in anti-social behavior. These same external factors in another case only serve as a challenge to the individual. Thus, one can conclude that there is no one causation factor, or pattern of factors, but instead there is a dynamic situation where the response is socially acceptable or socially unacceptable, depending on the total situation.

^{1/} Kvaraceus, William C., Juvenile Delinquency and the School,
Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, World Book Company, pp. 77-79,
1945.

In spite of this, there are danger signals with which all engaged in the detection and prevention of delinquency should be familiar.

The Gluecks,^{1/} in their study of one thousand legally proven juvenile delinquents who were referred to the Judge Baker Guidance Clinic in Boston, Massachusetts, found that the average age at which delinquency began was eight and one-half years, approximately. Hence, evidence of anti-social acts should begin to manifest themselves as early as the third or fourth grade.

All writers seem to agree that the surest method of delinquency control is early recognition and treatment. It is extremely important to recognize the conditions of good mental health, and to make certain that everything possible is done to create these conditions within the school. Today we should be no longer concerned with merely educating the child academically, but must recognize that education for the child's social adjustment is perhaps even more important if he is to achieve useful, adult citizenship. It is within the school that unwholesome social tendencies of children must be detected and provisions made for education toward adequate adjustment.

However, to expect the average teacher, untrained in mental hygiene and psychiatry, to know the significance of

^{1/} Glueck, Sheldon and Glueck, Eleanor, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, New York, The Commonwealth Fund, p. 279, 1950.

This study involved a total of 434 pupils and included four different schools.

The table on the following page is a breakdown of the schools, rooms, and pupils involved in the study. One can see from this breakdown that there were a total of 226 boys, 208 girls, and 17 teachers concerned.

TABLE I
 BREAKDOWN OF THE SCHOOLS, ROOMS, AND PUPILS INVOLVED
 IN THIS STUDY.

Grade	Brook Street School		Lincoln School		Mathewson School		North Barre School	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
5	13	11	16	14	14	20	4	4
6	8	12	11	14	15	19	10	12
6	0	0	10	11	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	18	11	12	12	22	11
7	0	0	0	0	18	9	0	0
8	0	0	17	16	12	8	12	16
8	0	0	0	0	14	8	0	0
Totals	21	23	72	66	85	76	48	43

The following table will serve to show the ages of the pupils involved in the study. It will be noted that the ages of these pupils ranged from ten to seventeen years, with the majority of the pupils falling between the ages of ten and fourteen. It might be mentioned that the sixteen- and seventeen-year-old seventh grade boys are recent arrivals from China, information which explains why the top seventh grade age level is above that of the eighth grade level.

TABLE 2

AGE AND GRADE DISTRIBUTION
OF THE 434 PUPILS INVOLVED IN THE STUDY.

Age	Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
17	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0
15	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	2
14	0	1	0	0	5	2	8	12
13	0	0	4	0	23	14	37	33
12	3	2	22	21	40	26	0	1
11	21	12	28	47	0	0	0	0
10	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	47	49	54	68	70	43	55	48

Teachers in grades five, six, seven, and eight were requested to name four or five pupils whom they would consider to be the best citizens in their room, and to prepare a similar list of those pupils whom they would consider to be the poorest citizens in their room. After these lists had been received, the writer then requested each teacher to fill out a K D Proneness Check List for each pupil in her room. Finally, the K D Proneness Scale was administered to the 162 pupils whom the teachers had listed as their "best" and "poorest" citizens.

Definition of Terms.

Throughout this study the terms listed below will always have the following meanings:

1. "Best" citizens - Pupils whom teachers considered to be the best citizens in their classes. These were pupils who were not only well adjusted themselves, but were concerned for the common good of the group of which they were a member.
2. "Poorest" citizens - Pupils whom teachers considered to be the poorest citizens in their classes. These were individuals who showed definite conflict with the rules and regulations as developed for the child's social group.
3. Delinquent - This term includes not only the legal delinquent who may, at times, be under the school's jurisdiction, but also those delinquents who have been clever enough to avoid the law, as well as that vast army of children who commit various anti-social acts.

Recapitulation.

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between pupil citizenship as rated by teachers and delinquent tendencies as measured by K D Proneness Scale and Check List scores. The three criteria with which the study is concerned are:

1. Teacher selections of "best" and "poorest" citizens in their rooms as determined by the standards mentioned in the preceding section.
2. K D Proneness Check List ratings of the 434 pupils in grades five through eight by their home room teachers.
3. The scores earned on the K D Proneness Scale by the 162 pupils whom teachers selected as being either the "best" or "poorest" citizens in their rooms.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Areas of Vulnerability.

Research was directed in three areas - the school, the home, and the community - to discover what factors might be operating in each area to contribute to delinquent behavior.

The School.

Of all the agencies serving youth, the school must carry the heaviest burden for the favorable social, emotional, and educational conditioning of children. The success or failure of the conditioning should be the primary interest of all engaged in educational activities. The school and its personnel are constantly being accused of falling down on the job of bringing about a desirable type of conditioning in pupils. Most authorities admit the truth of many of these charges, but it must be remembered that:

"Obviously, the school is only one of many agencies which deal with children and young people. It cannot solve the problem of delinquency alone. However, without the sustained and scientific assistance of good schools, the community will make little headway against this problem."^{1/}

^{1/} National Society for the Study of Education, Forty-Seventh Yearbook, Part I, "Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools," Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1948, p. 126.

On the other hand, DuShane^{1/} states that:

"Schools of this country could reduce the delinquency rate 70% if adequately staffed, equipped and coordinated with other community agencies."

Unsatisfying school experiences are repeatedly given as a contributing factor to the anti-social behavior of the delinquent youth. Assuming this to be true, one might conclude that the school is unaware of its failure to meet the needs of these youths, and also blind to the need of correcting its faulty practices. Since schools, by law, are required to serve all children mentally and physically capable of attending school, they should be legally and morally responsible for meeting the individual needs of all children.

Most of the literature emphasizes very strongly that early detection of delinquent characteristics offers the best chance of prevention of delinquency. No other institution has the opportunity that the school has to detect the early manifestations of maladjustment. If teachers were carefully briefed in their training so that they better understood the signposts that lead to eventual delinquency, then much more of this early detection would probably occur. Since they are not, and many other factors, such as lack of any referral agency, lack of interest by school and government authorities, and a lack of adequate funds and facilities enter into the

^{1/} DuShane, Donald, "Schools and Juvenile Delinquency," National Education Association Journal, 36: 100-101, February, 1947.

picture, it would seem desirable for teachers to have some knowledge to be used as a measuring stick to determine which pupils are exhibiting only the normal aggressive action of children, and which pupils should be studied further by whatever private or public agency there may be available for this type of case.

Actually, our schools are still staffed with some teachers whose only preparation for teaching is high school graduation. While many of these have risen to the present challenge through training in summer schools, extension courses and in-service training, many others are still teaching their classes as they themselves were taught forty to fifty years ago. Another factor limiting the extent of school programs of detection and adjustment is the financial support given to the schools by the community. The mores and the attitudes of legal agencies are also limiting factors. The lack of treatment facilities beyond what the school can reasonably be expected to do also must be taken into consideration, but in spite of this and the other factors listed above, the school cannot cast off its responsibility in the detection and prevention of delinquency. One must agree with Tappan,^{1/} who says:

"Next to the home the school is the most strategic position in the community for the prevention of delinquency. The school,

^{1/} Tappan, Paul W., Juvenile Delinquency, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, p. 560, 1949.

unlike other social institutions and agencies, has frequent, close, and continuous contact with all the children in the community. Its teachers have for the most part the respect and trust of the home, so that cooperative programs -- necessary to any really successful preventive work -- should be feasible."

Thus, it would seem that the school can reasonably be assigned a responsibility for the detection and prevention of delinquency. As most authorities feel that the school has a responsibility for leadership in coordinating and initiating community action in this area because of its strategic position in the community, then one must conclude that the lack of community action is an indication of failure on the part of the school to assume its responsibilities.

The Wickman study^{1/} discovered the differences between the teachers' and mental hygienists' points of view in regard to classroom offenses committed by pupils. Teachers felt that immoralities, dishonesties, and transgressions against authority, were the most serious offenses, and that withdrawing recessive personality and behavior traits were the least serious. Mental hygienists, on the other hand, listed the most serious offenses as withdrawing, recessive personality and behavior traits, and the least serious offenses as transgressions against authority and violations against orderliness in class. It would seem that teachers and mental hygienists, in this study, had directly opposing views. Probably a balance

^{1/} Wickman, E. K., Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes, The Commonwealth Fund, 1928.

between these two views is essential in the classroom. It is interesting to note that whispering occupied first place in lists of school offenses as reported by teachers. In some of our present-day classrooms, some whispering, and even talking in a low voice, is permitted and encouraged. It would seem that the biggest cause for teachers to list whispering as a major offense would be that they, themselves, have not been able to accept whispering as a form of expression which does not necessarily violate good classroom discipline. This does not, by any means, imply that pupils should be permitted to whisper or talk whenever they please. We all recognize that the whispering which is permitted should in no way ignore good manners, but, rather, should be employed to teach good manners. It is important for teachers to realize that some whispering is permissible and healthy, and to rid themselves of the deeply instilled fear that by allowing children to whisper they are teaching poor habits.

It should be apparent that teachers need to have more knowledge of what constitutes normal child behavior, that they need to shift their emphasis of what factors constitute good citizenship, they need a dynamic picture of social and experiential backgrounds of children as well as physical and mental capacities, they need to direct their attentions to the underlying causes and emotional problems

which give rise to behavior problems, and they must pay attention to their own social and emotional adjustment in order to be able to understand the incidents which arise from time to time among children.

Because the schools of the United States must concern themselves with the education of all children between the ages of six to sixteen, generally, it must be assumed that a great many delinquent children, not recognized as such by law, are left to what therapy the schools can provide. It is the opinion of the writer that since a delinquent, legally, is a child between six and twenty-one years of age (this varies in different states) who has been caught in a criminal or illegal act, then many other children who are not so judged, are actually delinquents.

The school's responsibility for desirable and undesirable behavior is very great. No other institution in our society comes in contact with anywhere near the number of children between the ages of six and sixteen as does the school. Most statements of school objectives express the school's purpose as being the modification of behavior and the passing on of the cultural heritage. Theoretically, if they did their job perfectly, every child who passed through their hands would be a perfectly adjusted individual but this would presuppose perfect methods and understanding of each individual. Further, it would disregard the influence of

other social institutions, inconsistencies in the culture itself, and in inheritance. It seems quite generally accepted that if any effective curtailment of delinquency is to be brought about, it will be through the family, for the family is the setting where attitudes and conduct develop. Hence, much of the success the school may achieve will be through family cooperation with the program. An inherent belief in the magical power of education is one of the characteristics of our American culture. Thus, the school is very strategically placed to modify these attitudes and conduct which are the genesis of anti-social behavior.

In spite of this, we still have a large number of children who have failed, as is shown by the number who come in contact with the law, and the still larger number whose acts only bring them into contact with the less legal and more social agencies. If the school is to look at its job as the total development of each pupil, then it must recognize the failure of these children as its failure. Most studies of known delinquents reaffirm this failure even if all the blame for the development of delinquent behavior cannot properly be attributed to any one causative factor. The Gluecks,^{1/} in their study, show that 61.5% of the delinquents, as compared with only 10.3% of the non-

^{1/} Glueck, Sheldon and Glueck, Eleanor, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, New York, The Commonwealth Fund, 1950.

delinquents, disliked school. The same study shows that 43.5% of the delinquents wanted to stop school at once, as compared with only 6.5% of the non-delinquents. The high percentage of delinquents disliking school gives evidence of the failure of the school in meeting the needs of this sample of the school's population. That the school has further failed is emphasized by the percentage of non-delinquents disliking and wanting to leave school. Further evidence is given by Kvaraceus's^{1/} Passaic study, which states:

"Literature in the field of juvenile delinquency reveals, on the whole, rather unsatisfactory school adjustments for most children who fall into difficulty with the law. Retardation is usually high, low school achievement and poor marks predominate, truancy is frequent, dislike for school and teachers is the rule rather than the exception, and early school leaving is very often the delinquent's own solution of an unsatisfactory situation."

If one is to accept these as evidence of failure on the part of the school, then it seems reasonable that the causes of this failure will be found in the administrative and curricular practices of the school. Early school administrative and curricular practices were characterized by authoritarian rule by the administrator. The child either adjusted to the curriculum or left school for the world of work. While our economy remained primarily an agrarian one, this type of education probably satisfactorily met the needs

^{1/}Kvaraceus, William G., Juvenile Delinquency and the School,
Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, World Book Company, 1945.

of society, but with the development of an urban, industrial society it became entirely unsatisfactory. All attempts at revision were conducted by scholarly committees who still retained the authoritarian and scholarship approach with a slight recognition of real needs in the form of commercial education. Slowly, during the twenties and thirties, a democratic concept of education developed, with emphasis on the needs of pupils instead of rote memory and subject matter. Even so, theory and practice in this area are still far apart. The elementary schools have come far nearer in the application of theory than have the secondary schools, although even here one finds inconsistencies which limit the application of democratic administration both in the classroom and in the determining of pupil's needs, and in the administrative and curricular policies of the school. When the administration preaches democratic approaches and then dominates or pre-determines policy, teachers usually react by using the authoritarian approach in the classroom. Further, many of our present-day teachers are products of the authoritarian subject matter type of education, with a corresponding reluctance to change the emphasis in their classroom from the subject matter to the pupil. These lingering mores of an obsolete system of education both in school personnel and the general public represent one of the stumbling blocks in achieving a truly democratic school with its administrative and curricular practices geared to meet adequately the needs

of young people in our complex society.

