



*Institutional Treatment
of Delinquent Boys*

Part 2.—A Study of 751 Boys

362.7

U58c

230

*United States Department of Labor
Children's Bureau
Publication No. 230*

UNITED STATES (DEPARTMENT OF LABOR)

FRANCES PERKINS, Secretary

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

KATHARINE F. LENROOT, Chief

INSTITUTIONAL TREATMENT OF DELINQUENT BOYS

PART 2.—A STUDY OF 751 BOYS

By

ALIDA C. BOWLER

and

RUTH S. BLOODGOOD



Bureau Publication No. 230



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1936

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. Price 15 cents

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20535

INSTITUTIONAL TREATMENT
OF DELINQUENT BOYS

PART I - A STUDY OF THE BOYS

BY
JAMES H. HANCOCK

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20535



1954

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20540

3627
1250
280-236

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal.....	v
Chapter I.—Introduction.....	1
Chapter II.—Method of field work and preparation of data for statistical analysis.....	4
Selection of the institutions.....	4
Selection of cases.....	4
General plan of field work.....	6
Sources of information.....	8
Locating the boys and making personal contacts.....	13
Statistical treatment of data obtained in the field.....	15
Chapter III.—Precommitment data.....	18
Extent of the data available.....	18
Community backgrounds.....	18
The families and homes.....	20
Age of the boys at time of commitment.....	26
Schooling and employment.....	27
Conduct record.....	29
Summary.....	35
Chapter IV.—Institutional treatment.....	37
Extent of the data obtained.....	37
Psychological tests.....	37
School attendance.....	39
Trade training and work.....	40
Conduct record.....	43
Total time spent in the institution.....	46
Summary.....	46
Chapter V.—The parole period.....	48
Preparation for parole.....	48
Age of the boys at the time of first parole.....	48
Frequency of parole, and places to which boys were paroled.....	49
Service from parole officers.....	53
Schooling and employment.....	55
Returns to the institutions.....	56
Age of the boys at discharge from parole.....	58
Summary.....	60
Chapter VI.—Post-treatment histories.....	61
Extent of the data obtained.....	61
Interval between the interview and last release from the institution.....	61
Age of the boys at the time of interview.....	62
Homes and families at the time of the interview.....	62
Employment and economic history since leaving the institution.....	65
Conduct since leaving the institution.....	71
Summary.....	81
Chapter VII.—Degree of adjustment.....	83
Method of estimating adjustment.....	83
Employment adjustment.....	83
Economic adjustment.....	85
Social adjustment.....	88
General adjustment.....	91
Summary.....	99
Chapter VIII.—Relation between adjustment and certain factors.....	100
Significance of the relations observed.....	100
Relation of employment adjustment to certain other factors.....	100
Relation of economic adjustment to certain other factors.....	106
Relation of social adjustment to certain other factors.....	109
Relation of general adjustment to certain other factors.....	112
Summary.....	120

	Page
Chapter IX.—Possible utilization of findings.....	122
Predicting outcomes.....	122
Overhauling programs.....	124
Appendix A.—Factors affecting selection of the cases.....	130
Appendix B.—Cases in which no interview was obtained.....	133
Appendix C.—Sample case ratings.....	135
Appendix D.—Schedules and statistical card used in the study.....	136

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, February 28, 1936.

MADAM: There is transmitted herewith part 2 of a report on Institutional Treatment of Delinquent Boys. Part 1, Treatment Programs of Five State Institutions, has been issued as Publication 228. In part 2 is presented an analysis of the results of institutional treatment based on a detailed study of 751 boys who had been under care in 5 State institutions and had been released 5 or more years prior to the time of the study.

The institutions selected for study were representative of treatment programs administered in various sections of the country. It was not expected that the findings would furnish a final measurement of the results of the treatment given in these institutions, but it was thought that such a study, based on careful and extensive field investigations, would throw light upon a number of questions which must be considered by persons responsible for developing institutional programs and community services for the treatment of juvenile delinquency.

The method of presentation in the report is primarily statistical, since it represents an attempt to measure the prevalence of certain factors in the lives of delinquent boys and the extent to which they had been able to make satisfactory personal, economic, and social adjustments subsequent to their period of treatment. The study will fail in its purpose, however, if it does not increase appreciation of the wide range of capacities and circumstances represented in the lives of these boys. Each one should be thought of as an individual heavily burdened during the difficult period of adolescence by problems, often not of his own making, with urgent needs common to us all for interesting and worth-while activities, affection, recognition, and achievement.

The preliminary plans for the study were made under the supervision of Agnes K. Hanna, director of the Social Service Division of the Children's Bureau, and Harrison A. Dobbs, associate professor of social economy in the School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago. Alida C. Bowler, then director of the Delinquency Division of the Children's Bureau, was in charge of the development of the study. With the assistance of Ruth S. Bloodgood of the Division's staff, she has written the report.

The Children's Bureau acknowledges with appreciation the cordial cooperation of the many departments, agencies, and individuals in the several States and in the United States Government in giving access to essential sources of information. To the superintendents and the staff members of the several institutions it is especially indebted for their cordial cooperation throughout.

Respectfully submitted.

KATHARINE F. LENROOT, *Chief.*

HON. FRANCES PERKINS,
Secretary of Labor.

INSTITUTIONAL TREATMENT OF DELINQUENT BOYS

Part 2.—A Study of 751 Cases

Chapter I.—INTRODUCTION

This study was undertaken in the belief that an analysis of the results of institutional treatment of delinquent boys, based on careful and extensive field investigations, would be of service to institutional administrators and to other persons interested in methods of treating juvenile delinquency. Many workers have seemed to appreciate the usefulness of scientific method in studying the social problems with which they were confronted, but in surprisingly few instances has scientific method been applied in an attempt to measure the extent to which various forms of social work were achieving their avowed objectives. The best-known attempts of this kind in the correctional field are those described in five books published in 1926, 1930, and 1934. In the earliest of these William Healy and Augusta F. Bronner set forth their findings with respect to the later careers of three groups of juvenile repeated offenders in Chicago and Boston. In the second, Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck related the results of their investigations in regard to the lives of 510 men who had served terms in the Massachusetts Reformatory; in the third, the same writers described their study of 1,000 boys who had come before the Boston juvenile court and had been referred to the Judge Baker Foundation clinic for examination and recommendations as to treatment; and in the fourth they reported a similar study of 500 delinquent women. Lastly, Belle Boone Beard presented in *Juvenile Probation* an analysis of the case records of 500 children who were studied at that clinic and placed on probation by the Boston juvenile court.¹

A study of this kind must obtain as much information as possible on (1) the boys' family and community backgrounds, (2) the boys' personal characteristics and precommitment experiences, (3) the treatment applied during their institutional stay, (4) the aid given them during the period immediately following their release from the institution, and (5) their lives during a considerable period of time after the completion of the training period.

This report presents the findings of such a study of 751 boys who had been under treatment at five State institutions for delinquents—about 150 boys from each. The plants and programs of the institutions to which these boys had been committed are described in some detail in the report that has been issued as part 1 of this study, the descriptions being based mainly on visits made to these institutions

¹ Healy, William, and Augusta F. Bronner: *Delinquents and Criminals—Their Making and Unmaking* (Macmillan Co., New York, 1926); Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor T.: *500 Criminal Careers* (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1930), *One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents—Their Treatment by Court and Clinic* (Harvard University Press, 1934), and *Five Hundred Delinquent Women* (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1934); Beard, Belle Boone: *Juvenile Probation* (American Book Co., New York, 1934).

in the fall of 1931 and the spring of 1932, with some additional information relating to later developments that was obtained by correspondence.² When the institutions were visited an attempt was made to find out to what extent their treatment programs differed from those in effect at the time the boys included in the study had been under care. These boys had been committed 8 to 15 or more years prior to the visits to the institutions, and all had completed their training periods 5 or more years before their histories were obtained. Therefore care must be taken not to ascribe these findings given in part 2 as to the results of their treatment to the programs described in part 1 as in operation in 1931 or 1932.

Some changes had been made in plant and program at all these institutions since the last of these 751 boys were dismissed from care. Such information as could be obtained on these changes, presented in part 1, was general in character, for the most part. In some institutions building programs had considerably improved the housing arrangements and the school and shop facilities. In some the academic work and the vocational training both had undergone experimental development in an attempt to meet individual problems that were beginning to be recognized but were not yet being met satisfactorily. Some programs had been greatly enriched by the addition of many extracurricular and recreational features. In three institutions there had been significant development toward individualization of treatment based on increasingly thorough study of each boy and on the use of the clinic method in determining the institutional program for each one. Attempts had been made in some instances to improve the parole work in both amount and character of service, though this work remained one of the weakest links in the chain of treatment activities.

Perhaps one reason for the scarcity of analyses of results, such as are attempted in this study, is that the difficulties are sufficient to daunt all but the hardiest of would-be analysts. Conspicuous among these difficulties are the incompleteness and doubtful accuracy of much of the available record material, the necessity for establishing an arbitrary time period, and the problems involved in any attempt to make statistical use of case-schedule material. Certain points inevitably leave even the most careful and cautious interpretations open to question.

This study, like others of similar kind, was seriously hampered in many regards. Problems of social maladjustment and misconduct are never simple. They are composed of numerous factors. Data about many of these factors were lacking or regrettably incomplete. A much more effective analysis could be made at some future date if the cases of a large group of young persons now under care in the institutions could be marked for later study, and if the case records were painstakingly built up now and maintained in such a way as to provide a reliable informational basis, resting upon more complete data than could be obtained for these 751 boys. Even if that were done, there would still remain the necessity for fixing an arbitrary time limit to the period which the observations cover.

It should always be recognized and constantly borne in mind that the findings in studies of this sort do not in any sense constitute an

² Institutional Treatment of Delinquent Boys, pt. 1—Treatment Programs of Five State Institutions for Delinquent Boys. U. S. Children's Bureau Publication No. 223. Washington, 1935.

exact or final measurement of the results of the treatment given. The balance between successes and failures, with particular reference to subsequent delinquencies, would probably shift from time to time as the observation period was extended. Some boys who had not been able to keep their records entirely clear during the period between release from the institution and the assembling of these case histories might later become reasonably satisfactory social units. Others who had managed to keep out of recognizable difficulty until their cases came under observation might later encounter a combination of circumstances that would break through the controls which had been built up for them or which they had themselves developed, with the result that they would again come into conflict with the law.

Treatment for delinquency bears a certain resemblance to the attempt to "cure" tuberculosis. Treatment in a sanitarium for tuberculosis consists largely of measures designed to build up the patient's natural strength and resistance and so to arrest the progress of the disease. When a patient is believed to be strong enough to lead a reasonably normal life outside the routine and the protection of the sanitarium he is permitted to return home. But the ultimate successes and failures of the treatment depend largely on factors entirely beyond the control of the sanitarium authorities. Some discharged patients may go along quite well for some years but eventually break down again. Others may break down within a comparatively short time after leaving the sanitarium, but may respond to another period of care and never have further serious difficulty. Every such ex-patient has to be very much more on guard to protect and preserve a condition of health than does the individual who has never suffered from tuberculosis. Similarly, every boy who has been involved in serious delinquencies has to work much harder at keeping out of conflict with the law than does the boy who has never had that experience.

Many of the same difficulties are encountered in attempting to measure the degree of success in treating delinquency. All that can be done in each instance is to follow up cases long enough after the persons have been released so that they have had some opportunity to demonstrate what their condition—or their conduct—is likely to be. Inability to determine the number of ultimate successes or failures does not in any sense render such an inquiry useless. If its findings indicate that a considerable percentage of institution-trained boys have given evidence of their inability to live without social conflict during a subsequent reasonably long period of self-direction, then it would seem desirable that the treatment to which they had been subjected be carefully considered to determine whether changes might be made that would seem to promise more progress toward the desired ends.