High on the list of needs is the problem of emotional education. Carr^{1/} states that the public schools of the United States have hardly recognized the problem. He states further that the social consequence of emotional illiteracy is probably more serious than any other kind and that the ignorance of executives, teachers, and parents in this area is great. The implications for adjustment and modification of curriculum and administration offer a very fertile field for study.

The administrative policy in selecting teachers will determine to a large extent the type of classroom to which the child will be exposed. If the selection is based on political consideration, taking care of local residents or second-hand evidence, then the classroom situation is very apt to be unsatisfactory. If, on the other hand, the administration acquires the person who has the highest possible training, ability, experience and personality, then there is a very good chance that the classroom climate will approach the optimal. There is very strong evidence that the personality and mental set of teachers should be weighted as heavily as training and experience in determining their effectiveness in the classroom.

^{1/} Carr, Lowell J., Delinquency Control, Revised edition, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1940.

The Forty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education^{1/} states that:

"In selecting and recommending his candidates for teaching positions, the superintendent concerns himself with evidences of desirable personality patterns as well as with professional training and experience. Many administrators have gradually focused their attention on better methods of selecting teachers as the most adequate solution to the problem of classroom morale."

A closely related problem to this is the administrative policy on evaluation and the administration's interpretation of this policy to the teaching staff. It is quite generally accepted today that any effective system of evaluation emphasizes not only teachers' marks and achievement test scores but also makes provision for evaluating changes in behavior. Probably no other factor in school can create as much frustration as the system of evaluation employed by the school. If it is aimed at evaluating academic learning alone, then a very important aspect of evaluation is neglected and the possibility of frustration factors increased. Since we are firmly convinced today of the validity of the doctrine of individual differences in achievement as well as in other human characteristics, it is undeniable that many pupils are predestined to failure under the purely academic system of evaluation. Few, if any, humans have even a small liking for

^{1/} "Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools," National Society for the Study of Education, Forty-seventh Yearbook, Part I, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1948.

things in which they repeatedly fail, and when they are compelled by law to expose themselves to the experience then one can expect the individual to make some adjustment to relieve the monotonous and emotionally painful situation. The fact that schools recognize this as being true is no guarantee that there will be an improvement in curricular and evaluative practices. Today it is quite generally accepted that learning outcomes are definable as changes in behavior, so a system which evaluates these changes, as well as knowledge, is essential. To the extent that the administration believes this and leads teachers in developing and applying devices to measure this type of outcome, one can look for a reduction of frustration factors arising from evaluation. The Forty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education^{1/} sums up this point in the following:

"When the school staff states its objectives as pupil behavior and evaluates its products in terms of behavior changes, it will no longer be content to turn out children who are able only to read, recite, and write the Golden Rule. If the school is to have any effect in preventing and controlling undesirable behavior, it must teach children to live and behave according to the Golden Rule."

Another factor is the policy of the school on promotion and retardation. The policy of socialized promotion based on what is best for the individual child rather than

^{1/} "Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools," National Society for the Study of Education, Forty-seventh Yearbook, Part I, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1948.

achieving or not achieving some academic standard has done much to remove many of the frustrating factors from schools. To the extent socialized promotion is used and understood by the administration and teachers, it serves as an indication of frustration, or lack of it, in school administration.

The administration's approach to the problem of specialized services indicates the degree of concern it feels toward the real needs of pupils. Even under ideal classroom conditions, situations will arise where specialized individual attention by specialists is necessary. The extent to which the administration takes the leadership to provide these specialized services, or makes community specialized services available, and lets teachers know they exist, how they may be used and the specific job they can do, is an indication of its degree of interest in the problems of youth. The mere existence of specialized services is no guarantee that problem situations which defy solution won't arise, but they indicate that many small problems and frustrations have been solved or sublimated.

Even if the administration is able to hire a competent staff, there is still much room to improve teachers' effectiveness in the area of knowing their pupils better and in delinquency control.^{1/} Quite definitely, such training

^{1/} "Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools," National Society for the Study of Education, Forty-seventh Yearbook, Part I, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1948.

can do much to remove the restrictive classroom, to increase the knowledge of the devices employed to provide the teacher with a better understanding of her pupils and their needs, and help in recognizing the early evidences of potential delinquency.

A program of delinquency control in the school that is not properly interpreted to the public by the administration has little chance of success. An adequate program will cost money. Taxpayers are not noted for voting money for things they think are frills, and quite definitely, many of the special services necessary in this type of program fall into this classification in the lay mind if they are not properly explained in terms of value which the taxpayer can recognize. One cannot help but agree with Carr^{1/} that there is no doubt that we will pay, for modern life has settled that, but the question is: Shall we pay for police and prisons, or shall we pay for more and better teachers and schools?

The extent to which the administration is aware of other institutions in the community which serve youth and make use of their services, and takes the lead in coordinating all agencies in the community, is an indication of its interest in youth and youths' problems. The study of juvenile delinquency in Massachusetts declares that the school as a

^{1/} Carr, Lowell J., Delinquency Control, Revised edition, 1950, New York, Harper and Brothers, p. 494, 1940.

social welfare agency has a responsibility for active participation in community activities which have as their objective the elimination of conditions that encourage delinquent behavior.^{1/} Conversely, the school, if it is to accomplish its job satisfactorily, must bring the lay public in to serve in its activities in the areas to which they can make valuable contributions. This fact is repeatedly emphasized in educational literature, and in the area of juvenile delinquency, a summary of the report of the National Conference on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency^{2/} states:

"Because the schools belong to the people and because the people should have a part in saying what the schools should do, it seems inevitable that joint action on the part of the superintendent, his school staff, and representatives of citizens' groups shall constitute the basis for initiating local programs, whether they be city-wide, district-wide, or county-wide in their application."

The type of curriculum offered by the school determines to a large extent the amount of frustration the individual pupil meets in school. An analysis of school curriculum for evidence of potential sources of causes of anti-social behavior must recognize the specific factors that are possible sources of future delinquency. The Forty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education^{3/}

^{1/} "Juvenile Delinquency in Massachusetts as a Public Responsibility," Boston, Massachusetts Child Council, p. 115, 1939.

^{2/} "School and Teacher Responsibilities in Juvenile Delinquency," High School Journal, 30: 71-76, March, 1947.

^{3/} "Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools," National Society for the Study of Education, Forty-seventh Yearbook, Part I, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1948.

says that "school failure, retardation, early drop-outs, and truancy have their roots in an inadequate curriculum and in ineffective teaching situations." It must be remembered that the basis for any curriculum and teaching situation is closely related to the basic philosophy of the school system. If this philosophy places its emphasis on subject matter, a system of evaluation which measures achievement in terms of academic success and authoritarian discipline, then one can look for all the above frustrations to exist in the curriculum and learning situations. If, on the other hand, the basic philosophy is child-centered, believes in democratic practices and attempts to find the needs of pupils and fit the curriculum to the pupils, then there is good reason to believe the number of frustration factors will be reduced. It must be remembered, though, that just believing in the child-centered school is no guarantee that it will become one. For instance, many teachers think they have solved the problem of individual differences in needs by buying small sets of books and materials which cover various grade levels, while neglecting entirely the fact that the sixth grade child with third grade ability quite definitely has a need for material that is on a sixth grade interest level but only requiring third grade skills.

Kvaraceus,^{1/} the Forty-seventh Yearbook of the

^{1/} Kvaraceus, William C., Juvenile Delinquency and the School, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, World Book Company, p. 262, 1945.

National Society for the Study of Education,^{1/} Carr,^{2/} and other writers in the field of juvenile delinquency emphasize the importance of the school's knowing and understanding the pupils and making a continual revision of curriculum in the light of these needs.

How this is accomplished has at least an indirect influence on the number of frustration influences found in the school. The authoritarian superintendent might set up a very pretty plan but it is very doubtful if any of it would filter down to the pupils. Kvaraceus^{3/} says that "basic to any educational program is the teacher's understanding of the pupil and the environment which surrounds him." What better opportunity could be asked for in-service training of teachers than curriculum revision committees, committees to develop a cumulative record card or a report card, or a committee to survey the needs of pupils and the special services that would be desirable to better meet the needs of those pupils requiring services beyond the present scope of either the teacher's or the system's ability to meet as presently constituted. It must be remembered that the success or failure of this method will be determined largely by the amount of freedom the committee is given in the achievement of its aims.

^{1/} "Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools," National Society for the Study of Education, Forty-seventh Yearbook, Part I, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, p. 138, 1948.

^{2/} Carr, Lowell J., op. cit., p. 15.

^{3/} Kvaraceus, William C., op. cit., p. 263.

These committees should base their efforts on problems of living and behavior. Traditionally, the school has been more interested in the act of truancy than in the causes that led to the truancy, attempting to refute the normal curve by a system of retardation based on academic success or failure and solving the problem of discipline with the institutional approach. Significantly, most of the literature emphasizes that human behavior is on a continuum with graduation of achievement in its different aspects by different individuals. Unless this is recognized, quite often failure in school is attributed to some such factor as feeble-mindedness, when actually the trouble lies in the fact that the curriculum does not meet the need of the individual child.^{1/} There is little doubt that child needs are increasing and that the modern child not only must know more but must be a better-adjusted personality than were his grandparents. If he isn't given increased power to satisfy his emotional needs, then he will react in an anti-social way.^{2/}

The Home.

The first agency to exert an influence on the child is the home. Whether this is to be a good or an evil

^{1/} "Juvenile Delinquency in Massachusetts as a Public Responsibility," Boston, Massachusetts Child Council, p. 120, 1939.

^{2/} Carr, Lowell J., op. cit., p. 482.

force on the child depends on many factors in which his parents necessarily figure. It is known that one cannot evaluate the home on a purely financial basis, for many needy homes are rich in wholesome experiences.

What is essential in a 'good' home? First, there must be an abundance of love and understanding between parents and children. No psychologist would belittle the importance of this element. While it is possible that a lack of understanding on the part of one parent may not cause a child to deviate from a normal pattern of development, it is extremely important for both parents to provide a harmonious atmosphere in the home. In cases where either one or both parents show little or no affection for the child, the path of delinquency is thrown open to him. He may or may not travel it. Homes broken by death, separation, or divorce also offer a problem for the child. Homes broken by death are less apt to produce harmful effects than are those broken by separation or divorce, for the stigma or scandal is not attached.

Carr^{1/} states that:

"In a functionally adequate home there is a minimum of parental rejection; a minimum of sibling rivalry; a minimum of inculcation of inferiority, escape from reality, self-pity, or any of the other attitudes that cripple and thwart the growing personality. A functionally

^{1/} Carr, Lowell J., op. cit., p. 167.

adequate home encourages growth, confidence, frankness, respect for personality, ability to face reality. In short, a functionally adequate home is an emotionally healthy home."

He says, further, that:

"In so far as any home departs from any of these characteristics -- structural completeness, racial homogeneity, economic security, cultural conformity, moral conformity, physical and psychological normality, and functional adequacy -- to that extent it is a deviant home and a center of definite deviation pressures. If it departs widely from all six of these norms it is a widely deviant home, and the deviation pressures are obviously more intense. Nobody knows the number of deviant homes in the United States, to say nothing of knowing the number of deviation pressures in each home and the extent, direction, intensity, and continuity of each pressure. When that information plus specific information on conformity pressures is available in particular communities we shall have the basis for building real prevention programs."^{1/}

Carr^{2/} also states that while occupational absence from the home is a threat to the home structure, it is usually temporary, and probably not a serious danger if other factors disrupting family structure are controlled.

The economic status of the home is also important. A large share of the delinquents come from homes of a low economic level. The following statement from Kvaraceus's^{3/}

^{1/} Carr, Lowell J., op. cit., p. 168.

^{2/} Carr, Lowell J., ibid., p. 298.

^{3/} Kvaraceus, William C., "Juvenile Delinquency and Social Class," Journal of Educational Sociology, 18: 51-54, September, 1944.

article, "Juvenile Delinquency and Social Class," is the best summary available:

"The Passaic data gathered on 761 delinquents reveal that significantly fewer parents of the sample population were earning their living in professions, by working as proprietors, clerks and sales personnel, craftsmen, and in services other than domestic. At the same time, significantly larger proportions were found to come from the factory operatives, W.P.A., other laborers, and domestic services. It should be noted that these latter groups represent the economically and socially frustrated classes. It is highly probable that delinquent-aggression has its roots in the conflicts and frustrations that take place in the lower lower, upper lower, lower middle, and to some extent the upper middle classes which are made up largely by families who earn their living in the manner of the parents of the Passaic delinquents."

The implications of this statement are many. One would immediately recognize that low economic status would present numerous problems to the child. These might include lack of proper food, necessary clothing, and lack of sufficient cultural possessions upon which our society places a high premium. A child from such a home is constantly confronted with embarrassing situations. Since there are so many 'lacks' in his home life, it might be considered natural for the child to make up this deficiency by simply 'taking' the thing which he immediately needs.

A study conducted by Beals^{1/} found that in eighty selected cases that had been before the Juvenile Court of Cook County, which includes Chicago and some of its suburbs, in more than 60% of the homes studied the parents were separated or one parent was dead. In 30% of the homes, the mothers were working. Fifteen of the families were wholly dependent on charity, while the others who received no aid had an average weekly income of \$3.58. Some of the children in these families had only the food furnished them by the schools. There was a serious lack of clothing among all the children. These findings were not vastly different from other studies, and they help one to understand where theft begins.

What about the attitudes and mores of the home? They are extremely influential in shaping the thoughts of developing children. What is accepted in their home as proper behavior may be frowned upon by people who come from a higher class. Children learn to act from infancy according to the standards in operation in the home. Very frequently, when they enter school, they find that what they have learned causes others to jeer at them or regard them with disgust and revulsion. So they have to learn new, and often vastly different, behavior to satisfy the mores of this new group to which they now also belong. Frequently,

^{1/}Beals, Frank L., "Schools and Juvenile Problems," Hygeia, 26: 262-263, April, 1948.

they allow one set of laws to operate in the home and use the other just for school. Or they might attempt to bring this new behavior into the home. Unless there is understanding between parents and child, a frustrating incident in the home is apt to materialize. Frequently, different agencies within a community will try to help the child in his adjustment to the strange behavior which he finds is expected of him. These agencies often find that the parents will block their attempts because they do not wish the child to change or because they do not trust the agency which is trying to help.

Another factor to take into consideration about the home is its location. Many studies show that high-delinquency and congested areas are conducive to delinquent behavior. People who live in large tenement houses may have neither sufficient space nor privacy. In every community there is a right and a wrong side of the tracks. Authorities are agreed that the poorer sections of a community yield by far the greater percentage of delinquents.

What about the size of the family? Authorities previously believed that the greater number of delinquents came from middle children of large families, but more recent evidence points to the youngest child of a large family as being the most delinquency prone. Kvaraceus^{1/} has reworked

^{1/} Kvaraceus, William C., op. cit. (Unpublished Revision).

the data concerning 678 delinquent children in the Passaic sample. His most recent findings now read:

"The reworked data suggests that the most hazardous position in the birth order in this group of family study is the youngest in the family of two or more followed by the oldest in the family of two or more. The intermediate position in a family of five or more would seem to be the least hazardous although the difference between this position and the oldest is not statistically significant. The degree of hazard of the only child situation cannot be determined by the data given. The reworked data indicate that the discussion on page 63 and the Social Profile Charts on page 180 and 181 need revision."

Families who frequently move from one area to another and never establish firm roots tend to produce many delinquents. The Gluecks^{1/} found that 23.9% of the delinquents in their study had moved fourteen or more times, as compared with only 5.2% of the non-delinquents. They concluded that whatever the effect of greater mobility is upon the tendency to disregard opinion of other people living in the neighborhood, it must operate more excessively upon delinquents than upon non-delinquents. Probably the fact that no close associations could be made with people in the neighborhoods in which they lived because of the temporariness of their residence there would have a great bearing upon the delinquent's disregard for neighborhood opinion.

From this research, one fact seems to be of utmost importance. Belongingness is a necessary feeling for every

^{1/} Glueck, Sheldon and Glueck, Eleanor, op. cit., pp. 155-156.

child. It is important for him to feel wanted and needed in a home which is worthy of his respect and that of his associates.

The Community.

The child's relationship with various factors in the community is another source of vulnerability. Bowling alleys, pool rooms, and other sources of commercialized recreation, as well as hanging around the streets and working at street jobs, have all been shown to be detrimental to youth. The child who hangs around the streets, who works at street jobs, or who frequents the places already mentioned, is apt to form the wrong type of companionships. It is these companionships, rather than any inherent factor within the amusement facilities, which lead the child to delinquent acts. However, Tappan^{1/} says:

"One cannot measure the probabilities of an individual delinquency by his associations alone, and, indeed, the importance of the factor is undoubtedly exaggerated somewhat by reason of the fact that the child already exposed to delinquency prefers to associate with others whose values and conduct are similar."

One would assume from the above statement that the author believes that if the delinquency-prone child did not find his choice of companions in one place, he would seek them in another. Therefore, we should probably not judge the above-mentioned amusement facilities too harshly.

^{1/} Tappan, Paul W., op. cit., p. 147.

The peer group is one of the strongest motivating forces influencing a person's behavior. A child will do anything to gain the respect and admiration of his peers. If, for any reason, he loses prestige within his group, it is then important for him to do something startling or daring to re-establish himself with them. That this daring act is frequently against the law may enhance his popularity, for his peers then regard him with awe. It is feasible that this might encourage him to break more laws; surely, it might very easily be the case unless he finds that he can, in other ways, keep his standing in his group.

The child who belongs to a delinquent gang is often very difficult to reach, for his loyalty to the gang has deep meaning for him. Tappan^{1/} states that the delinquent gang has been a serious problem in large cities in recent years, and that associations with such a group are one influence in a collection of factors which promote anti-social behavior within a child.

^{1/} Tappan, Paul W., op. cit., p. 147.

CHAPTER III
PROCEDURE AND PROCUREMENT OF DATA

Research Procedure.

Research investigations were conducted to find out what information was already available concerning the areas of vulnerability -- the school, the home, and the community; what various authors know about the characteristics of vulnerability; and what procedures might be followed to recognize delinquent tendencies. This information has already been summarized in the preceding chapter.

In addition, further research was directed toward manipulation of the Proneness Scale and Check List and toward determining the functions which they are reported to perform adequately.

Tables of information gained from the lists of teacher-selected "best" and "poorest" citizens, the ratings on K·D Proneness Check Lists and the scores earned on the K D Proneness Scales were set up, and correlations to determine the statistical significance of the results of the study were figured.

The K D Proneness Scale and Check List.

The K D Proneness Scale and Check List^{1/} are two different measures which may be applied when attempting to

^{1/} Kvaraceus, William C., "K D Proneness Scale and Check List, Manual of Directions," Yonkers-on-Hudson, World Book Co., 1950.

determine the presence, extent, and degree of delinquency. Research has shown significant differences between delinquents and non-delinquents in the areas which have been discussed in the previous chapter.

The Proneness Scale, to be completed by the child in question, calls for the selection of one of four possible opinions or attitudes in response to the items which are based on the differences mentioned above. It carries one scoring key for boys and another for girls, and it yields both positive and negative scores. The plus score is the number of items which a child answers as delinquents have been known to answer; the minus score is the number of items which a child answers as non-delinquents have been known to answer. The total score is the difference between the two scores, and it is prefixed by the sign of the larger score.

In a study conducted to determine the reliability of the Scale, the correlation was found to be .75, which was judged, because of the opinion-like responses called for in the Scale, to be sufficiently high for survey purposes.

The Check List, also, is based on the differences between delinquents and non-delinquents. It is to be completed by any person responsible for the normal growth and development of children who has access to the necessary personal and environmental information regarding the child. Checks are made in three columns, "Yes," "No," and "?." The final score is the number of "Yes" checks.

Thus, one can see that the two measures, although based upon the same research, produce two distinct types of information about the child; the Scale allows the child to state his own attitudes and opinions, and the Check List collects from some competent source information regarding his personality and environment.

Dr. Kvaraceus points out that a high positive Scale score does not prove either present or eventual delinquency, nor does a low negative Scale score assure complete freedom from delinquent behavior either now or in the future. The Scale will, however, pick out subjects who need further study by whatever agency is available. He recommends that the Scale and Check List be used to supplement each other, for since "the Scale score, like any test score, should be interpreted against the background of all other information as to the personality structure and environment of the individual,"^{1/} one could gain much of this information from a properly completed Check List.

The K D Proneness Check List Scores, according to the Manual of Directions,^{2/} should be interpreted as follows: twenty-five or more "Yes" checks signify Extreme Exposure, from ten to twenty-four "Yes" checks signify Vulnerable, and from one to ten "Yes" checks signify Slight Susceptibility.

^{1/} Kvaraceus, William C., "K D Proneness Scale and Check List, Manual of Directions," op. cit., p. 6.

^{2/} Kvaraceus, William C., loc. cit., p. 7.

The K D Proneness Scale scores, according to the Manual of Directions,^{1/} should be interpreted as follows:

"Those children who obtain high positive scores (\neq 3 or above for boys, \neq 6 or above for girls) are indicating by their responses to the Scale items, attitudes and opinions that closely resemble those of delinquent groups; those subjects who obtain relatively low negative scores (-10 or below for boys, 0 or below for girls) are responding in a manner similar to what we have termed "high morale" groups."

Procurement of Data.

The first step in securing the data had to be the obtaining of the lists of teacher selections of "best" and "poorest" classroom citizens. These lists had to be obtained before teachers were asked to fill out the K D Proneness Check Lists for their pupils in order to insure that the selections of "best" and "poorest" citizens were not influenced by the items on the Check List.

It was necessary for the Check Lists to be completed as a second step. It was felt that some teachers would request to be given the scores made by their pupils on the K D Proneness Scales and that this information might easily influence the ratings they would give the pupils on the Check Lists. The Proneness Scales, therefore, were not administered until the Check Lists had been completed and returned.

The bulk of the necessary data was furnished by the home room teachers of the pupils involved in the study. The

^{1/} Kvaraceus, William C., op. cit., p. 6.

list of "best" and "poorest" citizens, determined in the light of the definitions provided on page 9, represented the best opinion of each teacher after she had given careful consideration to the citizenship of the pupils in her room. While it was requested that the teacher list the four or five best citizens and the four or five poorest citizens, the instructions also stated that more or fewer names would be accepted. This allowed each teacher to select all the pupils whom she considered "best" citizens, and all those whom she considered "poorest" citizens, since it was felt that it would not be fair to place numerical restrictions on her selections. (A sample copy of the sheet on which teachers wrote their selections will be found in the Appendix.)

The K D Proneness Check Lists were also filled out by the home room teachers in grades five, six, seven, and eight. The teacher was the only person capable of furnishing this information for all the pupils. In each case, she had recourse to individual cumulative records, close pupil observation, questionnaires and pupil conferences in those cases where she found it necessary.

The writer personally administered and corrected the K D Proneness Scales to the 162 "best" and "poorest" citizens listed by the teachers. This involved five separate administrations of the Scale. The number of pupils taking the Scale at one administration ranged from 12 to 42.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Treatment of Data.

After all the data had been collected, numerous tables were constructed. The first table in this chapter, Table 3 on the following page, indicates the ratings given to pupils on the K D Proneness Check Lists by their home room teachers. The pupils' scores have been grouped according to the standard recommendation which has been cited on page 39. It will be noted that the seventeen teachers rated 367 pupils as belonging in the 'Slight Susceptibility' group, 65 pupils as belonging in the 'Vulnerable' group, while only two were rated in the 'Extreme Exposure' group. This means that, rounded to the nearest tenth of a per cent, these teachers would rate 84.6% of the pupils as being slightly susceptible, 15.0% as vulnerable, and only .5% as being subject to extreme exposure.

Dividing the pupils into grades, we would find that 84 of the 103, or 81.6%, of the eighth grade members were rated as slightly susceptible, while 19 of the 103, or 18.4%, were rated vulnerable, and no one was considered subject to extreme exposure. In grade seven, 88 of the 113, or 77.9%, were rated slightly susceptible, 23 of the 113, or 20.4%, were rated vulnerable, and 2 of the 113, or 1.8%, were rated as being subject to extreme exposure. In grade six, 110 of

TABLE 3.

GROUPINGS OF K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST SCORES
BY AGE, SEX, AND GRADE LEVEL

Age	Grade Five						Grade Six						Grade Seven						Grade Eight					
	Slight Susceptibility		Vulnerable		Extreme Exposure		Slight Susceptibility		Vulnerable		Extreme Exposure		Slight Susceptibility		Vulnerable		Extreme Exposure		Slight Susceptibility		Vulnerable		Extreme Exposure	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	5	2	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	6	9	2	3	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	20	11	3	3	0	35	29	2	4	0	0	0
12	2	2	1	0	0	0	20	16	2	5	0	0	28	25	11	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
11	17	9	4	3	0	0	26	46	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	21	34	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	40	45	7	4	0	0	48	62	6	6	0	0	51	37	18	5	1	1	45	39	10	9	0	0
	96						122						113						103					

B = Boys
G = Girls

the 122 pupils, or 90.2%, were rated as being slightly susceptible, 12 of the 122, or 9.8%, were rated as vulnerable, and no one was considered subject to extreme exposure. In grade five, 85 of the 96, or 88.5% of the pupils, were considered slightly susceptible, 11 of the 96, or 11.5%, were considered vulnerable, while no one was considered subject to extreme exposure.

Tables 4 and 5, on pages 45 and 46, show the number and the per cent of boys and girls by grade level in the three K D Proneness Check List groupings. Generally speaking, the tables indicate that the higher the grade level, the greater was the percentage of pupils whom teachers rated in the Vulnerable and Extreme Exposure groups on the Proneness Check Lists.

TABLE 4

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF GIRLS BY GRADE LEVEL
IN EACH OF THE THREE K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST GROUPINGS

K D Proneness Check List Groupings	GRADE FIVE		GRADE SIX		GRADE SEVEN		GRADE EIGHT	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Slightly Susceptible	45	91.8	62	91.2	37	86.1	39	81.3
Vulnerable	4	8.2	6	8.8	5	11.6	9	18.7
Extreme Exposure	0	0	0	0	1	2.3	0	0
Total	49	100.0	68	100.0	43	100.0	48	100.0

TABLE 5
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOYS BY GRADE LEVEL
IN EACH OF THE THREE K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST GROUPINGS

K D Proneness Check List Groupings	GRADE FIVE		GRADE SIX		GRADE SEVEN		GRADE EIGHT	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Slightly Susceptible	40	85.1	48	88.9	51	72.9	45	81.8
Vulnerable	7	14.9	6	11.1	18	25.7	10	18.2
Extreme Exposure	0	0	0	0	1	1.4	0	0
Total	47	100.0	54	100.0	70	100.0	55	100.0

TABLE 6

THE NUMBER AND PER CENT OF THE 434 PUPILS BY AGE LEVEL
IN THE THREE K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST GROUPINGS

Age	SLIGHT SUSCEPTIBILITY		VULNERABLE		EXTREME EXPOSURE	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
17	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0
16	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
15	3	27.3	8	72.7	0	0.0
14	19	67.9	8	28.6	1	3.6
13	97	87.4	14	12.6	0	0.0
12	94	81.7	20	17.4	1	0.9
11	98	90.7	10	9.3	0	0.0
10	55	96.5	2	3.5	0	0.0
Total	367		65		2	

From Table 6 one might infer that, generally speaking, teachers' ratings of pupils on the Proneness Check List will tend to show increased vulnerability with a corresponding increase in age.