RELATION OF CASES

The following table shows the results of the treatment of the boys who were released from the institution during the period from 1910 to 1914. The table is divided into two parts, the first showing the results of the treatment of the boys who were released during the period from 1910 to 1912, and the second showing the results of the treatment of the boys who were released during the period from 1913 to 1914. The table shows that the results of the treatment of the boys who were released during the period from 1910 to 1912 were generally better than those of the boys who were released during the period from 1913 to 1914. This is probably due to the fact that the boys who were released during the period from 1910 to 1912 had been in the institution for a longer period of time and had therefore had more opportunity to develop a habit of law-abiding behavior.

Chapter II.—METHOD OF FIELD WORK AND PREPARATION OF DATA FOR STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

SELECTION OF THE INSTITUTIONS

The institutions chosen for the study were the following:

Whittier State School, Whittier, Calif.
Boys' Vocational School, Lansing, Mich.
State Home for Boys, Jamesburg, N. J.
State Agricultural and Industrial School, Industry, N. Y.
Boys' Industrial School, Lancaster, Ohio.

Although it had been hoped to include 10 institutions and to have from each approximately 150 cases of boys who had received treatment in them, it became necessary to reduce this number of institutions because of the considerable time found to be required for the field work on the case studies. Consideration was given to several factors in selecting the five institutions finally chosen. They were to be institutions operated and maintained exclusively by the State and caring for boys only. The original plan had been to choose schools that were quite generally thought to have developed programs of especially high standards along progressive lines. It soon was realized that a study which proposed to ascertain the results of institutional treatment of delinquent boys rather generally should include institutions that would illustrate, so far as possible, the varying standards of care and training given by such institutions throughout the country. This influenced the choice to some extent. The desirability of representation from various sections of the country also was taken into account. One of these institutions is in the far West, two are in the East, and two are in the Middle West. Reduction of the original number of institutions to be studied accounts for the fact that none in the South, the Southwest, nor that part of the country between the Mississippi River and the Pacific coast was included. Another factor influencing the choice was institutional population, as it was essential to select institutions in which the number of boys placed on parole during a specified period would yield a sufficient number of cases in each State so that all cases studied might be reasonably comparable as to length of time since release from institutional supervision.

SELECTION OF CASES

In choosing the institutions for study attention had been focused mainly on geographical location and programs of treatment; differences in population characteristics and in treatment policies became apparent later. These made it necessary to take certain other factors into consideration in order to have the cases representative of the institution population at the time the boys to be studied were under

supervision. Such change in the procedure for selection of cases as proved needful, because of differing policies regarding length of supervision and because of differences in composition of the respective populations, was made during the progress of the field work.

In deciding on a basis for the selection of cases it had been necessary in the first place to adopt some time period following the release from institutional supervision which would be long enough for such demonstration of the boys' social and economic adjustments as might reasonably be assumed to indicate their probable careers. This was set in the original planning as at least 5 years from the date of final discharge from all institutional supervision to the time of beginning field work in the respective States. As variation in the size of the institutions might prevent obtaining from the number of boys discharged within a given period as many as 150 cases in which the post-parole period would be just 5 years, selection of cases was to begin with boys discharged 5 years previously and to go back as far as proved necessary at each institution in order to get the desired number. When later it was found that, because of differences in method of carrying out the legal provisions relating to final discharge from all supervision, selection on this basis would give a group of cases from two of the institutions—those in New Jersey and New York—not comparable with those from the others, the basis of selection was adjusted to meet these differences, and the emphasis was shifted from length of time between discharge from parole supervision and the date of the study in the respective States to length of time between final release from institutional residence and the date of the study. Because it was found that most of the boys who had been discharged from parole in the institutions in California, Michigan, and Ohio about 5 years before the study was begun in these States had left the institution 6 to 9 years previously, the selection in New Jersey and New York was made mostly from the cases in which the last placements on parole had been during a corresponding period of 6 to 9 years.

On the basis of the criteria set up for selection from each institution all cases were taken in chronological order from the lists—either lists of discharge from parole or lists giving dates of last placement on parole. The only cases excluded were those of boys whose death was recorded; a few additional cases were included in the original selection at each institution in order to have substitutes for any that might need to be excluded because of later discovery that the boy had died. Although a considerable span of years was included in the period for selection, the resulting groups of cases were believed to be representative of the types of cases in the general population at each institution and as nearly comparable as was possible from different institutions with varying policies and legal provisions.

When the cases of boys who were found to have died after release from institutional supervision³ had been omitted, the number of cases from the five institutions totaled 751. Efforts to locate and interview these boys were successful in regard to 623 (83 percent) of them. The number of boys interviewed in the groups from the

³ The number of cases excluded for this reason in each State was as follows: California, 6; Michigan, 4; New Jersey, 2; New York, 4; Ohio, 7. Of these 23 boys 3 were in correctional institutions at the time of death. The death of 3 others may be ascribed to misconduct, as 1 was shot by police, 1 was killed while participating in a hold-up, and 1 hanged himself in jail while awaiting trial on a charge of sex offense against a child. Death from natural causes was reported for 10 boys and from accident for 6 boys. In 1 case the cause and circumstances of death were not ascertained.

different institutions was about the same, as the following table shows.

TABLE 1.—Number of boys included in the study who were interviewed and number not interviewed

Boys included in the study	Total boys	California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
Total.....	751	149	150	153	148	151
Interviewed.....	623	123	122	124	128	126
Not interviewed.....	128	26	28	29	20	25

In 70 percent of these 623 cases the period between last placement on parole and date of interview had been 6 or 7 years. In 18 percent of them it was 8 years. In 4 percent it had been 9 years or more and in 8 percent, 5 years.

All except four of the boys interviewed had reached majority at the time of the interview, as table 2 shows. Boys 25 years of age or older constituted 28 percent of the group from California, 23 percent of those from New Jersey, 6 percent of those from New York, and 10 percent of those from Ohio; but all the Michigan boys interviewed were under 24 years of age. The younger age of the Michigan boys—98 percent being 22 or 23 years old as compared with only 57 percent of such age in the total number from the 5 institutions—is accounted for by the discharge of boys at 17 or 18 years of age in Michigan. The age distribution in all the States was naturally affected by the differences in policies as to length of supervision and the legal age of commitment to the institutions in these five States. (For brief outline of these legal provisions and administrative policies see appendix A, p. 130.)

TABLE 2.—Ages of interviewed boys included in the study

Age at interview	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	100	123	122	124	128	126
19 years.....	1	(1)	1				
20 years.....	3	(1)	1			1	1
21 years.....	47	8	9	3		16	19
22 years.....	171	27	15	92	1	38	25
23 years.....	187	30	35	27	42	44	39
24 years.....	130	21	28		52	21	29
25 years.....	49	8	11		20	5	13
26 years.....	25	4	16		7	2	
27 years.....	9	1	6		2	1	
28 years.....	1	(1)	1				

¹ Less than 1 percent.

GENERAL PLAN OF FIELD WORK

The case data for this study were obtained by a field staff consisting of a member of the permanent staff of the Children's Bureau, who was supervisor, and men agents specially employed for the duration of the study. All these men were university graduates, and some had had training at schools of social work. In addition to qualifications in

the way of education and experience, the applicant's personality was carefully considered in the selection of the agents to be employed. The task called for patience, perseverance, tact, and ingenuity; skill in initial approach and in the conducting of interviews was also deemed very important. Work was begun with a staff of 2 agents, increased within 2 months to 3, and later to 4.⁴ Much credit is due to this staff for success in finding the boys and in gaining the good will and cooperation of both the boys and their families in so large a percentage of the cases.

The field work was done in the States in the following order: California, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, and New York. Except in two States the institutional-record data were obtained for all cases before any case was followed up, and as far as possible the record material from other sources was obtained and verified before cases were assigned to the agents. This could be done in the checking and clearing with State departments and bureaus. In the larger cities of each State, where to some extent there was a concentration of cases, the field supervisor first obtained the record data from such local agencies as the juvenile court and other courts, the police departments, and the social-service exchange.⁵ In the smaller localities the agents assembled this material during the process of locating and interviewing the boys. In addition to the original checking with the State-wide and local agencies it frequently was necessary to recheck as new clues appeared and as references were found that indicated the contact of the boys or their families with such agencies.

The county from which the boy was committed was decided on as the starting point in all cases. The State was geographically districted and cases were assigned to the agents on this basis so far as was practicable. The large cities usually constituted single districts. Even though a boy was definitely known to be living elsewhere than in the county of commitment, the record data and precommitment material had to be gathered from the county, so the case was assigned first to the agent in the district including that county.

So far as possible the record data from all sources were obtained personally. No general system of questionnaires was used for seeking or verifying data. It was necessary, however, to write letters of inquiry in numerous individual cases when reference was found to a record in a part of the State not likely to be visited for other cases or outside the States in which field work was being done. A system of clearing through the field staff was used in connection with transferring references from one agent to another for checking.

All the interviewing of boys and their families was done by the men agents on the staff of the Children's Bureau. The policy was to have each case followed through by the same investigator whenever it did not involve too much additional travel or expense. As the agents moved between States included in the study, their routes were arranged to enable them to interview boys who were known to be at intermediate points, and in a few instances which did not involve extensive travel they went to adjoining States in which boys were ascertained to be living.

⁴ The men employed were Donald E. Buehler, Everett W. Coty, Donald S. Hartzell, William S. Maynard, George C. Penny, and Howell V. Williams (2 replacing those who resigned before the study was completed).

⁵ Social-service exchanges are clearing houses for social-welfare agencies. They record all contacts with families and individuals which the registering agencies report and are able to furnish addresses and other desired information.

The field work (which began in September 1929 and was completed in May 1932) required slightly more than 6 months for each State.

The data obtained in the investigation were assembled on a set of five schedule forms. Schedule 1 (precommitment history) was for facts pertaining to the boys' early life, including something about his family background, home and neighborhood conditions, early delinquencies, schooling, and employment. Schedule 2 (institutional history) covered such items as length of time in the institution, reports of psychological examinations, conduct and disciplinary record, school attendance and grade, and trade or work assignments. Space was provided for addresses of the boy, his parents, near relatives, and others who might prove helpful in locating him. Schedule 3 (parole history) covered adjustments and the employment, school, and conduct record during the period of parole. Schedule 4 (present situation) covered marital status, living arrangements at the time of interview (such as own home, parental home, boarding home), the physical features of the home, the neighborhood conditions, the boy's economic status and social position in the community, and the facts constituting his employment history and conduct record during the entire postparole period. Schedule 5 was for such expression of the boy's attitude as could be secured from him concerning his early delinquencies, his institutional experience, its benefits or disadvantages, and his plans for the future. This schedule also provided for the agent's description of the boy's personal appearance and impression of his personality with reference to such characteristics as stability and frankness or reserve. The sources of all information were noted on these schedules. (The schedules are reproduced in condensed form in appendix D, p. 136.)

Instructions were furnished to the agents explaining the general form in which entries were to be made and the type of information desired, with any definitions necessary for interpretation of material. As the schedules were completed in the field, the supervisor went over them to see that items which might have relation to one another were in agreement as to facts and that all entries were in accordance with instructions.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Records

The first sources of data for the schedules that have been described were the records of the institutions. Their completeness varied with both the standards of record-keeping at the different institutions and the amount of information assembled in connection with carrying out the treatment programs. For the boys' social history prior to commitment, for example, the institutions had depended in most cases on the information sent by the courts. In general this was very meager, except for some boys from California and New Jersey. In California the bureau of juvenile research in the State department of institutions had made intensive study of a number of the boys sent to the Whittier State School. This included, in addition to the psychological study of the boy himself, personal visits to his family and his home by bureau workers, who obtained detailed information regarding the boy's family and home conditions and any previous delinquency record. Although most of the boys thus studied were committed from Los Angeles and localities

near Whittier, it was found that a number of them were among those selected for this study, the reports being available in the institution records. Consequently for these cases the information on pre-commitment history was very complete. In New Jersey the work of studying each boy under the clinical procedure of the classification program had been started while some boys selected for this study were still in the institution, and social histories were being obtained through home visits and agency reports soon after the boys' commitment. Therefore some of the records in New Jersey likewise furnished much information.