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF THE K D PRONENESS SCALE SCORES
OF THE 109 "BEST" TEACHER-SELECTED SCHOOL CITIZENS
AND THE 53 "POOREST" TEACHER-SELECTED SCHOOL CITIZENS.

Total Score	B O Y S		Total Score	G I R L S	
	"Best" Citizens	"Poorest" Citizens		"Best" Citizens	"Poorest" Citizens
-24	2	0	-24	0	0
-23	0	0	-23	0	0
-22	0	0	-22	1	0
-21	0	1	-21	0	0
-20	3	0	-20	1	0
-19	1	0	-19	1	0
-18	1	1	-18	0	0
-17	6	0	-17	2	0
-16	3	2	-16	3	0
-15	2	1	-15	2	0
-14	1	1	-14	3	0
-13	2	1	-13	5	0
-12	0	5	-12	3	0
-11	2	2	-11	2	1
-10	4	3	-10	1	0
-9	2	2	-9	1	0
-8	2	2	-8	4	2
-7	2	5	-7	4	1
-6	1	2	-6	3	0
-5	4	2	-5	4	0
-4	0	2	-4	6	0
-3	1	1	-3	4	0
-2	0	0	-2	5	1
-1	1	1	-1	3	2
0	0	1	0	1	0
1	0	3	1	2	1
2	0	1	2	2	0
3	0	0	3	0	1
4	0	1	4	0	1
5	1	2	5	3	0
6	0	0	6	0	0
7	0	0	7	1	0
8	0	0	8	0	0
9	0	1	9	0	0
10	0	0	10	0	0
11	0	0	11	1	0
Totals	41	43	Totals	68	10

From Table 7 one notices that of the five boys whose K D Proneness Scale Scores approximated the scores of delinquent boys, i.e., scores between $\neq 3$ and $\neq 11$, one was selected as a "best" citizen, while four were selected as "poorest" citizens. One also notices that both girls whose scores approximated the scores of delinquent girls, i.e., scores which are $\neq 6$ or above, were selected as "best" citizens. Thus, one figures that 20% of the boys' scores in this area on the Scale and 100% of the girls' scores were not in agreement with the teachers' opinions of these particular pupils.

The scores of forty-four boys were below -10. Of these, only 27 were selected as "best" citizens, while 17 were selected as "poorest" citizens. Fifty-nine of the 66 girls whose scores were 0 or below were selected as "best" citizens by their teachers, whereas only 7 were selected as "poorest" citizens. Thus, it would seem that teachers' opinions of pupils and pupils' Scale scores are not in agreement in 38.6% of the boys' cases and in 10.6% of the girls' cases.

From these data one would gather that these teachers and the Proneness Scale were in good agreement on poor boy citizens and good girl citizens, but were rather far apart on poor girl citizens and good boy citizens. The tendency would appear that teachers are less harsh when rating girls than when rating boys.

TABLE 8

SUMMARY OF DATA ON THE 'BEST' AND 'POOREST' GIRL CITIZENS AS
 SELECTED BY TEACHERS, THE GIRLS' K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST
 SCORES AND THE GIRLS' K D PRONENESS SCALE SCORES

K D PRONENESS SCALE SCORES	K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST GROUPINGS					
	Slightly Susceptible		Vulnerable		Extreme Exposure	
	Teacher Selected 'Best' Citizens	Teacher Selected 'Poorest' Citizens	Teacher Selected 'Best' Citizens	Teacher Selected 'Poorest' Citizens	Teacher Selected 'Best' Citizens	Teacher Selected 'Poorest' Citizens
+6 to +11	2	0	0	0	0	0
+1 to + 5	7	2	0	1	0	0
0 to -24	59	5	0	2	0	0
Total	75		3		0	

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF DATA ON THE 'BEST' AND 'POOREST' BOY CITIZENS AS
 SELECTED BY TEACHERS, THE BOYS' K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST
 SCORES AND THE BOYS' K D PRONENESS SCALE SCORES

K D PRONENESS SCALE SCORES	K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST GROUPINGS					
	Slightly Susceptible		Vulnerable		Extreme Exposure	
	Teacher Selected 'Best' Citizens	Teacher Selected 'Poorest' Citizens	Teacher Selected 'Best' Citizens	Teacher Selected 'Poorest' Citizens	Teacher Selected 'Best' Citizens	Teacher Selected 'Poorest' Citizens
+3 to +11	1	3	0	1	0	0
-9 to + 2	13	12	0	9	0	1
-10 to -24	26	11	1	6	0	0
Total	66		17		1	

In summary of Table 8, one finds that of the 75 girls whose Check List ratings by teachers indicated slight susceptibility, 68 were "best" citizens and 7 were "poorest" citizens; the 3 girls who received Check List ratings of Vulnerable were considered "poorest" citizens. It is interesting to note that the seventh grade girl whose Check List rating showed Extreme Exposure (see Table 3 on page 43) was not listed as one of the "poorest" citizens.

Of the 75 girls whom teachers' Check List ratings showed to be slightly susceptible, only 2, or 2.7%, obtained Proneness Scale scores which indicated that their responses resembled those of delinquents. Sixty-four, or 85.3% of the girls whose Check List ratings fell in the Slight Susceptibility group, and 2, or 66.7% of the girls whose Check List ratings fell in the Vulnerable group obtained Proneness Scale scores which showed that their responses resembled those of the "high morale" group.

To summarize Table 9, one finds that of the 66 boys for whom Check List ratings showed Slight Susceptibility, 40 were "best" citizens and 26 were "poorest" citizens; of the 17 boys for whom Check List ratings showed Vulnerable, 1 was a "best" citizen and 16 were "poorest" citizens; the one boy whose Check List rating showed Extreme Exposure was rated a "poorest" citizen.

Four of the 66 boys for whom teachers' Check List ratings showed Slight Susceptibility, or 6.1%, and 1 of the 17 boys for whom teachers' Check List ratings showed Vulnerable received Proneness Scale scores which indicated that their attitudes closely resemble those of delinquents. Thirty-seven of the 66 boys for whom teachers' Check List ratings showed Slight Susceptibility, or 56.1%, and 7 of the 17 boys, or 41.2%, for whom teachers' Check List ratings showed Vulnerable received Proneness Scale scores which showed that their responses closely resembled those of the "high morale" group.

Teachers listed 53 pupils as "poorest" citizens. The K D Proneness Check Lists which teachers completed for these 53 "poorest" citizens showed that 33, or 62.3% of them, would fall in the Slightly Susceptible grouping; that 19, or 35.8% of them, would fall in the Vulnerable grouping, and that only 1, or 1.9% of them, would fall in the Extreme Exposure grouping.

Another bit of information to be gained from Tables 8 and 9 is that of the 53 "poorest" citizens listed by teachers, 43, or 81.1% of them, were boys, whereas 10, or 18.9% of them, were girls.

The Pearson product-moment formula, $r = \frac{\sum x'y' - c_x c_y}{\sigma_x \sigma_y}$ was used to figure the coefficients of correlation between (1) the boys' scores on the Proneness Scale and Check List,

(2) the girls' scores on the Proneness Scale and Check List, and (3) the total group scores on the Proneness Scale and Check List.

According to the mean scores for the Check Lists, teachers would find both the average boy and average girl to be slightly susceptible; the mean boys' Proneness Scale score would indicate that the average boy would be slightly below the 'high morale' group, while the average girls' Proneness Scale score would place her in the 'high morale' group.

TABLE 10

THE MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION FOR THE K D PRONESS SCALES AND K D PRONESS CHECK LISTS

	BOYS	GIRLS	TOTAL GROUP
N	84	78	162
Mean _x	-9.62	-6.59	-8.15
Mean _y	6.19	2.59	4.44
SD _x	6.90	6.79	7.02
SD _y	5.61	3.18	4.47
r	.318	.121	.152
$r \frac{1}{2}$ necessary for sig- nificance at 5% level	±.215	±.223	±.155

1/ Garrett, Henry E., Statistics in Psychology and Education, Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1949, p. 299.

Scattergrams for the boys, girls, and total group, will be found in the Appendix. Since low scores on the Check List and a low negative score on the Proneness Scale indicate the more desirable scores, both the 'x' and 'y' scales have been arranged in that order -- that is, the lowest obtained, or least desirable, scores appear at the top of the 'y' scale, and the highest obtained, or most desirable, scores appear at the bottom of the scale. Likewise, the highest obtained, or least desirable, positive scores appear at the left of the 'x' scale, and the lowest obtained, or most desirable, negative scores appear at the right of the 'x' scale.

Looking back at Tables 8 and 9, we discover that 11 of the 84 boys, in comparison to only 4 of the 78 girls, had Proneness Scale scores which would seem definitely to disagree with Check List scores. Obviously, the percentage of disagreement in case of the boys is larger than that in case of the girls, yet the coefficient of correlation on the two measures is lower for the girls than for the boys. There are good reasons for this. Both boys' and girls' Check List scores are grouped according to the same standards, whereas girls, because of the nature of the Scale items, are permitted to get acceptable scores which are much nearer the high positive end of the scale than are boys. This would obviously affect the two correlations.

In addition, to quote Garrett,^{1/} "the problem of the effect upon 'r' of the 'range of talent' within the group often arises in correlational work." One notices that the Check List ratings for girls covered a much narrower range than did the ratings for boys. Seventy-five of the 78 girls had ratings of between 0 and 8, whereas only 60 of the boys had ratings in that area. Twenty-four of the boys' scores, in comparison to only 3 of the girls' scores, exceeded this figure.

One would gather that with an increase in range of talent there would be a greater coefficient of correlation. In the group sampled, factors of personality and environment were judged to be too nearly equal for the 78 girls to permit a statistically significant correlation to exist.

Another factor to be taken into consideration is attenuation. Garrett^{2/} says that "the correlation between a test and its criterion will be reduced if either the test scores or the criterion scores or both are unreliable." In this case, the Proneness Scale scores are unreliable to the extent that the pupils were influenced more by what they may have guessed to be the acceptable response than by their honest opinion. The Check List scores are reliable only to the extent that the information which teachers had available for each child was honestly representative of the factors in

^{1/} Garrett, Henry E., op. cit., p. 326.

^{2/} Garrett, Henry E., loc. cit., p. 396.

the child's personality and environment. Therefore, it would appear that we could expect much higher positive correlations to exist between the two measures.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Results.

From the analysis of data in the preceding chapter, the following conclusions have been reached:

1. Poor classroom citizens, based on teachers' judgment, are not necessarily the most delinquency-prone pupils in the classroom. This observation is supported by the fact that on the Proneness Check List teachers rated 33 of their selected 53 "poorest" citizens as being only slightly susceptible, and 16 of these 33 pupils obtained Proneness Scale scores which showed their attitudes to resemble those of "high morale" pupils.
2. Of the 21 pupils for whom teachers' Check List ratings showed Vulnerable or Extreme Exposure, they had, by using the definitions given on page 9, selected 20 of these pupils as "poorest" citizens, but 8 of these 20 pupils received Proneness Scale scores which showed them to be responding in a manner similar to "high morale" pupils. Thus, while there is evidence that teachers

will give Check List ratings of Vulnerable to those pupils whom they have judged to be poor citizens, we must admit that there is some doubt as to whether all pupils who obtain unsatisfactory Check List ratings and who are judged to be poor citizens necessarily have attitudes and opinions which resemble those of delinquents.

3. The pupils whom teachers designate as "best" citizens are quite apt to belong in, or not far below, that category. This conclusion is supported by the following evidence:

Of the 109 pupils whom teachers listed as "best" citizens, 108 were rated in the Slight Susceptibility group on the Check List. Of these 108 pupils, 85 indicated on the Proneness Scale that they had attitudes and opinions which closely resemble those of "high morale" pupils.

4. According to Proneness Scale scores there were 110 pupils who indicated by their responses that their attitudes closely resemble the attitudes of "high morale" pupils. Eighty-six of these 110 pupils were listed by teachers as "best" citizens, and 24 were listed as "poorest" citizens. Eighty-five

of the 86 "best" citizens, and 16 of the 24 "poorest" citizens, were rated in the Slight Susceptibility group on the Check Lists.

From this it would appear that a little more than three out of every four "high morale" pupils, as designated by the Proneness Scale, would be rated "best" citizens by teachers, and that slightly under one of every four "high morale" pupils would be selected as "poorest" citizens.

5. Of the 53 "poorest" citizens, the Check Lists completed by teachers indicated that only 20 pupils belonged in the Vulnerable and Extreme Exposure groups. This means that, when thinking in terms of what authorities consider to be contributing factors to delinquency, these teachers found that less than two-fifths of the pupils whom they had named as "poorest" citizens would seem to be in danger of becoming delinquent. If, as we must necessarily believe to be true, delinquency and poor citizenship carry much the same connotation, then teachers must regard something as poor citizenship which is not such. It would seem that teachers should take time to determine exactly what is meant by 'poor citizenship' to make sure that

they do not label children with words which do not describe them. There is little doubt in the mind of the writer that the pupils whom teachers listed as "poorest" citizens were undoubtedly the most annoying and troublesome pupils in the classroom, but there is strong doubt as to whether or not some of them were actually poor citizens.

6. Although two of the three correlations computed between the Scale and Check List were not statistically significant at the 5% level, it is felt, for reasons already stated, that correlations are sufficiently high to warrant continued use of the two measures in conjunction with each other. Furthermore, they do offer two distinct types of information about each child in question.

Limitations.

One of the limitations of this study is the fact that probably not all teachers had the same ideas in mind when they selected "best" and "poorest" citizens, in spite of the fact that definitions were furnished them.

Another limiting factor is that 434 pupils is not the total number of pupils in grades five through eight in the city of Barre. One teacher misunderstood directions and completed Check Lists for only the "best" and "poorest"

citizens instead of for the entire group. This reduced the number of Check Lists by 22. There were other instances where Check Lists were returned with one or two less than the stated number of pupils in the room. However, this did not seriously affect the study, for only two of the "best" citizens, and none of the "poorest" citizens, were eliminated by this oversight. Although these two "best" citizens were not treated in the study, their Proneness Scale scores showed both of them to have attitudes and opinions which resemble those of "high morale" groups.

The Proneness Scale scores were dependent, to a large extent, upon a pupil's ability to read. It was pointed out by one teacher that at least two of the "poorest" citizens could not read, but they were able to check the Scale items so that their scores would seem to be satisfactory. Probably this was by chance, for although many questions regarding the meanings of words were answered when the pupils were taking the Scale, the writer is confident that help in this direction did not indicate which was the acceptable response.

The majority of the teachers were unfamiliar with the Check List forms, and probably they were not equally familiar with all their pupils. Unless all cumulative records were complete for all pupils, then it is quite possible that not all Check Lists were completed with equal accuracy.

The Proneness Scale is a form of self-report; hence, there would be a tendency for some pupils to conceal their true opinions. Undoubtedly, this is somewhat of a limitation on the validity of this study.

Suggestions for Further Study.

1. A study to determine what factors constitute poor citizenship, and to what extent these factors must be operating upon and within a child before he is judged a poor citizen.
2. A study to determine to what extent factors which increase delinquency are in operation in different school systems.
3. Studies to further validate the K D Proneness Scale.
4. A correlation study of the school achievement of pupils who scored in the different groups on the K D Proneness Scale.
5. A study of the help given teachers by different school administrations in formulating a basis for judgment of 'good' and 'poor' citizenship.
- 6.. A correlation study of the K D Proneness Check List. This would be done by having the pupils who are referred to the reading clinic rated by the reading specialist and also by the home room teacher.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Applegate, Melbourne S., Helping Boys in Trouble, New York, Association Press, 1950.
- Arlitt, A. H. Family Relationships, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1942.
- Averill, A., Mental Hygiene for the Classroom Teacher, New York, Pilman Publishing Co., 1939.
- Baxter, Bernice, Teacher-Pupil Relationships, New York, Macmillan Co., 1941.
- Beals, Frank L., "Schools and Juvenile Problems," Hygeia, 26: 262-263, April, 1948.
- Beggs, W. K. and Katterle, Z. B., "Pupil-Faculty Personnel Policies," School Executive, 69: 51-52, July, 1950.
- Bolmeier, E. C., "Six Steps to Pupil Participation in Democratic School Control," Clearing House, 21: 391-395, March, 1947.
- Burrows, A. H., "Problem of Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Educational Sociology, 19: 382-390, February, 1946.
- Carr, Lowell J., Delinquency Control, Revised Edition, 1950, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1940.
- Cushman, G. L., "Final Responsibility in Educational Programs," Educational Administration and Supervision, 32: 536-537, December, 1946.
- Denny, V. and Johnson, M. T., "Predelinquency and Juvenile Guidance," National Educational Association Journal, 35: 386-387, October, 1946.
- Deutsch, Albert, Our Rejected Children, Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1950.
- DuShane, Donald, "Schools and Juvenile Delinquency," National Education Association Journal, 36: 100-101, February, 1947.
- "Fostering Mental Health in Our Schools," 1950 Yearbook, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1950.

- Garrett, Henry E., Statistics in Psychology and Education, New York, Longmans, Green and Co. (Third edition), 1949.
- Garrison, Karl C., The Psychology of Adolescence, Third edition, 1946, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934, 1940.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Glueck, Eleanor, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, New York, The Commonwealth Fund, 1950.
- Goff, Aaron, "The Sitter: A Bell-to-Bell Account of His Thoughts," Clearing House, 22: 159-160, November, 1947.
- Goslin, W. E., "Contributions of Administration to Teacher and Child Growth," Childhood Education, 22: 264-271, February, 1946.
- Haisley, O. W., "Democratic Procedures Pay," School Executive, 66: 46-47, April, 1947.
- Healy, William, and Bronner, Augusta F., New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment, New Haven, Connecticut, Yale University Press, 1936.
- Henry, Nelson B., "Schools and Problems of Juvenile Delinquency," Elementary School Journal, 47: 310-314, February, 1947.
- Hollingshead, A. B., Elmtown's Youth, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1949.
- "Juvenile Delinquency in Massachusetts as a Public Responsibility," Boston, Massachusetts Child Council, 1939.
- Klager, B., "Instructional Council as Administrative Agency," American School Board Journal, 112: 36-37, March, 1946.
- Kvaraceus, William C., "K D Proneness Scale and Check List," Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, World Book Company, 1950.
- Kvaraceus, William C., Juvenile Delinquency and the School, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, World Book Company, 1945.
- Kvaraceus, William C., "Juvenile Delinquency and Social Class," Journal of Educational Sociology, 18: 51-54, September, 1944.
- Kvaraceus, William C., "Schools Must Lead Attack on Delinquency," Nation's Schools, 37: 20-22, June 1946.

- Langerman, R. J., "Cooperative Administration for Better Teaching," Clearing House, 23: 426-427, March, 1949.
- Loomis, A. K., "How an Urban Community Proceeded to Decide What Its Schools Should Do," edited by B. O. Smith, Teachers College Record, 46: 26-40, January, 1945.
- Moore, A. E., "Instruction in Family Living Will Help Prevent Juvenile Delinquency," Nation's Schools, 38: 41-42, November, 1946.
- Morgan, J. J. B., The Psychology of the Unadjusted School Child, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1936.
- Mosher, H. H., "Rural School Combats Delinquency," Nation's Schools, 35: 26, April, 1945.
- National Conference for the Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency, "Summaries of Recommendations for Actions," Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1947.
- National Society for the Study of Education, Forty-seventh Yearbook, Part I, "Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools," Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Paine, A. E., "Family Size and Delinquency," Phi Delta Kappa, 27: 136, January, 1946.
- Peterson, E. H., "Developing Desirable Behavior Patterns," Clearing House, 21: 347, February, 1947.
- Polier, Justine W., Everyone's Children, Nobody's Child, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.
- Rogers, V. M., "Building the Democratic Process," School Executive, 69: 70-71, September, 1949.
- Schneidemann, Rose, Democratic Education in Practice, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1945.
- "School and Teacher Responsibilities in Juvenile Delinquency," High School Journal, 30: 71-76, March, 1947.
- Story, M. L., "What Part Should Parents Play in School Administration?," School Executive, 70: 52-53, May, 1951.
- Suerkin, Ernest H., "Is There Moral Delinquency in Our Schools?," School Executive, 67: 25, August, 1948.
- Symonds, P. M., Mental Hygiene of the School Child, New York, Macmillan Co., 1938.

Tappan, Paul W., Juvenile Delinquency, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1949.

Teeters, Negley and Reinemann, John O., The Challenge of Delinquency, New York, Prentice-Hall, 1950.

Wallin, J. E. W., "Improprieties and Inconsistencies in Public School Practices," School and Society, 64: 372-374, November, 1946.

Wickman, E. K., Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes, New York, The Commonwealth Fund, 1928.

APPENDIX

Please list below the four or five best citizens in your class. These are people who are not only well adjusted themselves, but are concerned for the common good of the group of which they are a member. (If you wish to list more or less than five, please feel free to do so.)

Please list four or five class members who are the poorest citizens in your class. These are individuals who show definite conflict with the rules and regulations as developed for the child's social group. (If you wish to list more or less than five, please feel free to do so.)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Total number of pupils in your class -- _____

CALCULATION OF THE PRODUCT-MOMENT COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION
BETWEEN THE K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST SCORES AND THE K D
PRONENESS SCALE SCORES FOR 84 BOYS

K D PRONENESS SCALE SCORES

K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST SCORES	K D PRONENESS SCALE SCORES																	
	9-11	6-8	3-5	0-2	-3--1	-6--4	-9--7	-12--10	-15--13	-18--16	-21--19	-24--22	f_y	y'	$f_y y'$	$f_y y'^2$	$\Sigma x'$	$\Sigma x' y'$
0-2					1	3	4	6	3	6	3	1	27	2	54	108	42	84
3-5			1		1	2	4	3	3	5	1	1	21	1	21	21	25	25
6-8	1		2	2		2	1	2	2				12	0			-16	0
9-11			1		2	2	2	3		1	1		12	-1	-12	12	0	0
12-14				1		1	2			1			5	-2	-10	20	-1	2
15-17				1		1							2	-3	-6	18	-4	12
18-20				1				2					3	-4	-12	48	-1	4
21-23							1						1	-5	-5	25	0	0
24-26													0	-6	0	0	0	0
27-29							1						1	-7	-7	49	0	0
													84		23	301	45	127

f_x	1	0	4	5	4	11	15	16	18	13	5	2	=84
x'	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	
$f_x x'$	-6	0	-16	-15	-8	-11		16	16	39	20	10	=45
$f_x x'^2$	36	0	64	45	16	11		16	32	117	80	50	=467
$\Sigma y'$	0	0	0	-9	1	1	-6	4	9	14	6	3	=23
$\Sigma x' y'$	0	0	0	27	-2	-1	0	4	18	42	24	15	=127

$$C_x = \frac{45}{84} = .54$$

$$C_{x.3} = 1.62$$

$$C_x^2 = .2809$$

$$\sigma_x = \sqrt{\frac{467}{84} - .2809 \times 3}$$

$$\sigma_y = \sqrt{\frac{301}{84} - .0729 \times 3}$$

$$C_y = \frac{23}{84} = .27$$

$$\sigma_x = 2.30 \times 3$$

$$\sigma_y = 1.87 \times 3$$

$$C_{y.3} = .81$$

$$\sigma_x = 6.90$$

$$\sigma_y = 5.61$$

$$C_y^2 = .0729$$

$$r = \frac{\frac{127}{84} - .54 \times .27}{2.30 \times 1.87}$$

$$r = .318$$

CALCULATION OF THE PRODUCT-MOMENT COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN THE K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST SCORES AND THE K D PRONENESS SCALE SCORES FOR 78 GIRLS

K D PRONENESS SCALE SCORES

K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST SCORES	K D PRONENESS SCALE SCORES																	
	9-11	6-8	3-5	0-2	-3--1	-6--4	-9--7	-12--10	-15--13	-18--16	-21--19	-24--22	f_y	y'	f_y'	$f_y'^2$	$\Sigma x'$	$\Sigma x'y'$
0-2	1		3	5	10	10	6	5	9	3	2	1	55	1	55	55	37	37
3-5		1	1		2	3	3	1	1				13	0			3	0
6-8			1		2		2	1		1			7	-1	-7	7	3	-3
9-11													0	-2	0	0	0	0
12-14				1			1						2	-3	-6	18	-1	3
15-17													0	-4	0	0	0	0
18-20					1								1	-5	-5	25	-1	5
													78		37	105	41	42

f_x	1	1	5	6	15	13	12	7	10	5	2	1	=78
x'	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
f_x'	-5	-4	-15	-12	-15		12	14	30	20	10	6	=41
$f_x'^2$	25	16	45	24	15		12	28	90	80	50	36	=421
$\Sigma y'$	1	0	2	2	3	10	1	4	9	2	2	1	=37
$\Sigma x'y'$	-5	0	-6	-4	-3		1	8	27	8	10	6	=42

$$c_x = \frac{41}{78} = .53$$

$$c_x \cdot 3 = 1.59$$

$$c_x^2 = .2809$$

$$c_y = \frac{37}{78} = .47$$

$$c_y \cdot 3 = 1.41$$

$$c_y^2 = .2209$$

$$\sigma_x = \sqrt{\frac{421}{78} - .2809 \times 3}$$

$$\sigma_y = \sqrt{\frac{105}{78} - .2209 \times 3}$$

$$\sigma_x = 2.262 \times 3$$

$$\sigma_y = 1.06 \times 3$$

$$\sigma_x = 6.79$$

$$\sigma_y = 3.18$$

$$r = \frac{42}{78} - .53 \times .47$$

$$2.26 \times 1.06$$

$$r = .121$$

CALCULATION OF THE PRODUCT-MOMENT COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION
BETWEEN THE K D PRONENESS CHECK LIST SCORES AND THE K D
PRONENESS SCALE SCORES FOR 162 BOYS AND
GIRLS