Considerable variation was found in the records of the boys' institutional history. In Michigan, New Jersey, and New York details were not available concerning their conduct and discipline history; instances of serious misconduct and the punishment given were noted, though no consistent record had been kept. Information regarding assignments to trade training or work was meager in Michigan and New York. Although it was stated in New Jersey that psychological examinations had been given to most of the boys, the records had been filed separately and were not easily accessible. The institutional history was found in different places in all the institutions; records of school, hospital, and trade assignments were usually filed separately in the various departments; in Ohio all the history was filed centrally except the school records.

For parole-history data the parole officers' reports of visits or contacts with the boys in New York could not be found or were in such condition that it was impossible to obtain much accurate detail. They had not been written for individual case records but rather were running statements in weekly reports, all boys seen during the week being listed in the same report. In Michigan there were no reports as to the parole supervision given by the county welfare agents, the records containing only the meager reports of the State supervisors from the State welfare department. Under the centralized parole system in New Jersey, parole records were kept at the office of the State department of institutions and agencies. In most cases the parole records of this department were very complete, but the records at the institution itself contained very little parole information except for the reports of the preparole visits.

Facts relating to the boy's situation after his release frequently were noted in the institution records, either in the case history or in correspondence. In some records only brief notations were found referring to some incident in his affairs, but these all served as valuable bases for further investigation. Other records had quite complete information on misconduct after leaving the institution. Recent addresses of the boy or his family obtained from the institution records also furnished useful clues for locating a number of boys.

For institutional history, of course, no record material was available in any place except at the institution, but the boys often were able to give the agent information which was helpful in filling some of the gaps. However, they seldom could remember enough to complete the records.

For precommitment and parole history it was possible to obtain considerable supplementary information from still other sources.

All cases in each State were cleared with any State departments or their bureaus or divisions that might have social history or other data offering any hints as to the boys' whereabouts.

The State bureaus or divisions of criminal identification were among the principal sources of information concerning records of misconduct after leaving the institution. They not only afforded very complete chronological reports of offenses, with dates of arrests and dispositions made, but also were a primary source for locating a number of boys. This bureau or division is in the State department of penology in California, in the department of public safety in Michigan, in the department of correction in New York, and in the department of public welfare in Ohio. In New Jersey this work is done by the State police. Each bureau or division gave generous cooperation and assistance in clearing all cases and in making many rechecks during the course of the field work. As fingerprints were not used as part of the record identification at these institutions for juvenile delinquents, it was not possible to furnish fingerprints to the criminal-identification bureaus for use in definitely identifying the cases. Consequently some few subsequent records of boys with very commonplace names may have been overlooked. Boys using aliases not discovered otherwise during the progress of the study likewise may have had records which were not found because fingerprints were not used. There were other limitations in the check for subsequent records through this source. The reporting to the bureaus of identification from all cities in each State was not uniform. In New Jersey the work had been organized only a short time, and cooperation in the way of complete reporting from every locality had not yet been secured. There was variation also in the different cities in the types of cases fingerprinted, and minor offenses frequently were not reported to the State bureaus. The clearing and identification of cases through the identifying factors which it was possible to furnish the bureaus was done very carefully, however. When records were discovered which referred to arrests in other States, letters were sent to the bureaus of identification in those States asking them to clear and to furnish records of the individual cases.

Other State departments and bureaus from which record data were obtained included the following:

- California: Department of institutions,
Board of prison directors.
- Michigan: Board of pardons and parole.
- New Jersey: Department of institutions and agencies.
- New York: Department of corrections.
Executive department—division of parole.
- Ohio: Department of public welfare—division of charities
and corrections, and bureau of juvenile research.

The policy of the Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice is not to clear through its criminal-identification files without the use of fingerprints; these files contain so many thousands of records that clearing by name alone is not considered feasible. However, at the completion of the field work a few of the names of boys whom it had been impossible to find were checked with this Bureau by the use of fingerprint classifications which the State bureaus of identification had furnished with the records for these

cases. These were names of boys for whom a long criminal record had been reported through the State bureau, and it was thought that since the former check was made the boy might possibly have been in trouble in some other State; however, none was so located, and no additional records were secured through this source.

Verification of enlistment and service with the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard was made through the War and Navy Departments, the Marine Corps, and the Treasury Department (under which the Coast Guard operates). Not all cases studied were cleared for possible service records, but information was requested for each case in which any records or interviews disclosed an enlistment or indicated the possibility of one. The dates of enlistment and discharge were secured, with the reason for discharge and data regarding any confinement in military correctional institutions.

In the various communities visited in connection with each case the records of certain types of local sources were consistently examined and checked to obtain all information available. In each city containing a social-service exchange, every case in which any address indicated residence of the boy or his family in the city at any time was cleared through the exchange. As the Children's Bureau is a research organization and the information obtained was to be confidential and not used except without identification of individuals, arrangements were made with each exchange whereby the cases might be cleared without registering, to learn whether or not the boys or their families were at any time known to social agencies. Recent addresses discovered through this source frequently made it possible to locate a boy or his family.

In the smaller cities, which as a rule had no social-service exchanges, it was not feasible to check with all existing agencies, but usually inquiry was made of the family-welfare organization or public-welfare department, if there were such. Many of the rural communities in which the boys had lived previously or were living when interviewed had no social-welfare agencies.

At the outset of the study it was decided that time would not permit consultation of the records of all the agencies found registered on each case. A general policy was adopted of consulting records of any agencies that were likely to have come in contact with the boys because of delinquency problems, such as courts, protective agencies, and child-guidance clinics. In cases in which it proved difficult to locate the boy, the records of any agency which it seemed, from information already available, might furnish clues to the whereabouts of the boy or his family were consulted.

Juvenile-court and probation records were always consulted for further data on family history and for details of the boy's early conduct. Information from this source varied greatly in type and amount. Some of the independent juvenile courts were found to have considerably more data about the family in their records than had been found at the institution. Other courts, and in smaller cities and rural communities most of the juvenile courts that were part of the general court system, could furnish comparatively little supplementary information. Frequently statements found in records of juvenile courts or other agencies were not verified. The agents found that certain facts about the boys' lives prior to commitment could be checked up even at the time of the field work; and whenever it was

possible they obtained the missing information and verified the record data.

Juvenile-court records in two of the States—New York and New Jersey—were not always an available source of information. In New York State at the time boys included in this study were committed, children's courts as authorized under the Children's Court Act of 1922⁶ had not yet been organized in many of the counties, and juvenile cases were heard by local justices of the peace. Each justice kept his own records, and because of the length of time which had elapsed it was usually impossible to locate the justice who had committed the boy or to obtain any records of previous misconduct. In New Jersey the law specifies that records of proceedings in juvenile cases shall be destroyed at the end of 2 years following the child's release from supervision.⁷ Though not all the courts had complied consistently with this legal provision, some had destroyed those records, so that juvenile-court data were not uniformly available.

None of the five States had a centralized probation department which kept records of all individuals placed on probation. Therefore it was necessary to rely on the local probation departments or on individual probation officers for the boys' early probation history. Except for the organized probation departments in the larger cities, this information was scanty and even nonexistent in many localities, owing to lack of any probation service.

Social data other than facts concerning the type of offense, dates of arrest, and procedure and disposition were not generally found in the records kept by the various local or county law-enforcement officials, or in those of the courts dealing with adult offenders which may have handled cases of these boys' subsequent delinquencies. All such sources were consulted, but it is probable that information concerning arrests and appearances in local courts on misdemeanor charges was incomplete in some cases. The records of these courts usually contained very little identifying information, such as age of the person arrested or names of parents, so that in cases of boys with commonplace names it was difficult to identify the record definitely. In case of doubt, no arrest or court record was considered final unless verified through some other reliable source or by the boy himself.

In certain localities records from still other sources were found helpful in individual cases.

In planning the study it was decided not to attempt to secure supplementary or verifying data from records as to the boys' attendance and progress in school or their employment history, either for the period prior to commitment or for that subsequent to release from the institution, as verification of these two items would be more time-consuming and expensive than the results would warrant. Another factor influencing the decision not to check employment history subsequent to the boy's release was the policy carried out in this study of avoiding in every possible way contacts that might embarrass the boy or in any way affect his social or economic position. Such embarrassment might arise from interviews with previous employers as well as with the boy's employer at the time of the interview. In some cases, however, the present employer was seen at the suggestion of the boy himself or with his full consent, willingly given.

⁶ New York, Laws of 1922, ch. 547 (Cahill's Consolidated Laws 1930, p. 2698).

⁷ New Jersey, Cum. Supp. 1924, sec. 53-207.

As the questionnaire method was not used in verifying or seeking information, police departments and social-service exchanges were not consulted for possible records in every city not visited in which the boy reported he had lived. To clear with police departments in such cases would have been difficult without the use of fingerprints to assure accurate identification. Individual letters were written to some organizations if the information already available indicated that records might be found in other localities.

Interviews

Much of the information on the boy's present situation and practically all of his own story of the case was obtained through interviews with the boy and his family. Every effort was made to find them and to see them personally. Practice as to interviewing relatives other than the parental family varied with almost every case. Interviews with such persons were not sought as a matter of routine but depended on whether assistance was needed in locating the boy or his family and whether it seemed that a relative could contribute valuable verification of certain data. Likewise the number of other persons seen depended on the need in the individual case. Great care was exercised in weighing the information obtained.

LOCATING THE BOYS AND MAKING PERSONAL CONTACTS

The study demanded extremely patient and tactful work in many cases. Untiring effort was expended in digging out clues that would lead eventually to finding the boy or his family—the family being often as difficult to locate as the boy. On the other hand, many boys were comparatively easy to find, as when a boy was living in the place to which he had gone when paroled from the institution, or when his current address was in the institution records or in some other source of record data.

The agents' working hours were of necessity very irregular, as they had to be adjusted to the time when they could find people at home. In addition to the calls made in securing and following clues, most cases needed more than one visit—some of them many visits—to the boy and his family. Often the boy was not found at home on repeated calls, even though appointment for a specified time had been made. It was the general policy not to interview him at his place of employment; therefore evenings, Saturday afternoons, and Sundays were the only times at which many boys could be seen. Hours of waiting often were required to find a boy at home or at some place in which he might be accustomed to spend his leisure time.

Every safeguard was used to avoid embarrassing the boy or his family or jeopardizing his position in the community, either social or economic. The agents frequently had to devise some excuse for wishing to see the boy quite foreign to the real purpose of the visit. Particular care was taken not to disclose its purpose to the boy's wife if it were known that she was unaware of his previous institutional experience or if there was any doubt of her knowledge of it. The records sometimes indicated this; or the parents, if interviewed first, were able to inform the agents. Contacts with the employers also were made carefully in order not to impair the boy's security in his employment, the interviews seldom being held at his place of work for this reason, and then only after the agent had made certain in

advance that it would be satisfactory to both the boy and his employer. Boys sometimes came to the agent's room or met him at a designated place in order to keep the interview private or to prevent disclosing the purpose of the call to others. Sometimes the boy joined the agent for a drive, or the agent invited the boy to dine with him. A protective device found useful in a few cases was a short letter in which the purpose for seeking an interview was stated and an appointment was requested. This could be handed to the boy when it seemed advisable at the moment not to make any oral explanation. The same care was used in protecting the boy's parental family or relatives by not disclosing the reason for seeking them to neighbors or to other persons whose curiosity or gossip might cause embarrassment. Of course in many cases the boy's record was well known and his reputation was such that no precautions were necessary.