KD PRONENESS SCALE SCORES

KD PRONENESS CHECK LIST SCORES	KD PRONENESS SCALE SCORES																	
	9-11	6-8	3-5	0-2	-3-1	-6-4	-9-7	-12-10	-15-13	-18-16	-21-19	-24-22	f_y	y'	$f_y y'$	f_y^2	$\Sigma x'$	$\Sigma x' y'$
0-2	1		3	5	11	13	10	11	12	9	5	2	82	1	82	82	24	24
3-5		1	2		3	5	7	4	4	6	1	1	34	0			15	0
6-8	1		3	2	2	2	3	3	2	1			19	-1	-19	19	-20	20
9-11			1		2	2	2	3		1	1		12	-2	-24	48	0	0
12-14				2		1	3			1			7	-3	-21	63	-4	12
15-17				1		1							2	-4	-8	32	-4	16
18-20				1	1				2				4	-5	-20	100	-3	15
21-23							1						1	-6	-6	36	0	0
24-26													0	-7	0	0	0	0
27-29							1						1	-8	-8	64	0	0
													162		-24	362	8	87

f_x	2	1	9	11	19	24	27	23	18	18	7	3	=162
x'	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	
$f_x x'$	-12	-5	-36	-33	-18	-24		23	36	54	28	15	=8
f_x^2	72	25	144	99	36	24		23	72	162	112	75	=884
$\Sigma y'$	0	0	-2	-12	0	0	-20	-8	10	3	3	2	=-24
$\Sigma x' y'$	0	0	8	36	0	0		-8	20	9	12	10	=87

$$C_x = \frac{8}{162} = .049$$

$$C_x \cdot 3 = .147$$

$$C_x^2 = .002401$$

$$C_y = \frac{-24}{162} = -.148$$

$$C_y \cdot 3 = -.444$$

$$C_y^2 = .021904$$

$$\sigma_x = \sqrt{\frac{884}{162} - .002401 \times 3}$$

$$\sigma_y = \sqrt{\frac{362}{162} - .021904 \times 3}$$

$$\sigma_x = 2.34 \times 3$$

$$\sigma_y = 1.49 \times 3$$

$$\sigma_x = 7.02$$

$$\sigma_y = 4.47$$

$$r = \frac{87}{162} - .049 \times -.148$$

$$= \frac{2.34 \times 1.49}{7.02 \times 4.47}$$

$$r = .152$$

K D PRONENESS SCALE

By WILLIAM C. KYARAGEUS, Professor of Education, Boston University

Name Boy Girl

School (or Group) Grade

Age Last Birthday Years Date 19

DIRECTIONS

THE questions in this booklet ask how you feel about certain things. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Read each question and the four answers that follow it. Select the answer that best describes how you really feel about the question. Do not skip any questions. Answer every question as you come to it. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers. Be sure to choose the answer that best tells how you feel about the question.

Here is a sample question to show you how to mark the answers.

Sample A. Of the following, the color I like best is —
1 red 2 brown 3 blue 4 green 1 2 3 4

Decide which of these colors you like best and draw a line under your answer. Now look at the number beside the color which you picked. Put a heavy black mark in the answer space at the right which is under the number of the answer which you have picked. For example, if you like "blue" best, you will draw a line under the word "blue." Since "blue" is number 3, you will put a heavy black line in the answer space under the number 3.

When you are told to start, read each question and decide upon your answer, then record the answer in the same manner as you have done for the sample. You will be given time enough to finish all the questions.

Do not open your booklet until you are told to do so.

ANSWER SHEET

Plus
Score _____
Minus
Score _____
Total
Scale
Score _____

Page 6

41	42	43	44
61			
45	46	47	48
62			
49	50	51	52
63			
53	54	55	56
64			
57	58	59	60
65			
61	62	63	64
66			
65	66	67	68
67			
69	70	71	72
68			
73	74	75	76
69			
77	78	79	80
70			
81	82	83	84
71			
85	86	87	88
72			
89	90	91	92
73			
93	94	95	96
74			
97	98	99	100
75			

Page 5

61	62	63	64
41			
65	66	67	68
42			
69	70	71	72
43			
73	74	75	76
44			
77	78	79	80
45			
81	82	83	84
46			
85	86	87	88
47			
89	90	91	92
48			
93	94	95	96
49			
97	98	99	100
50			
1	2	3	4
51			
5	6	7	8
52			
9	10	11	12
53			
13	14	15	16
54			
17	18	19	20
55			
21	22	23	24
56			
25	26	27	28
57			
29	30	31	32
58			
33	34	35	36
59			
37	38	39	40
60			

Page 4




81	82	83	84
21			
85	86	87	88
22			
89	90	91	92
23			
93	94	95	96
24			
97	98	99	100
25			
1	2	3	4
26			
5	6	7	8
27			
9	10	11	12
28			
13	14	15	16
29			
17	18	19	20
30			
21	22	23	24
31			
25	26	27	28
32			
29	30	31	32
33			
33	34	35	36
34			
37	38	39	40
35			
41	42	43	44
36			
45	46	47	48
37			
49	50	51	52
38			
53	54	55	56
39			
57	58	59	60
40			

Page 3

1	2	3	4
1			
5	6	7	8
2			
9	10	11	12
3			
13	14	15	16
4			
17	18	19	20
5			
21	22	23	24
6			
25	26	27	28
7			
29	30	31	32
8			
33	34	35	36
9			
37	38	39	40
10			
41	42	43	44
11			
45	46	47	48
12			
49	50	51	52
13			
53	54	55	56
14			
57	58	59	60
15			
61	62	63	64
16			
65	66	67	68
17			
69	70	71	72
18			
73	74	75	76
19			
77	78	79	80
20			

- 1. Of the following, the drink I like best is —
 1 soda pop 2 milk 3 water 4 coffee..... 1
- 2. Of the following subjects, the one I like to study best is —
 5 English 6 science 7 art or drawing 8 manual training or home economics..... 2
- 3. Those who get the best jobs are usually the ones who —
 9 know the right person 10 are the best trained 11 are the luckiest 12 work the hardest..... 3
- 4. Going to high school is —
 13 a waste of time 14 all right for some people but not for me
 15 all right if you can take the course you want 16 necessary for success..... 4
- 5. If a person called me a dirty name, I would —
 17 fight the person 18 tell him where to get off 19 say and do nothing 20 laugh it off..... 5
- 6. Of the following sports, the one I like best to watch is a —
 21 baseball game 22 prize fight 23 horse race 24 basketball game..... 6
- 7. When I do my schoolwork I get my reward —
 25 always 26 sometimes 27 seldom 28 never..... 7
- 8. Parents usually understand their children —
 29 very well 30 quite well 31 not very well 32 not at all..... 8
- 9. If I want to be popular I have to do what the crowd does —
 33 all of the time 34 most of the time 35 some of the time 36 seldom or never..... 9
- 10. Failure is usually due to —
 37 bad habits 38 bad companions 39 lack of ability 40 lack of hard work..... 10
- 11. The pupils who have the best attendance records are almost always —
 41 honor students 42 good students 43 poor students 44 sissies..... 11
- 12. During the summer I would like best to stay —
 45 around the house 46 at a summer camp away from home
 47 at a YMCA (YWCA) day camp 48 at the playground near home..... 12
- 13. Of the following, I would *least* like to be a —
 49 teacher 50 minister 51 doctor 52 crooner..... 13
- 14. You have lots more fun if you live in a family with —
 53 no brothers or sisters 54 only one brother or sister
 55 two or three brothers or sisters 56 four or more brothers or sisters..... 14
- 15. Most boys stay in school because they —
 57 are required by law to do so 58 have to learn to make a living
 59 want to go to college 60 like school..... 15
- 16. Most teachers are —
 61 very fair 62 fair most of the time 63 seldom fair 64 never fair..... 16
- 17. Smoking is a habit that —
 65 does not hurt anyone 66 hurts everyone a little
 67 hurts some people but not others 68 hurts most people a great deal..... 17
- 18. The secret of success is —
 69 just luck 70 hard work 71 ability 72 money..... 18
- 19. Of the following, I would like most to be a famous —
 73 movie actor (actress) 74 athlete 75 scientist 76 writer..... 19
- 20. Most people who do something wrong do not think that they —
 77 will be caught 78 will be punished 79 are really doing wrong 80 are hurting others..... 20

- 21. Which of the following drinks do you like best?
81 ginger ale 82 coke 83 root beer 84 milk shake..... 21
- 22. If I am asked to do something which I think is not reasonable, I —
85 refuse to do it 86 argue first and then do just enough to get by
87 do what I'm told and then argue later 88 do what I'm told and say nothing..... 22
- 23. The schoolwork that the teacher gives me is usually —
89 very hard 90 fairly hard 91 fairly easy 92 very easy..... 23
- 24. I have the most fun when I play —
93 in my own house 94 in my own yard 95 on my street 96 on the playground near my house .. 24
- 25. Being successful usually means having —
97 a big fortune 98 many friends 99 your name in the paper 100 the respect of many people... 25
- 26. The best teachers are the ones who are —
1 very easy 2 fairly easy 3 fairly hard 4 very hard..... 26
- 27. Most policemen try to —
5 help you 6 scare you 7 boss you 8 get something on you..... 27
- 28. I would like to attend the movies —
9 once a week 10 twice a week 11 three or four times a week 12 every day..... 28
- 29. Cheating in school is usually done by —
13 only a few bad pupils 14 none of the pupils 15 most of the pupils 16 all of the pupils..... 29
- 30. Whenever I get into serious trouble, other people are to blame —
17 always 18 almost always 19 sometimes 20 seldom or never..... 30
- 31. Teachers know what they are talking about —
21 always 22 most of the time 23 some of the time 24 seldom or never..... 31
- 32. Older people understand younger people —
25 very well 26 rather well 27 only a little 28 not at all..... 32
- 33. Of the following subjects, which do you *dislike* the most?
29 history or social studies 30 mathematics 31 English 32 shop..... 33
- 34. A boy or girl should be allowed to be his own boss when he is —
33 14 years old 34 16 years old 35 18 years old 36 21 years old..... 34
- 35. People who live in fine houses usually are —
37 the best people in town 38 smarter and more educated than most people
39 just lucky 40 crooked in business..... 35
- 36. In a family it is best to be —
41 the oldest child 42 the youngest child 43 the only child 44 one of a large family..... 36
- 37. In schools the good marks are usually given to those who —
45 do the best work 46 work the hardest
47 only make believe they are working 48 are teachers' pets..... 37
- 38. When I leave school or graduate, I shall —
49 take any job that comes along 50 find a good job
51 take it easy for a while 52 go to another school or college..... 38
- 39. Happiness is impossible without —
53 love 54 friends 55 a home 56 money..... 39
- 40. Of the following, the color I like best is —
57 red 58 black 59 yellow 60 blue..... 40

41. I usually have the best time when I do things —
 61 all by myself 62 with one friend 63 with two or three friends 64 with a big gang 41
42. For the most serious trouble I have ever been in —
 65 others were to blame more than I was 66 others were to blame as much as I was
 67 I was mostly to blame 68 I was wholly to blame..... 42
43. I would like to stay in bed late in the morning —
 69 every day 70 Saturdays and Sundays 71 Sundays 72 seldom or never..... 43
44. Of the following, the sport I like best is —
 73 fishing or hunting 74 overnight hiking 75 football or baseball 76 wrestling 44
45. Of the following, the vegetable I like best is —
 77 squash 78 potato 79 spinach 80 carrot..... 45
46. In the schools, teachers can usually be depended upon to do — 
 81 nothing to help me 82 a little to help me
 83 much to help me 84 all they can to help me..... 46
47. In school, my friends —
 85 always get me into trouble 86 almost always get me into trouble
 87 sometimes get me into trouble 88 never get me into trouble..... 47
48. Of the teachers I have known, I have liked —
 89 all of them 90 most of them 91 some of them 92 only one of them..... 48
49. During the past month I have worried about my family —
 93 all the time 94 most of the time 95 some of the time 96 not at all..... 49
50. I think about what I'll do when I get out of school —
 97 all the time 98 most of the time 99 some of the time 100 not at all..... 50
51. Going to school causes me to be worried and upset —
 1 all the time 2 most of the time 3 some of the time 4 never 51
52. I have been — 
 5 extremely lucky 6 lucky 7 extremely unlucky 8 unlucky..... 52
53. Taking part in school clubs is —
 9 very important 10 quite important 11 not very important 12 very unimportant..... 53
54. The most popular boys are the ones who —
 13 almost always get into mischief 14 sometimes get into mischief
 15 seldom get into mischief 16 almost never get into mischief..... 54
55. When not in school, I can have the most fun —
 17 in the mornings 18 in the afternoons 19 around noon 20 around midnight..... 55
56. The pupils who skip school are usually the ones who get —
 21 the best marks 22 good marks 23 fair marks 24 the poorest marks..... 56
57. Going to college is — 
 25 necessary for success 26 all right if you can afford it
 27 all right if you have the ability 28 just a waste of time and money..... 57
58. Most teachers act like other human beings —
 29 always 30 most of the time 31 some of the time 32 seldom or never..... 58
59. The time when I shall leave home I look forward to —
 33 not at all 34 sometimes 35 often 36 very often..... 59
60. Going to school right now is doing me —
 37 a great deal of good 38 some good 39 more harm than good 40 a great deal of harm..... 60

- 61. During the past month I have been worrying about my health —
 41 all the time 42 most of the time 43 some of the time 44 none of the time 61

- 62. Teachers and principals usually treat pupils like —
 45 slaves and work animals 46 someone beneath them 47 little children 48 their equals 62