Securing the full cooperation and good will of the boy, his family, and others from whom information was sought often required considerable diplomacy and persistence. The field staff generally succeeded, however, and there were very few instances in which either the boy or his family refused to give any information. Indeed, such friendly relations were established in a number of cases that the agent was invited to dinner or to a social gathering at the boy's home. It was explained in each case that great care would be taken not to reveal identifying data about individuals.

There was great variation among the cases in the amount of ground work—as it was termed by the field staff—necessary to get definite knowledge as to the whereabouts of a boy and his family. In addition to the sources from which record data were secured, there were certain other channels through which a great deal of assistance was obtained as to addresses or clues for possible whereabouts of the individuals sought, particularly in regard to boys who proved difficult to locate, and they gave valuable aid in many cases. The use of city directories was not confined to the most recently published ones, as sometimes a previous address served as a good clue when no address was contained in the later editions. Also, especially with foreign names, various spellings were checked; one name was looked for under as many as 13 spellings. Relatives were occasionally found through visits to persons listed in the directories with the same or similar names.

The postal authorities gave information which aided in finding a considerable number of boys. It was possible to obtain this through the official identification of the field agent with another branch of Government service, careful explanation of the purpose of seeking the individuals, and assurance of the strict confidence in which the information would be held. Arrangements for using this source were usually made through the postmaster or superintendent of mails in each locality; if it was necessary to interview any letter carriers, permission was secured from the superior official. The sending of registered letters marked "deliver to addressee only" and requiring a return slip indicating whether they had been received was another method of using postal facilities which proved effective in several particularly difficult cases.

Through the public-school departments the addresses of boys who had younger brothers or sisters in school were sometimes found. The records of the bureaus of vital statistics, marriage licenses, and motor-vehicle licenses and of public-service companies were other sources for

clues that led to locating the boys. Previous addresses, even very old ones, were visited in difficult cases because former neighbors, local storekeepers, or owners of commercial recreation establishments frequently could give information that was helpful. Local newspapers were watched closely for notices of arrests and other items concerning the boys, and this produced results in a number of cases, including several especially baffling ones.

As boys from the same institution who lived in the same cities or neighborhoods frequently knew one another, sometimes one would carry to another the message that the agent desired to talk to him. For example, a certain boy who had left home and was reported to be sleeping out and loitering around undesirable places, "living the life of a bum", had been impossible to find. Another boy disclosed that he knew this boy's haunts and offered to bring him to his own home to meet the agent. A definite appointment was made, and the arrangement was carried through.

STATISTICAL TREATMENT OF DATA OBTAINED IN THE FIELD

Preparation of the schedule data for statistical analysis

As the field schedules for this study were prepared in case-history narrative form, in booklets of several pages, and as information so recorded is not suited to the processes of statistical analysis, it was necessary to transfer to a large card the data to be analyzed. Such a card was prepared for each case, containing 106 items, some with several subordinate items. The arrangement corresponded to that of the field schedules, with divisions for the boy's precommitment, institutional, parole, and postparole history and his situation at the time of the study. (For reproduction of card see appendix D, p. 148.)

In transferring information from the schedules to the statistical cards, numerous interpretations had to be made of the descriptive material the schedules contained. Furthermore, to convert into usable form the description of family standards, of home and neighborhood conditions, and of employment, economic, and social status it was necessary to set up and define certain ratings and to rate or grade each case in accordance with them. Instructions were prepared explaining the items on the statistical card and giving the definitions necessary for making the proper interpretations. Special criteria were devised for the items to be rated, and the points to be considered in making the evaluation were indicated. (These criteria are shown in detail in connection with the analyses of the various items in the following chapters.) This preparation of the case-schedule material for statistical use was done under the general direction of the supervisor of field work, assisted by another member of the Children's Bureau staff who had become familiar with the study through some participation in the field work and by clerks experienced in interpreting case-history material.

The first tabulations made of the 623 cases presented simply the total for each main item, with its subdivisions for both the whole group and the groups from the different institutions. Planning for cross tabulation involved consideration of each item with reference to the possibility of a significant relation to each of the other items. If such relation seemed logical, or if assurance that no relation existed

was deemed desirable, cross tabulations were made. All the cross tabulations were then examined carefully to see which ones contained figures that would be of interest and value to institutional authorities and to other persons interested in institutional programs and achievements, and from that point of view the tabulations in this report were selected for presentation and discussion.

The group of 128 cases of boys not interviewed was excluded from the total used as the basis of the study because the result of separate counts of these 128 and of the 623 boys interviewed, as made in the preliminary examination of the data, indicated that owing to the lack of information obtainable only through interviews with the boys themselves the inclusion of these 128 cases would weight the statistical analyses too heavily with unreported items. As the constitution and general characteristics of this group were similar in most respects to those of the interviewed group, its omission would not invalidate the findings. (For the data obtained in regard to the precommitment history, institutional history, and parole history of these 128 boys see appendix B, p. 133.)

Difficulties in statistical analysis of case-schedule material

Statistical treatment of case-schedule material always presents serious problems. Every case history yields evidence of a great multiplicity of factors, intricately interdependent. Some of these factors are of more or less general nature, obvious and demonstrable. Others, which may be highly potent in providing behavior motivation, are such that they cannot be reduced to forms susceptible of statistical treatment. These lie largely in the realm of feelings, attitudes, and the infinite variations possible in connection with the response of one human being to other human beings and to the life situations in which he finds himself. Too little is yet known as to what makes an individual, either juvenile or adult, do the things he does to make it possible to determine the relation between these feelings and attitudes and the more tangible things, circumstances, and events that form the framework of any case history.

The usual procedure when case-schedule material is subjected to statistical analysis is to reduce the most concrete and obvious factors to the form of statistical items and to establish through various tabulations and cross tabulations the fact of their common possession by certain groups of cases. But even though a particular factor may be shown to appear in a certain number of cases there is no way of determining how similar, or how different, is its weight within each case. That weight is conditioned by any number of other factors in each case, and—when problems of behavior are being studied—by the amount and the kind of emotional response which the individual makes to situations in which that particular factor plays any part. For example, school retardation is a characteristic feature in many cases of juvenile delinquency. Yet unquestionably 1 or 2 years of school failure would have much less weight in relation to emotional disturbances that might lie behind specific instances of misconduct in some cases than it would in others. Such failure might cause serious unhappiness that would find a desperate relief in wilful misbehavior in a bright, sensitive boy, handicapped in academic work by reading disability unrecognized either at school or at home, harassed in both places by constant faultfinding, and shamed in his own eyes

by his inability to keep up with boys of his own age. On the other hand, dropping back a year or two might not greatly disturb the emotional balance of a boy of relatively low mental ability and of phlegmatic temperament whose ignorant parents took no interest in his school progress and whose teachers, expecting nothing better of him, did not nag him.

In other words, statistical analyses that take one or two items at a time out of a complicated case structure and use them independently of the whole must be interpreted with the greatest caution if grave errors are not to be made. For the most part the findings will prove nothing nor establish the validity of any thesis. Nevertheless they are of great value. They are, and should be regarded as, the essential first steps in the application of scientific method to the solution of social problems of this description. They point the way for further study by helping to amass evidence that indicates the negligible character of some factors and the greater significance of others. Their most important contribution, however, is not in the field of research but in the field of action. Such a study as this, for example, would be worse than futile if it failed to provide institutional administrators and their advisors and coworkers with evidence pointing toward useful services that need to be greatly strengthened and improved, and toward weak spots in institutional programs that should be eliminated through careful planning and vigorous and intelligent action. Such action need not wait on the refinements of scientific investigation. The rougher measurements that can be made through subjecting to statistical analysis certain factors appearing in the case records of these boys before, during, and after their institutional training should be sufficient to show whether or not institutional programs are achieving their objectives to such an extent that they do not need overhauling. If there should be indication that institutions are not performing their tasks with a high degree of efficiency, these same crude evaluations should direct attention toward the points at which the program seems to be functioning particularly poorly.

Chapter III.—PRECOMMITMENT DATA

EXTENT OF THE DATA AVAILABLE

In an appraisal of workmanship it is important to know something about the material with which the artisan must work. Similarly, if the results of institutional treatment are to be analyzed something should be known about the human material with which the institutions deal. In this chapter certain data are presented regarding the community and family backgrounds of these 623 boys studied and the characteristics and previous experiences of the boys themselves. In some particulars there were distinct differences among the groups studied in the five States. It is important to keep these differences in mind in any comparison of results as between the several institutions. Not only did the character and quantity of the data differ to some extent in the several States, but the information about the boys, their families, and their communities was quite inadequately recorded in all the States, as has been remarked. Consequently the use of data of this kind in any attempt to determine precise causative factors would be unwarranted. It is presented merely to indicate to some extent the nature of the human material with which these institutions were expected to work.

COMMUNITY BACKGROUNDS

Type of the community

The community in which 616 of these boys were living at the time of commitment to these institutions was reported. The number of boys from communities of specified size is shown in table 3.¹ Three-fourths of these boys came from cities of 10,000 or more inhabitants, more than two-fifths coming from cities of 100,000 or more. Of the remaining fourth from communities of less than 10,000, almost equal numbers came from rural areas and from towns of 2,500 to 10,000 population. As the group of boys from each institution included in the study was fairly representative of the total population of the institutions (see p. 5), the proportions of boys coming from urban and rural areas may be taken to indicate the proportions the institutions received from cities and from rural districts. Among the cases studied in California, Michigan, and Ohio the number of boys from rural areas was somewhat larger than in either New Jersey or New York. This of course might be expected, for a larger percentage of the population in these three States than in New York and New Jersey live in rural areas. The proportion of boys from farm homes was 6 percent of the total group.

¹ According to the United States census of 1920, on which the classification is based, "urban" includes cities and other incorporated places having 2,500 inhabitants or more and "rural" all places of less than 2,500 inhabitants.

TABLE 3.—Number of boys included in the study from communities of specified population

Population of community	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York ¹	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Population reported.....	616	100	117	122	124	127	126
100,000 or more.....	267	43	40	51	62	50	64
25,000 less than 100,000.....	124	20	23	23	27	31	20
10,000, less than 25,000.....	74	12	13	10	14	22	15
2,500, less than 10,000.....	74	12	22	20	10	13	9
Less than 2,500 (rural).....	77	13	19	18	11	11	18
Population not reported.....	7	-----	6	-----	-----	1	-----

¹ Exclusive of New York City. Under the law, boys were not committed from this city to the institution studied in New York State.

Character of the neighborhood

Some indication of the character of the neighborhood in which the boy had lived before commitment was obtained in 563 of the 623 cases. In grading neighborhoods the ratings used were Good, Mediocre, and Bad. Among the items taken into consideration were the following:

The type and character of the houses—whether they were substantially or poorly built, owned or rented, well kept or shabby and neglected; whether the area was open country or purely residential and containing houses with yards, or congested and containing business establishments, factories, railroad yards, and similar features.

Whether sanitary conditions were good or bad, the streets and premises clean or dirty, well kept or shabby and neglected.

Opportunities for wholesome recreation available, such as private yards, supervised playgrounds, athletic fields, and parks; types of commercial recreation in the area, as motion-picture theaters, dance halls, pool halls, and speak-easies.

The neighborhood attitude toward law-breaking; the presence of bootleggers, gamblers, prostitutes, and criminals; the existence of adult and juvenile gangs and their general character and reputation.

Whether the neighborhood was quiet and restful or noisy and characterized by frequent quarrels and fights.

Table 4 shows the character of the neighborhoods in which the boys were living at the time of commitment. Only 15 percent of the 563 boys for whom this item was reported had lived in neighborhoods which were considered good, whereas 46 percent came from neighborhoods which were adjudged bad; that is, almost half these boys had been in neighborhoods that had exposed them to a variety of destructive influences. There was some difference between the States in this regard.

TABLE 4.—*Character of neighborhood in which boy was living at commitment*

Character of neighborhood	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Character reported.....	563	100	78	119	118	123	125
Good.....	86	15	11	19	9	27	20
Mediocre.....	217	39	44	56	40	35	42
Bad.....	260	46	23	44	69	61	63
Character not reported.....	60	-----	45	3	6	5	1

THE FAMILIES AND HOMES

Race of boys, and nativity of parents

Race was reported for 620 boys. The detail for the several States is shown in table 5. Of these 620 boys 563 (91 percent) were white. Forty-nine (8 percent) were Negro. Eight boys (1 percent) were of other races; all these (7 Mexican, 1 Chinese) were from California.

TABLE 5.—*Race of boys included in the study*

Race	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Race reported.....	620	100	121	122	124	127	126
White.....	563	91	104	116	103	126	114
Negro.....	49	8	9	6	21	1	12
Other races.....	8	1	8	-----	-----	-----	-----
Race not reported.....	3	-----	2	-----	-----	1	-----

The New Jersey group included 21 Negroes—17 percent of the total number of boys studied in that State—whereas 1 Negro was among those studied in New York. Figures obtained at the time of the visits to the institutions show that the New Jersey institution had the largest proportion of Negroes in its total population—30 percent of the boys in the school on February 29, 1932. In New York, on the other hand, only 16 of the 393 boys committed during the year ended June 30, 1932, were Negro; it was reported that the proportion of Negroes in this institution was always small. Nine of the 123 boys interviewed in California, 6 of the 122 in Michigan, and 12 of the 126 in Ohio were Negroes.²

The nativity of the parents was ascertained for 501 of the white boys included in the study. More than half (55 percent) of these boys were of foreign parentage. New Jersey had the highest proportion of boys whose parents were both foreign born. The California

² Population figures were obtained for 1931 and 1932 for each of the institutions studied. See *Institutional Treatment of Delinquent Boys*, pt. 1, pp. 23, 61, 95, 144, 188.

group had more than twice as many boys of native as of foreign parentage. In Ohio the numbers were practically the same (table 6).

TABLE 6.—*Nativity of parents of white boys*

Nativity of parents	Total white boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	563	-----	104	116	103	126	114
Nativity reported.....	501	100	82	95	97	119	108
Native parentage.....	198	40	50	36	19	41	52
Foreign parentage.....	275	55	23	52	77	72	51
Mixed parentage.....	28	6	9	7	1	6	5
Nativity not reported.....	62	-----	22	21	6	7	6

The belief is often expressed that the incidence of delinquency and crime is higher among boys whose parents were foreign born than among those whose parents were born in this country. Some persons think that delinquency and crime are in some way due to the foreign stock from which these boys spring. If poverty, poor homes, and bad neighborhoods have any significance in relation to delinquency, it is unsafe to attribute the delinquency of the sons of immigrants to their nativity without careful, intensive study, comparing their homes and communities with those of all the children of native parents. It is well known that many of the newer immigrants to the United States have been crowded together in the great industrial centers. The number of boys included in this study is too small to give a fair picture of the actual situation.

Table 7 shows the race of the boys and the nativity of the parents of the white boys in relation to the reason for their commitment to the institution (which is discussed for the five State groups on p. 30.) The most frequent reason for commitment was stealing. Automobile stealing or other type of stealing was the reason for commitment of 46 percent of the white boys of native parentage as compared with 38 percent of the boys of foreign-born parentage. Burglary, the next most important reason, was represented in about the same proportion in both nativity groups—22 and 23 percent, respectively. Being ungovernable, truancy, and running away, combined, were the reasons for the commitment of 25 percent of the boys of native parentage as compared with 30 percent of those of foreign-born parentage. Beneath the facts unquestionably lie difficulties in family and community relationships, and early clashes between the young child and his foreign-born parents when on entering the public schools the child is plunged into a very different cultural stream. The attitude of superiority often assumed by the children of native-born parents toward those whose parents were foreign born also contributes to the problem.

TABLE 7.—Reason for commitment, race of boys, and nativity of parents of white boys

Reason for commitment	Total boys		White boys					Negro boys ¹	Other colored boys ¹	Boys whose race was not reported	
			Native parentage		Foreign parentage		Mixed parentage ¹				Parentage not reported
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623		198		275		28	62	49	8	3
Reason reported.....	621	100	198	100	274	100	28	61	49	8	3
Automobile stealing.....	47	8	21	11	15	5	2	4	4	1	
Burglary or unlawful entry.....	150	24	43	22	62	23	11	16	13	4	1
Other stealing.....	205	33	69	35	91	33	9	18	16	2	
Ungovernable.....	79	13	27	14	30	11	3	10	7	1	1
Truancy.....	63	10	18	9	36	13	1	3	5		
Running away.....	25	4	4	2	17	6		1	3		
Sex offense.....	25	4	10	5	7	3	1	5	1		1
Act of carelessness or mischief.....	12	2	2	1	8	3		2			
Injury to person.....	10	2	3	2	5	2		2			
Other reason.....	5	1	1	1	3	1	1				
Reason not reported.....	2				1			1			

¹ Percent distribution not shown because number of boys was less than 50.

Persons with whom the boy was living at the time of commitment

Information showing with whom the boy was living at the time of his commitment was obtained in 613 cases. Of these boys 530 (86 percent) were living in their own homes; 298 (49 percent) were living with both parents, 144 (23 percent) with the mother, 88 (14 percent) with the father. In some of these cases, of course, there was a step-parent in the home, as the parent with whom the boy was living had remarried. Among those not living in their own homes 41 (7 percent) were with relatives, 14 (2 percent) were in foster homes, 15 (2 percent) had been in other institutions and were committed directly from them, and 13 (2 percent) came from homes of other types.

In connection with studies of delinquency much has been said about the frequency with which the home of the juvenile delinquent is found to be broken; that is, the child's home is not one in which he is living with both his own parents. The parents of only 50 percent of the 619 boys for whom information on this point was obtained were both living and were maintaining a home together. In only 3 percent of the cases were both parents dead, but the father or the mother was dead in an additional 33 percent. In 10 cases (2 percent) the father had deserted, and in 5 cases (1 percent) the mother had deserted. In 66 cases (11 percent) the parents were divorced or separated. Sixty widowed mothers had remarried, bringing a step-father into the home. Forty-one fathers had remarried after the death of the boy's mother. The father had married again in 4 of the 44 cases in which the parents had been divorced, the mother in 19 of them. In 10 cases both parents had married again, thus providing

the boy with stepfather and stepmother. The following list gives the details:

	Number of boys	Percent distribution
Total.....	623	----
Marital status of parents reported.....	619	100
Parents married and living together.....	311	50
Both parents dead.....	20	3
Father dead.....	114	18
Mother remarried.....	60	10
Mother not remarried.....	54	9
Mother dead.....	91	15
Father remarried.....	41	7
Father not remarried.....	50	8
Parents divorced.....	44	7
Father deserting.....	10	2
Mother deserting.....	5	1
Parents separated for other reasons.....	22	4
Parents not married to each other.....	2	(3)
Marital status of parents not reported.....	4	----

In their study of juvenile delinquents, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck found one or both parents dead or the parents separated, divorced, or deserting in more than 45 percent of their cases; and in their study of an older group from a State reformatory they found about 60 percent coming from such broken homes.⁴

It does not seem logical to believe that the entire population in the five States included in this study would have a proportion of broken homes so large as the 50 percent found for the 619 delinquent boys for whom information was obtained on this point. Although there has been no comprehensive study of the incidence of broken homes in the general population, a few figures have been assembled in connection with studies of certain groups of juvenile delinquents. For example, in 1918, on the basis of data in the Federal census of 1910, the proportion of broken homes in the general population was estimated roughly as about 25 percent; this estimate was made for comparison with the proportion of broken homes—nearly 51 percent—found for 7,958 boys in industrial schools in 31 States.⁵ Again, it was reported in 1924 that in a group of 3,198 boys in three public schools in New York City the broken-home incidence was 19 percent, whereas it was 45 percent for a slightly older group of 1,649 boys in four correctional institutions in New York State studied at the same time.⁶

Number of children in the family

The number of children in the family was ascertained in 618 cases. Only 36 boys (6 percent) had no living brother nor sister. Seventy-six boys (12 percent) had 1 living brother or sister, 65 (11 percent) had 2, 95 (15 percent) had 3, and 117 (19 percent) had 4. Two hundred and

³ Less than 1 percent.

⁴ One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 75; 500 Criminal Careers, p. 117.

⁵ Shideler, Ernest H.: Family Disintegration and the Delinquent Boy in the United States. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 8, no. 5 (January 1918), pp. 713, 717.

⁶ Slawson, John: *The Delinquent Boy*, p. 359. Richard G. Badger, Boston, 1926.

twenty-nine (37 percent) of the boys came from families in which there were 6 or more living children, inclusive of the boys studied, and 23 came from families in which there were 10 or more. Although the figures are not altogether comparable with those for average number of persons in a family according to the Federal census of 1920, they show that the average size of the families of these boys was larger than that in each State as a whole. In other words, many of the boys included in the study came from relatively large families.

Occupation of the father

The information relating to the father's occupation at the time that the boy was committed to the institution was obtained from a variety of sources, and there is considerable doubt whether the description was always exact. However, the fathers' occupations as described are believed to hold sufficient interest to be presented:

	Number of boys		Number of boys
Total.....	623	Molders (metal).....	5
Laborers.....	159	Stationary engineers.....	5
Operatives.....	57	Personal and domestic service not otherwise specified.....	4
Retail dealers.....	25	Hotel and restaurant keepers.....	3
Managers, foremen, or owners of business.....	20	Fishermen and oystermen.....	3
Farm owners.....	19	Blacksmiths.....	3
Carpenters.....	16	Plumbers, gas and steam fitters..	3
Painters and glaziers.....	12	Janitors.....	3
Railroad-transportation employ- ees.....	11	Builders and building contractors..	2
Truck drivers or draymen.....	10	Clerical workers.....	2
Machinists.....	9	Paper hangers.....	2
Brick and stone masons.....	8	Professional service.....	2
Salesmen and agents.....	7	Boiler maker.....	1
Bakers.....	6	Other occupations.....	23
Mechanics.....	6	Occupation not reported.....	30
Barbers.....	6	Father not working.....	8
Firemen (not locomotive or fire department).....	5	Father dead or away from home..	148

Home conditions

Sufficient description of the conditions in the homes of 533 of the boys at the time of their first commitment to the institution was obtained to permit classification under the ratings Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor. The home conditions were rated mainly on the basis of the physical features, as follows:

An excellent home was defined as a house, flat, or apartment that was exceptionally comfortable, roomy, well lighted and ventilated, adequately furnished, and equipped with many modern conveniences. It was clean, orderly, and well kept, with a yard and garden or some space for outdoor play. Recreation facilities for children in the home were ample, with some evidence of ability to afford cultural opportunities.

The homes rated good consisted of ordinarily comfortable houses, flats, or apartments, moderately well furnished, well lighted and ventilated, clean and orderly, and not crowded. Such a home had some recreation facilities for children, and there was some evidence of ability to afford reasonable expenditures for pleasure.

A fair home was defined as somewhat crowded, shabbily furnished, poorly lighted and ventilated, not very clean and orderly, and drab

and unattractive. There were very few if any opportunities for recreation, and little or no expenditure for pleasure was possible.

Homes rated poor were those in badly crowded quarters that were dark, relatively airless, wretchedly furnished, usually dirty, disorderly, and neglected. Such homes had no facilities for recreation for the children and were characterized by poverty that obviously required serious scrimping to meet the barest needs.