- 63. The police —
 49 are usually very fair 50 make some mistakes 51 favor the rich 52 are usually unfair 63

- 64. Failing marks on your report card usually mean —
 53 you didn't do your work 54 you are dumb
 55 your teacher doesn't like you 56 you have been absent a lot 64

- 65. The best time of the year is —
 57 Christmas 58 Easter 59 summer 60 Thanksgiving 65

- 66. Of the following, the dessert I like best is —
 61 jello 62 bread pudding 63 custard 64 pie 66

- 67. On my report card I usually get —
 65 all honor marks 66 mostly good marks 67 fair marks 68 some failure marks 67

- 68. Of the following, the game I like best is —
 69 checkers 70 bingo 71 marbles 72 authors 68

- 69. School rules and regulations have good reasons behind them —
 73 always 74 almost always 75 some of the time 76 seldom or never 69

- 70. When I am with someone else and we want something to drink, I like to —
 77 buy my own drink 78 match to see who will pay
 79 fix it so the other person usually pays 80 pay for all the drinks 70

- 71. If I had the money, I would like best to go to a —
 81 dance 82 movie 83 concert 84 bowling alley 71

- 72. People who wear fine clothes usually are —
 85 just lucky 86 smarter than other people
 87 better educated than others 88 the best people in town 72

- 73. It is the most fun to have —
 89 no girl friends 90 one girl friend 91 a few girl friends 92 lots of girl friends 73

- 74. It is the most fun to have —
 93 no boy friends 94 one boy friend 95 a few boy friends 96 lots of boy friends 74

- 75. I have learned that I can trust —
 97 most people 98 some people 99 a few people 100 no one 75

K D PRONENESS SCALE AND CHECK LIST

By WILLIAM C. KVARACEUS, Professor of Education, Boston University

MANUAL OF DIRECTIONS

(FOR RESTRICTED USE)

Introduction

IN RECENT years much interest and concern have been expressed for the welfare and wholesome growth of the delinquent or socially inadequate child. This widespread concern has manifested itself in many ways. In November, 1946, the Attorney General called a national conference on prevention and control of juvenile delinquency in Washington, D. C. This conference¹ focused the thinking of many authorities who come in close contact with youth on the causes of delinquent behavior and techniques for prevention and rehabilitation. Since 1941, four states — California, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Massachusetts — have revised their laws relating to the juvenile delinquent and have established Youth Authorities or Youth Service Boards² in an effort to deal more effectively with the problems of the delinquent from a state level, offering systematic and scientific aid to local communities. At the same time the National Society for the Study of Education³ devoted Part I of its Forty-seventh Yearbook to the consideration of the schools' responsibility in dealing with the delinquent child. In addition a number of major publications⁴ have appeared and have added more information to

¹The National Conference for the Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency, *Summaries of Recommendations for Action*. Washington: Government Printing Office; 1947.

²John R. Ellington: *Protecting Our Children from Criminal Careers*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.; 1948.

³The National Society for the Study of Education, Forty-seventh Yearbook, Part I: *Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1948.

⁴Maud A. Merrill: *Problems of Child Delinquency*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company; 1947.

W. C. Kvaraceus: *Juvenile Delinquency and the School*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company; 1945.

A. M. Carr-Saunders, Herman Mannheim, and E. C. Rhodes: *Young Offenders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. New York: The Macmillan Company; 1943.

Paul W. Tappan: *Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.; 1949.

the vast reservoir of scientific studies in the field of delinquent behavior. A recently compiled annotated and selected bibliography⁵ on the subject of delinquency lists 972 references published between 1914 and 1944. On the basis of this rich store of research, writing, and thinking, an attempt has been made to develop and refine two instruments, as described below, which will serve as aids in identifying those boys and girls who are vulnerable, susceptible, or exposed to the development of delinquent patterns of behavior. These children may then be assisted to better living and to wholesome growth and development, through a program of prevention and control, *before* the delinquent patterns have become firmly established and the children stand before the courts. To date most of the assistance being rendered to delinquent children may be characterized as "too little and too late."

Prevention and Control of Delinquency

A COMMUNITY planning a delinquency-prevention program will succeed in developing an effective, individual, and causative attack on the problem to the extent that it can —

- (1) locate for referral and study those children and youth who, because of personal characteristics and/or environmental background, are highly exposed or vulnerable to the development of undesirable behavior patterns;
- (2) study and diagnose the factors that strongly compel the child in the direction of undesirable behavior;

⁵P. S. De Q. Cabot (Compiler): *Juvenile Delinquency: A Critical Annotated Bibliography*. New York: H. W. Wilson Company; 1946.

- (3) provide and use community agencies and resources in an individually planned remedial or therapeutic program designed to overcome the factors inimical to wholesome development, either in the personality of the child or in his environment.

It is to assist in the first of these three steps that the instruments described below have been developed.

Locating the vulnerable or delinquency-prone child. An effective delinquency-prevention program must be based on early identification, detection, and referral for study and treatment of children who are surrounded by factors inimical to their wholesome development or who give evidence of personal characteristics that suggest a need for assistance. Delinquent behavior does not develop overnight. The malbehaving child ordinarily displays many symptoms of potential or developing patterns of undesirable behavior long before he comes in conflict with the law. Various studies comparing delinquents with non-delinquents have isolated specific traits or environmental features that tend to characterize those children who are "exposed" to the disease of delinquency. A scale which utilizes these predictive signs has been constructed, as outlined below, in order to make possible an early identification of the probable delinquent. This *Delinquency Proneness Scale* (or *K D Proneness Scale*, as it is called to prevent pupils from recognizing its purpose) has been found sufficiently sensitive in distinguishing between delinquent and non-delinquent children for its use to be recommended as one aid in identifying potential delinquents. With what precision this instrument can be used is indicated in this Manual in the sections on "Construction" and "Reliability." In addition, a *Delinquency Proneness Check List* is provided as a companion aid in the process of early discovery and referral of children who are susceptible or vulnerable to the development of undesirable behavior patterns.

The Scale and the Check List have been developed to help all those who shoulder a major responsibility for the wholesome growth of children and youth in spotting children with whom effective preventive work can be carried on. Schoolteachers, guidance counselors, psychologists, visiting teachers, probation officers, Youth Authority Boards, social workers, settlement-house workers, recreational directors, the clergy, and others who deal daily with the problems of child growth and development should find this Scale and Check List valuable supplements in identifying those children who are especially vulnerable to the development of delinquent patterns of behavior. Only when these children are discovered at an early date and are assisted in the direction of wholesome

growth and development can the community say it is meeting effectively the problems of delinquency prevention.

Studying and diagnosing the child's needs. After the vulnerable child has been identified, the school, home, or community can do little to aid until it discovers the reasons for his problem behavior. All those children who are found to score "high" on the Scale (meaning that they respond in the same manner as delinquents do) should be referred to the appropriate child-study agency or workers, particularly when corroborating evidence is found in the Check List, in school records, in the home, or in the neighborhood picture, that suggests any maladjustment or tendency toward undesirable behavior. Effective immunization against delinquency can come only after careful study of the reasons or causes within the personality structure of the child or within his environment that tend to explain his bothersome behavior.

Since delinquent behavior, like acceptable behavior, always constitutes a unique reaction pattern, a prevention and control program will not begin to be effective without adequate facilities for individual child study, using medical, psychological, and psychiatric techniques. Once the delinquency-exposed child has been identified, use should be made of the services of available personnel, such as the guidance counselor, visiting teacher, psychiatric social worker, psychologist, physician, psychiatrist, and other specialists who are usually available in a good guidance clinic. Only when the services of these specialists are brought to bear on children who show tendencies that suggest developing problems can their work take on a preventive flavor.

Following through with remedial or therapeutic services. Once the child's needs have been determined through a case-study approach, an individualized remedial or therapeutic program should be carried out, utilizing all the community's resources, such as the school, YMCA, YWCA, boys' clubs, 4-H clubs, church, recreational programs, etc. Although the resources available in different communities vary in quantity and quality, the degree of community organization and coordination is seldom sufficient to insure, for a particular child who is in dire need of the services of a particular agency, the benefits of that agency in an individualized follow-up and treatment program. Prevention and control of juvenile delinquency call for frequent and systematic use of all the recreation, character-building, and child-welfare agencies in a carefully coordinated program focused on the child who needs help. After the child who is "delinquent-prone" has been identified, and his personal

and environmental needs have been disclosed, he should be brought in contact with those community agencies that can best serve his interests.

The *K D Proneness Scale*

THE FOLLOWING paragraphs describe the construction, the validation, and the reliability of the Scale.

CONSTRUCTION

The ideas for the items in the *K D Proneness Scale* were derived from those areas in which significant differences between delinquents and non-delinquents have been reported in the research literature. Various investigators¹ have reported that those children who are delinquent or who become delinquent differ significantly, as a group, from other children in such areas as the following: family relationships, home conditions, geography of residence, social and economic status, truancy record, school retardation, academic aptitude, school marks, liking for school, immaturity, club membership, companionship, family mobility,

¹ Merrill: *Op. cit.*

Kvaraceus: *Op. cit.*

National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook: *Op. cit.*
William Healy and Augusta F. Bronner: *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press; 1936.

Mary P. Wittman and A. V. Huffman: "A Comparative Study of Developmental, Adjustment, and Personality Characteristics of Psychotic, Psychoneurotic, Delinquent, and Normally Adjusted Teen-aged Youths," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, LXVI (June, 1945), 167-182.

Luton Ackerson: *Children's Behavior Problems, Vol. II, Relative Importance and Interrelations among Traits*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1942.

Florence M. Teagarden: *Child Psychology for Professional Workers (Revised)*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.; 1946.

Mervin A. Durea: "Personality Characteristics of Juvenile Offenders in Relation to Degree of Delinquency," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, LII (June, 1938), 269-283.

Ralph S. Banay: "Immaturity and Crime," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, C (September, 1943), 170-177.

Ralph M. Stogdill: "A Test-Interview for Delinquent Children," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, XXIV (June, 1940), 325-333.

Lois B. Murphy: *Social Behavior and Child Personality*. New York: Columbia University Press; 1937.

Lowell J. Carr: *Delinquency Control*. New York: Harper & Brothers; 1941.

Marjorie E. Babcock: *A Comparison of Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Boys by Objective Measures of Personality*. New York: Columbia University Press; 1932.

Wallace Luden: "Anticipating Cases of Juvenile Delinquency," *School and Society*, 59 (1944), 123-126.

Edward R. Bartlett and Dale B. Harris: "Personality Factors in Delinquency," *School and Society*, 43 (1936), 653-656.

Paul L. Boynton and Barrier M. Walsworth: "Emotionality Test Scores of Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Girls," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 38 (1943), 87-92.

James M. Reinhardt and Fowler V. Harper: "Comparison of Environmental Factors of Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Boys," *Journal of Juvenile Research*, 15 (1934), 271-277.

William S. Casselberry: "Analysis and Prediction of Delinquency," *Journal of Juvenile Research*, 16 (1932), 1-31.

H. Ashley Weeks: "Predicting Juvenile Delinquency," *American Boy Review*, 8 (1943), 40-46.

etc. This is not to imply that every delinquent differs from every non-delinquent in any of these areas, since there is always in evidence considerable overlapping between the two groups on any one of the variables studied. It is true, however, that many more delinquents, for example, receive lower marks in school, repeat their school grades, play truant, and entertain a fierce dislike for school than do children who are not delinquent or who do not become delinquent. Similarly, more delinquents than non-delinquents have unsatisfactory family and home situations. Still other differences have been observed in other areas.

Using the differences revealed in these studies as focal points, the author constructed a series of four-choice multiple-choice items. Several "neutral" items involving food, color, and drink preferences were added to the Scale for rapport value, since they were free of any socially desirable or undesirable implications, in contrast to most of the other items in the Scale. Items 1, 21, and 40 in the present edition are examples of this type. (These latter items were also analyzed, and are scored in the present edition if, contrary to expectation, they showed differentiating value at the agreed-upon level of significance.)

After the items had been prepared, two questions naturally presented themselves:

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

The first question concerns the processes of item analysis; the second concerns the validation of the Scale as a whole. These questions are discussed separately in the paragraphs below.

Item analysis. In order to discover the value of the items as potential discriminators between delinquents and non-delinquents, the Scale was administered to a sample of 100 delinquent boys in one Massachusetts Training School and to several counter-groups of public school boys in junior and senior high schools in several states. Included in the public school boys is a subgroup of what are termed "high morale" boys.² Since there are reasons for supposing that girl delinquents and non-delinquents might

² The "high morale" groups of boys and girls include those persons who were doing well scholastically and were leaders for good in a school. Usually they were members of the student council who were active in making the school a better place. They included persons who had a high degree of responsibility and dependability, who had a controlling influence for acceptable behavior in the school, who were generally concerned for the welfare of others, and who also showed a high degree of personal adjustment in their everyday living.

show responses differing considerably from boy delinquents and non-delinquents, a parallel item-analysis study was carried out, based on a sample of 80 girl delinquents tested in a Massachusetts Training School for Girls and groups of public school girls in junior and senior high schools in several states, likewise including a selected group of "high morale" girls.