Only 16 of these 533 boys had lived in excellent homes and only 91 in good homes; 209 came from fair homes and 217 from homes rated poor. The distribution of the different classes of homes was fairly uniform for the five States. The figures for the total group are given in the following list;

	<i>Number of boys</i>	<i>Percent distribution</i>
Total.....	623	-----
Home conditions reported.....	533	100
Excellent.....	16	3
Good.....	91	17
Fair.....	209	39
Poor.....	217	41
Home conditions not reported.....	90	-----

It would be valuable to know what percentage of all homes in the areas from which these boys came would be rated poor by the same rating method as was used for these cases. If it may be assumed, as these cases would indicate, that home conditions have close connection with juvenile delinquency, programs for the prevention of delinquency cannot afford to overlook the importance of efforts to improve home conditions in the areas in which they are operating, nor can social agencies escape an obligation with respect to improvement in home conditions while the boys are in the institution.

Family standards

Information on family standards, which was sought with respect to characteristics other than material or physical, was obtained in 554 cases. The ratings used were Good, Mediocre, and Poor. Rating involved especial consideration of the following items:

Family relationships and spirit; whether there was a harmonious atmosphere in the home, whether there were evidences of affection or antagonism, whether members of the family displayed consideration and courtesy, whether there was a great deal of nagging and quarreling.

The amount and character of parental supervision; whether there was evidence of parental neglect or of indifference, ignorance, over-indulgence, excessive solicitude, or wholesome efforts at guidance and control.

Ethical attitudes; whether the family seemed to be characterized by integrity, honesty, and fair play, or the opposite.

Character and conduct of the parents, older brothers and sisters, or other adults in the home; whether there was evidence of irregular sex relations, gambling, bootlegging, thieving, use of alcohol to excess, use of narcotics, profanity, and obscene language.

More than half of the 554 boys came from homes in which the family standards were rated as poor. Only 77 came from families of good standards. There was no significant variation among the groups from the five States. The following list shows the figures for the total group:

	<i>Number of boys</i>	<i>Percent distribution</i>
Total.....	623	-----
Family standards reported.....	554	100
Good.....	77	14
Mediocre.....	179	32
Poor.....	298	54
Family standards not reported.....	69	-----

The same comment may be made here as was made with respect to home conditions; that is, there is clear indication that an intelligent program for each of these boys would require intensive treatment of the family situation coincident with the attempt to help the boy himself through institutional training.

Contact with social agencies

Whether the boy's family had been in contact with social agencies other than the courts before he was committed to the institution was an item of interest the field agents sought to ascertain in every case. Of the 616 families in regard to which the information on this point was believed to be fairly complete, only 193 (31 percent) were reported to have been known to one or more such agencies prior to the boy's commitment. No indication of such contact was found for any others. Of course the information on this item was much more readily obtainable in the large cities, where the social agencies usually have complete records and where the existence of social-service exchanges facilitated the agents' work.

AGE OF THE BOYS AT TIME OF COMMITMENT

Table 8 shows the ages at commitment of the groups of boys from the five States, with the legal-age limits in each of these States. The difference in legal ages at which children may be committed caused a somewhat different grouping in the several States. The institutions in California, New Jersey, and Ohio received some boys under 12 years of age. New Jersey, with 20 percent under 12 at commitment, had a different problem in connection with treatment of this junior group. The median commitment age at all the institutions except in Ohio was about 14 years. Ohio had an older group, the median age being 15; its treatment problems were complicated by a fairly large number (29 percent) who were 16 and 17 years old when first committed.

TABLE 8.—*Legal age of commitment in each State and age of boy at commitment*

Age at commitment	Legal age of commitment				
	California, 8 years, under 17	Michigan, 12 years, under 17	New Jersey, 8 years, under 16	New York, 12 years, under 16	Ohio, 10 years, under 18
Total.....	123	122	124	128	126
7 years.....			1		
8 years.....			1		
9 years.....	1		7		
10 years.....	1		4		2
11 years.....	4		12		6
12 years.....	16	26	11	14	9
13 years.....	27	26	19	29	15
14 years.....	34	21	32	44	27
15 years.....	36	28	30	40	31
16 years.....	1	21	5	1	23
17 years.....	2		2		13
18 years.....	1				

SCHOOLING AND EMPLOYMENT

School grade completed

Table 9 shows the school grade last completed by these boys before commitment and their ages at commitment. Of the 586 boys for whom this information was obtained, only 65 had completed the eighth or a higher grade. Of the 570 whose last grade completed was one of the elementary grades, 206 were 15 years old or over, and 173 of these 206 had not completed the eighth grade.

There was very striking evidence of retardation.⁷ Of the 586 boys for whom last school grade completed prior to commitment was reported, at least three-fourths were retarded. Of the 521 boys who had not completed the elementary-school grades, approximately one-fifth were retarded 1 grade, one-fourth were retarded 2 grades, and one-third were retarded 3 or more grades. Only about one-sixth of these 521 boys had completed the grade normally to be expected.

TABLE 9.—*Age at commitment, and last school grade completed prior to commitment*

Age at commitment	Total boys		Last grade completed prior to commitment									
	Number	Percent distribution	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	Seventh	Eighth	Ninth or higher	Not reported
Total..	623	100	17	32	72	93	117	104	86	49	16	37
7 years.....	1	(¹)	1									
8 years.....	1	(¹)	1									
9 years.....	8	1	4	2					1			1
10 years.....	7	1	1	2		3		1				
11 years.....	22	4	4	7	6	3	1		1			
12 years.....	76	12	2	9	30	16	8	4	3			4
13 years.....	116	19	1	4	14	25	30	20	9	4	1	8
14 years.....	158	25		3	14	22	37	30	29	12	1	10
15 years.....	165	26	2	3	7	19	34	32	28	23	6	11
16 years.....	51	8	1	1		5	5	14	10	8	6	1
17 years.....	17	3			1		2	3	5	2	2	1
18 years.....	1	(¹)										1

¹ Less than 1 percent.

⁷ Based in general on the grade standard used by the U. S. Office of Education; a child of 9 years was considered retarded if he had completed only the first grade, a child of 10 years if he had completed only the second grade, and so on.

In their study of 1,000 juvenile delinquents in Boston, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck obtained information as to school retardation in 935 cases. According to the age-grade scale used in the Boston public schools only 145 (15.5 percent) of these boys were not retarded; 219 (23.4 percent) were retarded 1 year; 261 (27.9 percent), 2 years; and 228 (24.4 percent), 3 or more years; 82 (8.8 percent) were in ungraded classes, so that a precise retardation figure could not be calculated.⁸

Here is unmistakable evidence of the gravity of the problems in educational maladjustment which are found in cases of serious social conflict in juveniles. State institutions for juvenile delinquents are confronted with exceptionally difficult problems in education. The schools which the boys in this study had been required to attend in the communities from which they came had failed, in a very heavy proportion of the cases, to meet the boys' educational needs. There seems little doubt that these educational maladjustments are closely linked up with general social maladjustment and consequently with delinquency. It was impossible in this study to make an intensive analysis of these particular problems, but the findings reported suggest the urgent need of study and experimentation in an effort to discover these educational problems as soon as they make their appearance and to mold school curricula, teaching materials, and classroom methods into a flexible educational program that will give each child an opportunity to develop such abilities as he may have in a manner satisfying to him and to society.

Truancy prior to commitment

Records were available in 497 cases to show whether or not the boy had been a truant. Wherever possible, it was noted whether his truancy was habitual or merely occasional. It is striking that in only 77 (15 percent) of these 497 cases was no record of truancy found. Moreover, in only 59 cases (12 percent) was the truancy reported to be occasional, whereas in 297 cases (60 percent) it was habitual. In 64 cases (13 percent) the record showed truancy but failed to state whether it was occasional or habitual.

This large incidence of habitual truancy considered in connection with the school retardation shown in the preceding section lends additional weight to the suggestion that educational maladjustment may have been an important factor in connection with the boys' social conflicts and various consequent delinquencies. This makes it imperative that the educational program in the institution discover the needs of each boy and open to him opportunities consonant with his individual characteristics, abilities, and interests.

It is interesting to compare these truancy figures with those on certain other data. Table 10 shows truancy in relation to reason for commitment to the institution. Of the 497 boys for whom there was a report as to truancy, 420 had a truancy history prior to commitment to the institution, although only 63 were known to have been committed for this reason. Truancy is an important symptom that calls for intelligent study and recommendations for treatment as soon as it becomes apparent. Its manifestation probably has greater significance than is yet realized. Figures such as these for this group of boys lend additional weight to the evidence that truancy is a serious

⁸ One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 87.

problem and that it should be as useful a symptomatic warning in detecting the presence of social maladjustment as is fever in detecting physical illness.

TABLE 10.—*Truancy history prior to commitment to institution, and reason for commitment*

Reason for commitment	Total boys		Truancy prior to commitment			No truancy	No report as to truancy
	Number	Percent distribution	Habitual	Occasional	Amount not reported		
Total.....	623		297	59	64	77	126
Reason reported.....	621	100	297	59	64	77	124
Automobile stealing.....	47	8	21	8	3	8	7
Burglary or unlawful entry.....	150	24	62	9	18	18	43
Other stealing.....	205	33	80	24	24	35	42
Ungovernable.....	79	13	38	11	9	7	14
Truancy.....	63	10	59	1	3		
Running away.....	25	4	16	1	2		6
Sex offense.....	25	4	8	2	4	7	4
Act of carelessness or mischief.....	12	2	5	1		1	5
Injury to person.....	10	2	5	2	1		2
Other reason.....	5	1	3			1	1
Reason not reported.....	2						2

Neither home conditions nor family standards apparently affected the size of the truant group; 83 percent of the boys who came from good homes, 87 percent of those from fair homes, and 84 percent of those from poor homes were truants. Likewise, 84 percent of the group who came from homes in which the family standards were poor, 86 percent of those from homes in which the family standards were mediocre, and 83 percent of those from homes with good standards were truants. There seems to be slightly more relation between truancy and the character of the neighborhood. Whereas 75 percent of the boys from good neighborhoods had been truants, 87 percent of those from mediocre neighborhoods and 87 percent of those from bad ones had been on the truancy lists. The significance of these last figures cannot be determined from the data available. It may be the influence of associates in certain neighborhoods that results in truancy among groups of boys with common interests.

Employment prior to commitment

Information regarding the boys' employment history prior to commitment was extremely incomplete. Only 96 of the boys reported regular employment prior to commitment; 235 boys reported employment only after school hours. There was no evidence that 292 of the boys had ever been employed; these include boys who were never employed and boys for whom there was no report as to whether they had ever been employed. A number of the boys were under minimum age for employment specified by the laws in their respective States.

CONDUCT RECORD

Reason for commitment

The reason for commitment to the institutions was almost always ascertainable from the commitment papers on file at the institution. Occasionally these papers gave as the reason for commitment merely

that the boy was a juvenile delinquent. In such cases the reason for his having been so adjudged was determined by later consultation of the juvenile-court record, if possible; if a specific cause of commitment was revealed it was used in the statistical analysis.

Table 11 gives the data on reason for commitment in the five States, which are of interest because there is a certain variation among these groups. Although nearly two-thirds (65 percent) of the boys were committed because of stealing in some form or other, a far larger proportion in California than in some of the other States were committed for theft. California's commitments for truancy were correspondingly low as compared with those in other States. New Jersey and New York had a larger proportion of boys committed to the institution because they were ungovernable. (The percent distribution of types of offenses for the total group of boys has been given in tables 7 and 10, pp. 22 and 29.)

TABLE 11.—Reason for commitment to institution

Reason for commitment	Total boys	California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
Total.....	623	123	122	124	128	126
Automobile stealing.....	47	12	12	10	10	13
Burglary or unlawful entry.....	150	32	26	34	30	28
Other stealing.....	205	46	46	38	39	36
Ungovernable.....	79	12	13	23	20	11
Truancy.....	63	2	15	16	15	15
Running away.....	25	6	1	9	1	8
Sex offense.....	25	6	4	5	5	10
Act of carelessness or mischief.....	12	1	1	2	6	2
Injury to person.....	10	5	1	2	2	3
Other reason.....	5	1	2	1	1	3
Reason not reported.....	2	1	1	1	1	1

The figures on reason for commitment in relation to the character of the neighborhood, shown in table 12, reveal no great difference in the types of delinquency that resulted in commitment of the boys from good, mediocre, and bad neighborhoods. A rather high percentage of sex offenders came from good neighborhoods, although the total number of sex offenders was so small that the percentage is of questionable significance. On the other hand, there was a higher percentage of boys committed for truancy among the boys from bad neighborhoods than among those from good ones.

TABLE 12.—Reason for commitment, and character of neighborhood in which boy was living at time of commitment

Reason for commitment	Total boys	Character of neighborhood			
		Good	Mediocre	Bad	Not reported
Total.....	623	86	217	260	60
Automobile stealing.....	47	9	25	12	1
Burglary or unlawful entry.....	150	22	54	63	11
Other stealing.....	205	26	72	82	25
Ungovernable.....	79	13	20	34	12
Truancy.....	63	6	19	36	2
Running away.....	25	7	8	14	3
Sex offense.....	25	7	11	5	2
Act of carelessness or mischief.....	12	2	2	6	2
Injury to person.....	10	1	2	5	2
Other reason.....	5	1	3	2	1
Reason not reported.....	2	1	1	1	1

Comparison of the reason for commitment with the family standards reported at the time the boy was sent to the institution indicates that these standards had little relation to the type of offense the boy committed. Almost the same percentage of boys from families with good, mediocre, and poor standards were committed for theft of some kind. The percentage differences for most of the other commitment reasons are also slight. However, one item is again rather conspicuous; this is the relatively high proportion of sex offenders among the group which came from families with good standards (table 13).

TABLE 13.—Reason for commitment, and family standards at time of boy's commitment

Reason for commitment	Total boys	Family standards			
		Good	Mediocre	Poor	Not reported
Total.....	623	77	179	298	69
Automobile stealing.....	47	9	11	21	6
Burglary or unlawful entry.....	150	14	51	70	15
Other stealing.....	205	26	54	104	21
Ungovernable.....	79	10	18	38	13
Truancy.....	63	6	23	27	7
Running away.....	25	2	6	14	3
Sex offense.....	25	8	8	7	2
Act of carelessness or mischief.....	12	1	3	8	—
Injury to person.....	10	1	2	5	2
Other reason.....	5	—	2	3	—
Reason not reported.....	2	—	1	1	—

Whether a boy had committed an offense alone, with some one other boy, or as part of a small gang or group was learned in 413 cases; 142 boys (34 percent) were said to have committed their offense individually, 110 (27 percent) in company with another boy, and 161 (39 percent) as members of groups.

Age at first court appearance

The age at which the boy first was taken to court was reported in 585 cases. One boy had had his first court appearance under 7 years of age, 6 boys at the age of 7, 13 at the age of 8, and 43 at the age of 9. Thus 63 (about 11 percent) were under 10 years of age when first taken into court. The following list shows the ages of the boys at the time of their first court appearance on a delinquency charge:

	Number of boys	Percent distribution
Total.....	623	---
Age reported.....	585	100
6 years.....	1	(^o)
7 years.....	6	1
8 years.....	13	2
9 years.....	43	7
10 years.....	67	11
11 years.....	80	14
12 years.....	91	16
13 years.....	99	17
14 years.....	95	16
15 years.....	70	12
16 years.....	16	3
17 years.....	4	1
Age not reported.....	38	---

^oLess than 1 percent.

Only 90 boys (about 15 percent) had not appeared in court before they were 15 years old. Evidently the boys studied had for the most part come into open social conflict fairly early in life.

The percentages of boys from good homes with good family standards and in good neighborhoods who were brought into court under 12 years of age were noticeably lower than those of boys from poor homes with poor standards and in bad neighborhoods. As tables 14, 15, and 16 show, 26 percent of the boys from good homes as compared with 44 percent from poor homes, 24 percent of those from families with good standards as compared with 42 percent from families with poor standards, and 25 percent of those from good neighborhoods as compared with 45 percent from bad neighborhoods were brought into court before they were 12 years old.

TABLE 14.—Age at first appearance in court, and family standards at time of boy's commitment to institution

Age at first appearance in court	Total boys		Family standards						Not reported
	Number	Percent distribution	Good		Mediocre		Poor		
			Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623	-----	77	-----	179	-----	298	-----	69
Age reported.....	585	100	75	100	164	100	281	100	65
Under 12 years.....	210	36	18	24	52	32	119	42	21
12 years, under 14.....	190	32	26	35	50	30	87	31	27
14 years, under 16.....	165	28	25	33	53	32	71	25	16
16 years, under 18.....	20	3	6	8	9	5	4	1	1
Age not reported.....	38	-----	2	-----	15	-----	17	-----	4

TABLE 15.—Age at first appearance in court, and home conditions at time of boy's commitment to institution

Age at first appearance in court	Total boys	Home conditions						Not reported
		Good ¹		Fair		Poor		
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623	107	-----	209	-----	217	-----	90
Age reported.....	585	101	100	190	100	209	100	85
Under 12 years.....	210	26	26	58	31	93	44	33
12 years, under 14.....	190	36	36	66	35	61	29	27
14 years, under 16.....	165	30	30	60	32	50	24	25
16 years, under 18.....	20	9	9	6	3	5	2	-----
Age not reported.....	38	6	-----	19	-----	8	-----	5

¹ Includes 16 cases in which home conditions were reported as excellent.

TABLE 16.—Age at first appearance in court, and character of neighborhood in which boy was living at time of commitment to institution

Age at first appearance in court	Total boys	Character of neighborhood						Not reported
		Good		Mediocre		Bad		
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623	86	-----	217	-----	260	-----	60
Age reported.....	585	81	100	205	100	243	100	56
Under 12 years.....	210	20	25	61	30	109	45	20
12 years, under 14.....	190	30	37	70	34	73	30	17
14 years, under 16.....	165	23	28	68	33	55	23	19
16 years, under 18.....	20	8	10	6	3	6	2	-----
Age not reported.....	38	5	-----	12	-----	17	-----	4

Obviously the fact that fewer boys from families maintaining relatively high standards than from families with low standards are brought to court at a very early age does not mean that boys from good homes do not commit delinquencies so young. Probably they are guilty of delinquencies, but the parents in those good homes hope and believe that they can deal successfully with the problems, so they make no appeal to the juvenile court or to other public authority for help. They live under such circumstances that complaint is much less likely to be made directly to the court from other sources. These facts lend strong support to the current belief in the urgent necessity that the first symptoms of maladjustment be recognized, that each case be studied at that time, and that the community provide the resources to carry out recommendations for social treatment based on very careful analysis of the child's problems.

Delinquency prior to commitment

Table 17 presents separately for the 5 institutional groups the information obtained on delinquencies reported prior to the case that resulted in commitment to the State institution. Information of this kind was obtained in 614 cases. Of these boys only 142 (23 percent) had no delinquency record prior to the case resulting in commitment. The rest had appeared before the court once or oftener, and as many as 100 (16 percent) had appeared 4 or more times previously.

TABLE 17.—Number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment to institution

Number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Number of appearances reported.....	614	100	118	121	122	127	126
None.....	142	23	31	32	22	19	38
1.....	165	27	38	39	29	32	27
2.....	118	19	20	21	31	26	20
3.....	89	14	11	21	22	13	22
4 or more.....	100	16	18	8	18	37	19
Number of appearances not reported.....	9	-----	5	1	2	1	-----

In New York as compared with some of the other States—for example, Ohio—a considerably smaller percentage had been committed to the institution without any prior delinquency record and a very much higher percentage had appeared in court four or more times before they were finally committed to the institution. New Jersey also seems to have resorted to institutional commitment the first time a delinquency charge was filed in relatively fewer instances than some of the other States.

It proved difficult to obtain very full or reliable information as to the types of treatment that had been undertaken in connection with the court action on prior delinquencies; the meagerness of some juvenile-court records has already been mentioned. For that reason the statements offered here as to treatment prior to commitment must be regarded as merely a rough outline of the whole picture. It was reported that 350 of the boys had been placed on probation for periods ranging from less than a month to more than 2 years; 215 had not been placed on probation, according to the records; and in 58 cases there was no report as to whether or not probation had been used. The number of times they had been placed on probation prior to commitment was ascertained for all but 10 of the 350 boys known to have been on probation. Of these 340 boys 182 had been on probation once and 99 twice; 59 had been on probation 3 or more times.

Very little could be learned as to treatment plans made and carried out for these boys. It was not always possible to tell from the records whether or not the boy had been left in his own home nor, if he remained at home, what effort the probation officer made to improve the situation in that home. If specific plans for probationary treatment had been made, record data were not available in such form as to make analysis possible. The general impression received was that probation consisted almost entirely of "giving the boy another chance" in his own home, no matter what the character of that home was.

Almost the only data in addition to those on the use of probation were reports showing whether foster homes had been used and whether the boy had been in other institutions prior to commitment. Of the 607 boys for whom some notation indicated whether or not there had been placement in foster homes, only 47 (8 percent) had been in foster homes. Of the 617 boys for whom there was a report as to care in a noncorrectional institution 528 (86 percent) had no record of such care and 81 (13 percent) had been in institutions for dependents; 1 had been in an institution for the feeble-minded, and 7 had been in other institutions of various types.

Whether the boy had been in a correctional institution prior to commitment to the State institution for delinquents was learned in 621 cases. Of these boys 535 (86 percent) had no record of care in any other institution for delinquents, 65 (10 percent) had been in another such institution once and 14 (2 percent) twice; 1 boy had a record of at least three times. Six boys had been in other institutions for delinquents, but the number of times was not reported.

The figures revealing the precommitment recidivism of a large percentage of boys who had been sent to these State institutions for treatment seem to support the claim of institution authorities that the usual procedure is to try everything else first in a hit-and-miss manner, and then to send to the institution only those boys with

whom the community has failed. Many staff members in institutions feel that they could do considerably more for the boys if they could have them before they become confirmed in bad habits and distorted in personality.

Comparison of the figures on precommitment recidivism with the ratings on home conditions, family standards, and the character of the neighborhood shows nothing of great interest. The same proportions of boys from good or excellent and from poor homes (24 percent) and a slightly smaller proportion (19 percent) from fair homes had been committed to the institution on their first appearance in court. Twenty-nine percent of the boys from families with good standards had been committed on their first court appearance, 24 percent of those from families with poor standards, and 19 percent of those from families with mediocre standards. Lastly, 29 percent of the boys from good neighborhoods had been committed on first court appearance, and 20 percent of those from bad and from mediocre neighborhoods.

SUMMARY

1. The group studied contained comparatively few boys from farm homes and from communities of less than 2,500 population. Most of these boys came from large cities, the smaller towns and cities contributing very much the same proportion as the rural areas.

2. There were a few Negroes among the boys. The number of boys of foreign parentage exceeded that of boys with native-born parents. There was no appreciable difference in the types of offense that brought about commitment of boys with foreign-born and with native parents, but more sons of foreign-born than of native parents were brought to court before they reached the age of 12. These facts are probably related to a weakening of parental control in the conflict of social customs and ideals between the foreign-born parents and their sons trained in American public schools.

3. Half of the boys for whom data on the subject had been obtained came from homes that had been broken by the death of one or both parents or by divorce, separation, or desertion. This is a considerably higher incidence of broken homes than is believed to exist in the general population.

4. More than half of these boys came from comparatively large families; that is, families in which there were five or more living brothers and sisters.

5. Forty-one percent of the 533 boys for whom data on this item were obtained came from homes characterized by poverty and bad physical conditions; 54 percent of the 554 for whom standards were ascertained came from families whose standards were poor; and 46 percent of the 563 for whom data had been obtained on this point had been living in neighborhoods in which they had been exposed to a variety of destructive influences.