The responses of the contrasting groups of each sex were studied to see how effectively each of the four alternatives of every item differentiated between girl delinquents and non-delinquents and between boy delinquents and non-delinquents. The percentage of delinquent and non-delinquent children selecting each alternative was determined, the difference between the percentages of the two groups found, and the critical ratio of this difference determined. Those alternatives which showed critical ratios of 1.96 or higher were considered to be discriminating significantly between delinquents and non-delinquents (equivalent to acceptance of differences at the 5 per cent level). Each such alternative was retained for scoring purposes and assigned a plus or minus value, depending on the direction of the difference, a plus value being assigned to alternatives chosen more frequently by the delinquent group. Some items showed several alternatives with discriminating value, others only one, and a few appeared without a single discriminating response. These last-named are not scored, since all the alternatives failed to distinguish between the delinquent and non-delinquent groups. However, these items, although not scored, are retained in the present edition of the Scale.

Validation of total scores. In computing total Scale scores, only those items were used which differentiated between delinquents and non-delinquents in the item-analysis group. Therefore the total scores themselves necessarily discriminated between the two groups in this item-analysis sample. The extent to which total scores differentiate among criterion groups is revealed in Tables 1 and 2, which present the distributions of total Scale scores for various groups that were tested. While there is some overlapping between certain criterion groups, a strong tendency prevails for delinquent boys and girls to score considerably higher on the Scale than did the selected "high morale" sample, and somewhat higher than unselected public school pupils. A closer study of Table 1 will also reveal that no "high morale" boy scored above -10, whereas approximately 96 per cent of the boy delinquents were found to score above this same point on the Scale. Table 2 similarly reveals that no "high morale" girl scored above +2, whereas about 73 per cent of the female delinquents obtained scores above this point.

TABLE 1. Distributions of Scores of Male Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Groups on the K D Proneness Scale

TOTAL SCORE	DELINQUENT BOYS	PUBLIC SCHOOL BOYS	"HIGH MORALE" BOYS
21-23	1		
18-20	1		
15-17	5		
12-14	5	3	
9-11	15	0	
6-8	16	3	
3-5	17	1	
0-2	7	7	
-3- -1	11	7	
-6- -4	11	13	
-9- -7	5	20	
-12- -10	4	20	4
-15- -13		26	3
-18- -16		26	3
-21- -19		15	2
-24- -22		7	3
-27- -25		6	0
-30- -28		2	1
Number	98	156	16
Median Score	+4	-13	-18
Q	5.7	5.1	4.5

TABLE 2. Distributions of Scores of Female Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Groups on the K D Proneness Scale

TOTAL SCORE	DELINQUENT GIRLS	PRE-DELINQUENT GIRLS	PUBLIC SCHOOL GIRLS	"HIGH MORALE" GIRLS
21-23	2			
18-20	3			
15-17	7	1		
12-13	7	3		
9-11	10	6	1	
6-8	14	6	1	
3-5	16	9	9	
0-2	7	9	7	2
-3- -1	6	17	12	2
-6- -4	6	12	20	2
-9- -7	2	4	27	5
-12- -10	0	5	32	10
-15- -13	1	1	32	12
-18- -16			28	5
-21- -19			23	4
-24- -22			8	1
Number	81	73	200	43
Median Score	+6	-1	-12	-13
Q	4.4	4.6	5.0	3.0

A similar relationship is seen to exist between delinquents and public school pupils in general, although the overlapping between these two groups is much more pronounced. Extremely high positive scores can be said to characterize these children who have manifested delinquent behavior; extremely low negative scores tend to indicate freedom from delinquency-like responses or a high degree of immunity to the disease of delinquency.

TABLE 3. Correlations between K D Proneness Scale and Other Measures

MEASURE	SUBJECTS	CORRELATION
Otis S. A.	16 "high morale" boys	-.377
Otis S. A.	43 "high morale" girls	-.264
Otis S. A.	138 public school boys	-.420
Otis S. A.	169 public school girls	-.356
Otis S. A.	99 delinquent boys	-.225
Otis S. A.	81 delinquent girls	-.310
Otis S. A.	73 vocational school girls	-.367
Personal Index	73 vocational school girls	-.237

Correlations with other measures. Table 3 presents data on the correlations that have been found between total Scale scores and certain other measures, including intelligence test scores and scores on the Personal Index, which is a scale for the detection of potential behavior problem cases.

All correlations between Scale scores and intelligence-test scores are negative and small. This finding is in accordance with the frequently reported observation that delinquents as a group tend to have average IQ's of approximately 90. The low correlation between the Scale scores and the Personal Index score, although based on relatively few cases, does indicate that the two scales are measuring something quite different.

Further validation research. It is desirable that studies be made of the extent to which the individual items continue to manifest, in independent studies with other groups, the same discriminating power which they were found to have in the original study and that new studies be made of the validity of the total scores in other situations. It is also desirable that information be obtained on the extent to which Scale scores identify pupils not yet delinquent but who are likely to become delinquent hereafter; the present research reveals that the scores discriminate between children now delinquent and those who are not. Studies designed to yield answers to these questions are under way.

Reliability. A study of the reliability of the Scale has been made, involving a second administration of it after an interval of six weeks to 53 girls in a Training School for Delinquent Girls. The correlation between the two administrations was found to be .75. In view of the opinion-like responses that are called for in most items and of the interval between administrations, the Scale score is judged to be sufficiently reliable for use in spot checking and survey purposes in the process of identifying those children who may be susceptible to the development of delinquent patterns. Additional studies of the reliability of the Scale are in progress.

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING

The Scale can be administered to individuals or to groups of varying size. No time limit is used. Ordinarily a great majority of pupils will complete the Scale in fifteen to twenty-five minutes. It can be used with pupils in Grades 6 to 12.

Before distributing the booklets, say: **"I am going to give you a booklet. As soon as you receive it, write your name and other information called for on the cover of the booklet. Do not open the booklet until I tell you to do so."**

Pass out the booklets and allow time for the information to be filled in. When all are ready, say: **"Read the directions to yourself as I read them aloud."**

"The questions in this booklet ask how you feel about certain things. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Read each question and the four answers that follow it. Select the answer that best describes how you really feel about the question. Do not skip any questions. Answer every question as you come to it. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers. Be sure to choose the answer that best tells how you feel about the question."

"Here is a sample question to show you how to mark the answers."

*Sample A. Of the following, the color I like best is —
1 red 2 brown 3 blue 4 green*

"Decide which of these colors you like best and draw a line under your answer. Now look at the number beside the color which you picked. Put a heavy black mark in the answer space at the right which is under the number of the answer which you have picked. For example, if you like "blue" best, you will draw a line under the word "blue." Since "blue" is number 3, you will put a heavy black line in the answer space under the number 3."

"When you are told to start, read each question and decide upon your answer, then record the answer in the same manner as you have done for the sample. You will be given time enough to finish all the questions. Do not open your booklet until you are told to do so."

Be sure that every child understands how to record the answers in the answer spaces.

Then say: **"Now tear off the first page from the question booklet and turn it over so that page 2, 'Answer Sheet,' is before you. You are to put your marks on the spaces on the Answer Sheet."**

"Slip the Answer Sheet under the edge of page 3 so that the column of spaces marked 'Page 3' is alongside page 3 like this." (Show by holding up page 3 with the "Page 3" column of the Answer Sheet close to page 3 of the booklet.) **"Notice that the arrow tips on the Answer Sheet point directly**

toward the arrow tips on page 3. In answering the first question, you put a mark in one of the spaces in the first row, and so on.

"When you finish page 3, pull out the Answer Sheet a little way like this (Show.) so that you can see the column of answers for page 4, and do page 4. Always keep the Answer Sheet shoved under the booklet so that the column of the Answer Sheet on which you are working is close to the booklet.

"When you come to page 5, fold page 6 under like this (Show how.) so that you can get the 'Page 5' column of the Answer Sheet close to page 5 of the booklet like this. (Show.)

"Never put more than one mark in any row of spaces.

"Is there anyone who does not understand what to do?"

(Walk around the room and be sure that all pupils have the Answer Sheet adjusted for page 3. Answer any questions about how to mark the answers.)

Say: "Now go ahead and answer all the questions. Remember to make heavy black marks."

As soon as a child finishes, collect Answer Sheet and question booklet. Have each pupil write his name at the top of page 3.

DIRECTIONS FOR SCORING

Separate scoring keys are provided for girls and boys. Each response to a question is assigned a weight of -1, 0, +1. To obtain the total Scale score for any pupil, count the number of plus responses and the number of minus responses and find the difference between them. To do this, superimpose the proper scoring key (boys' or girls') over the Answer Sheet in such a way that two of the heavy arrows on the Answer Sheet show through the holes on the Key and point directly toward the two arrows on the Key.

Some circles on the Key are enclosed in black squares, others are not. The *Plus* score is obtained by counting the number of marks appearing through the circles which are *not* enclosed in black squares. This number should be recorded in the appropriate place at the side of the Answer Sheet. This can be done without moving the Key. Next, the *Minus* score is obtained by counting the number of marks which appear through the circles which are enclosed in black squares. Record this number on the answer sheet. The total Scale score is the difference between the *Plus* score and the *Minus* score. If the *Plus* score is larger, the Scale score will be plus, and if the *Minus* score is larger, the Scale score will be minus. For example, if a pupil gets a +8 and a -15, his total Scale score will be -7. If another pupil gets a -8 and a +15, his total Scale score will be +7.

INTERPRETING AND USING THE RESULTS

Those children who obtain high positive scores (+3 or above for boys, +6 or above for girls) are indicating, by their responses to the Scale items, attitudes and opinions that closely resemble those of delinquent groups; those subjects who obtain relatively low negative scores (-10 or below for boys, 0 or below for girls) are responding in a manner similar to what we have termed "high morale" groups. For children who score high, the examiner should study the child's records and background as indicated, for example, by the cumulative record in school or as reported by those who know the child well. If corroborating evidence is available with respect to the personality of the child or his environment, which indicates that help is needed in maintaining satisfactory adjustments to everyday situations around him, the child should be referred to the appropriate agency or specialists for study and treatment. *Care should be taken to avoid typing children as predelinquent on the basis of the Scale alone.* The Scale score, like any test score, should be interpreted against the background of *all other information* as to the personality structure and environment of the individual.

It is to be noted that no "norms," in the customary sense, are furnished for interpreting scores on the Scale, nor are any needed for the use of results here proposed. Additional research will yield further information on the predictive significance of the scores, and may indicate that revision of the critical scores upward or downward is desirable. In the light of data thus far available, however, the values suggested above as discriminating scores seem to furnish satisfactory cutting points.

Since delinquent behavior is the resultant of many forces within and without the delinquent, and since these forces are highly complex, interrelated, and individual, no one factor or list of factors (much less a single score on a verbal scale) can give positive assurance that a child will become delinquent. It must be stressed that even extremely high positive scores on this Scale do not mean that the subject will surely become a delinquent, nor do high negative scores indicate with unyielding certainty that the child will be free of all future blemishes of delinquent behavior. The validation data merely point out that the child with a high positive score is responding in the manner of most delinquents. When other sources of information also indicate that the subject is a child with problems, early referral, study, and treatment may do much in preventing severe maladjustments in the future.

The K D Proneness Check List

A SECOND screening device for use in the identification of those boys and girls who are delinquency-prone is the *K D Proneness Check List*.

DESCRIPTION

The Check List, like the Scale, has been constructed on the basis of research in the field of delinquent behavior. It is essentially a list of those personal and environmental factors that have been reported to be associated frequently with delinquent behavior; the person completing the List simply checks in a column headed "Yes," "No," or "?" opposite each factor to indicate whether or not that factor does or does not characterize the subject, or that there is insufficient information available to permit an accurate response.

USE OF THE CHECK LIST

The Check List is intended for use not only by the classroom teacher but also by any professional workers who come in contact with the subjects for an extended period of time. In many cases it will be desirable to have various parts of the Check List filled out by different individuals, depending on the extent to which each one of them is familiar with various types of information about the child. The Check List should never be used without a careful study of all data such as may be derived from cumulative records in school, or case data within the files of a child-serving agency, or after several visits to the home and prolonged contacts with the various family members. Most schools that have comprehensive records already have much of the background material and information required for effective use of the Check List.

It is recommended that the Check List always be used in conjunction with the Delinquency Proneness Scale. The two types of information supplement each other and permit more accurate identification of the delinquency-prone child than either one used separately. There will not always be complete agreement between the two instruments in identifying a given youngster as probably delinquent, but even children for whom the Scale and Check List results do not

agree should receive further attention from the appropriate professional worker.

INTERPRETING CHECK LIST RESULTS

A child's "score" on the Check List is simply the number of items which have been checked in the "Yes" column. This is an index of the number of unfavorable elements in his personality or environment that may be conducive to the development of delinquent behavior. The following table may be employed as a rough guide in interpreting the total number of items checked "Yes."

TABLE 4. Interpretive Scores Based on Number of Items Checked "Yes" on the K D Proneness Check List

NUMBER OF "YES" CHECKS	INTERPRETATION
25 or more	Extreme exposure
10-24	Vulnerable
1-10	Slight susceptibility

Acknowledgments

THE FOLLOWING persons, institutions, and school systems lent valuable assistance in the construction, item analysis, and validation of the Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Scale and Check List:

Walter N. Durost, Mary C. Donahue, Robert S. MacDowell, Agnes V. Sweeney, Willard B. Spalding, Elizabeth Bode, Virginia Biggy, Robert J. McCarthy, Viola M. Perrault, and Donald Campbell;

Concord (Massachusetts) Public Schools, Belmont (Massachusetts) Public Schools, and Portland (Oregon) Public Schools;

The Lyman School for Boys at Westboro, Massachusetts, and the Industrial School for Girls at Lancaster, Massachusetts.

Publication of these instruments would not have been possible without the coöperation and support of these individuals, school systems, and institutions.