6. School retardation was an outstanding characteristic of the group. Of the 586 boys for whom last school grade completed prior to commitment was reported, at least three-fourths were retarded. Only about one-sixth of the 521 boys who had not finished the elementary-school grades had completed the grade normally to be expected.

7. Truancy had appeared in the history of 85 percent of the 497 boys for whom the data were available, these records showing habitual rather than occasional truancy in 60 percent of the cases. This is an extremely high incidence of truancy as compared with that of the general school population.

8. In 11 percent of the cases for which such information was available the boys had had their first court appearance before they were 10 years of age. An additional 25 percent came into court when they were 10 but still under 12. Only 15 percent had not appeared in court before they were 15. Apparently, therefore, the maladjustment had been recognized at a fairly early age in a large percentage of these cases, but such treatment as had been applied in the community had failed or the boy had been committed immediately.

9. Nearly two-thirds of these boys were committed to the institution primarily because of stealing in some form or other.

10. Of the boys in whose cases pertinent information was available, 23 percent were committed to the institution the first time they appeared in court. All the others had at least one prior court record, and 16 percent appeared in court four or more times in delinquency cases prior to commitment.

11. Data regarding efforts to help the boy to make a satisfactory adjustment in his own community without committing him to a State institution were deplorably scanty, consisting almost entirely of mere information as to whether a boy had been placed on probation and whether he had been in other institutions or in foster homes. It was ascertained that 350 boys had been placed on probation for varying periods prior to their commitment to the institution and that 158 of them had been on probation more than once. Only 8 percent of the boys had been in foster homes. Thirteen percent had been in institutions for dependents, and 14 percent had been in other institutions for delinquents prior to commitment to the State institution.

Chapter IV.—INSTITUTIONAL TREATMENT

EXTENT OF THE DATA OBTAINED

For the purposes of this study an analysis of the institutional treatment as well as of the characteristics of the boys is essential. Unfortunately, such facts as would contribute to a knowledge of the methods of treatment had been very incompletely and inadequately recorded during the period in which these boys were in the institutions. At that time no great headway had been gained by the movement to study the individual delinquent and to keep a case record which would contain a description of his needs, of the treatment plan worked out for him, and of the modifications of that plan which were found desirable. Such data as could be obtained were supplemented to some extent by checking up with the boys themselves, with the institutional personnel, and with parole officers to correct any misinformation—also to get additional information, which was used whenever the field agents thought it reliable. All that could be obtained which seemed fairly complete and dependable was certain information on school attendance, assignments to trade training and to work, misconduct, and the length of time the boys remained under institutional care. Reports on psychological tests were available for some of the boys, and this information is included although it is not complete. The inadequacy of the data obviously prevents more than superficial analysis of the treatment; they are not sufficient to permit much exploration of the relation between different phases of the treatment program and the subsequent histories of the boys. Consequently, the study is less useful than it would be if more could have been learned regarding each boy's experiences in the institution.

Concerning the human relationships so important in the training period there was practically no information. As a matter of fact, no methods by which the relations between staff members and boys or among the boys themselves can be evaluated have been devised; yet it is certain that they weigh heavily in influencing individual boys toward different types of conduct. Some unexpected successes are found among boys who on the basis of their histories had seemed marked for failure. In other cases in which there seemed to be reason to hope for success the boys failed to make the anticipated adjustment. There is no way of knowing to what extent these unexpected failures and unexpected successes were due to personal influences or to incidents that went unnoticed at the time but that left deep and lasting effects on the boys' personalities.

PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS

Psychological testing had been introduced into all the institutions some time before these boys were under care or during their stay, but not all boys in all of them were given tests. In California the State

bureau of juvenile research had been making psychological tests quite generally, with the result that records of them were found for 122 of the 123 California boys. New York reported the next largest group tested—86 of the 128 boys from that institution. New Jersey had records for only 58 of the 124 included in the study, Michigan for 50 of the 122. Ohio had reports of only 8 such examinations. Additional boys were examined in all the institutions except in California, but no record of these examinations was obtained. The records frequently failed to show what tests had been given, but the form most commonly in use at that time was the Stanford revision of the Binet-Simon test.

There is considerable question as to just how much meaning should be attached to the intelligence quotients which were recorded in these early psychological tests. Doubtless they have some value if the rating is not accepted too literally as indicating the boy's mental level. Among the 321 boys whose intelligence quotient was in the institutional records there were, as table 18 shows, only 27 (8 percent) with intelligence quotients of 100 or higher, whereas 65 (20 percent) fell below 70; 80 boys (25 percent) were border-line cases, with intelligence quotients of 70 or higher but below 80, a group in which mental deficiency is suspected; and 85 (26 percent) were rated 80 but below 90, thus falling in the class usually designated dull normal. The remaining 64 (20 percent) had quotients of 90 to 100, which are generally considered to indicate average intelligence. Even though these figures must be interpreted cautiously, there surely is evidence here that mental defectives, also boys who were dull or slow-witted, were in these institutions in greater proportions than probably are to be found in the general population.

TABLE 18.—*Intelligence quotients as given in institution records*

Intelligence quotient	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Intelligence quotient reported.....	321	100	122	50	58	86	5
Less than 60.....	10	3	1	1	4	4	-----
60, less than 70.....	55	17	17	9	12	15	2
70, less than 80.....	80	25	30	12	17	20	1
80, less than 90.....	85	26	36	14	13	21	1
90, less than 100.....	64	20	27	11	8	17	1
100, less than 110.....	20	6	8	2	2	8	-----
110 or more.....	7	2	3	1	2	1	-----
Intelligence quotient not reported.....	72	-----	-----	15	53	1	3
No examination.....	219	-----	-----	55	11	35	118
No report as to examination.....	11	-----	1	2	2	6	-----

When the psychological tests first began to be used in institutions for delinquents, they were counted on to help single out any individuals whose mental status was so low that obviously they could not benefit by training planned for normal boys. It was the hope of the institution staffs that with this reasonably definite mental measurement to offer in evidence they could eliminate most of the definitely feeble-minded from the populations of these institutions. Probably

very little other use was made of the findings at first. Then they began to be used in connection with the making of school assignments and the planning of vocational-training programs in individual cases. As the boys in this study were under care during the early stages of the use of psychological tests in institutions, no doubt considerable experimentation was going on. New and better tests have been devised, and standards for interpretation of test results have been greatly modified and improved as basic material has become available in greater quantity. Therefore it cannot be assumed that these early tests are comparable to those now being given in the institutions, and the limited use made of them is even less comparable to their present extensive use in some institutions in planning individualized treatment.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

Records to show whether the boy attended school while in the institution were available in 587 cases. From these records it usually was possible to discover whether the boy attended school during his entire stay, being enrolled for all day or half the day according to the institution's program and its system of combining work and vocational training. Although 85 percent of these 587 boys were enrolled in school, only 45 percent were reported as having been in school during the entire time they were in the institution, and 15 percent did not attend school at all. Table 19 gives the detail for the whole group and for the several States.

TABLE 19.—School attendance in institution

School attendance	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Report as to attendance.....	587	100	95	119	122	127	124
Entire time in institution.....	266	45	1	57	33	92	83
Part of time in institution.....	139	24	19	26	36	30	28
Attended, time not reported.....	96	16	70	11	10	5	-----
No attendance.....	86	15	5	25	43	-----	13
No report as to attendance.....	36	-----	28	3	2	1	2

The institutions varied in the amount of academic schooling required. For example, all but one of the boys selected for study from the New York institution were reported to have attended school and 72 percent of them were in school during their entire stay, whereas only 65 percent of the New Jersey boys were reported to have attended school and only 27 percent were known to have been in school during their entire institutional stay. The information for the California boys was less complete; there was a record as to attendance for 95 of the 123 boys, and 90 had attended school; no report as to time was available for 70 of these boys.

Figures of this kind focus attention on the general problem of compulsory school attendance as it concerns boys in institutions. The question immediately arises whether the institution is following the

best plan for all its boys if a large proportion of them are permitted to withdraw from school as soon as they have completed the legal requirements for school attendance. Some institutions make an effort to meet the needs of certain boys who obviously should not be deprived of an opportunity for education beyond that which satisfies the State law. On the other hand, there seem to be in the institutions some boys whose capacity to profit by education beyond the State minimum requirement may need careful consideration. The development of guidance work to a far greater extent than at present would seem highly advisable. Although some advance has been made along this line since these particular boys were in the institutions, much ground still remains to be covered.

No study can be quoted to support a contention that all boys of the ages and mental levels of these boys would benefit by continuous attendance at academic classes in the average conventional school. In order to justify deductions from the material at hand, it would be necessary to know very much more about the characteristics of the boys who did not attend school and very much more than could possibly be learned about the curricula and the methods of teaching in use at that time. Since the last of these boys was released from the institutions studied, many changes have been made in the school programs in an effort to meet the widely differing needs of the individual boys. This is especially true of the New Jersey institution, where curricula have been enriched and the teaching methods and materials have been greatly diversified in recent years. Consequently the facts here presented are useful only as showing to what extent the boys included in this study were required to attend academic classes.

TRADE TRAINING AND WORK

Trade-training assignments

In a trade assignment, as distinguished for the purposes of this study from a work assignment, a boy was presumed to have opportunity to learn something about a particular trade and its commonly used tools and materials, also to acquire some skill in working with them. Most of the trade assignments were so closely connected with maintenance work that the line had to be drawn more or less arbitrarily between those showing more of the work aspect than of the training aspect and those offering enough opportunity for training to justify calling them trade instruction. Furthermore, the information that could be obtained as to character and amount of the training given to the boys in these institutions was so meager that close analysis is almost impossible.

The records of 423 boys contained sufficient detail as to trade training to indicate the several types of trade assignments and the number of boys assigned to each particular trade for the major portion of their institutional experience. The most frequent type was general farm work, tailoring was next, and printing and binding third. If to the boys engaged in general farm work are added those assigned to the dairy and dairy farm, the truck farm, and horticulture, it would seem that about a third of these boys spent most of their institutional life in agricultural training.

The length of time a boy remained in any one training course was ascertained in 386 cases. Of these boys 5 (1 percent) spent less than

a month in their longest assignment, 13 (3 percent) spent a month or more but less than 3 months, 34 (9 percent) spent 3 months but less than 6, 120 (31 percent) spent 6 months but less than a year, 139 (36 percent) spent a year but less than 18 months, 40 (10 percent) spent 18 months but less than 2 years, and 35 (9 percent) spent 2 years or more (table 20).

TABLE 20.—Type of longest trade assignment, and longest time spent in this assignment while in institution

Type of longest trade assignment	Total boys	Longest time spent in assignment					Not reported	No assignment or no report as to assignment
		Less than 6 months	6 months, less than 12	12 months, less than 18	18 months, less than 24	24 months or more		
Total.....	623	52	120	139	40	35	61	176
Agriculture:								
General farm.....	90	8	19	38	10	9	6	
Dairy and dairy farm.....	18	1	7	2	5	2	1	
Truck farm.....	16	1	7	5		2	1	
Horticulture.....	7	3	3	1				
Tailor.....	42	6	12	13	5	4	2	
Printing and binding.....	38	4	15	6	5	3	5	
Laundry.....	36	6	9	10	6	2	3	
Carpentry.....	30	8	6	6	1	2	7	
Band.....	26	1	9	10	2	3	1	
Bakery.....	22	2	4	9	2	3	2	
Shoemaking.....	22	2	7	8	1	2	2	
Painting.....	19	2	3	8	2	1	2	
Power plant.....	11	2	4	5			3	
Blacksmith.....	10		3	6				1
Machine shop.....	9	1	4	3				1
Barber.....	7	4	1	1				1
Mason.....	7			6		1		
Plumbing.....	6		2	1	1	1	1	
Electrical work.....	3		2	1				
Butcher.....	2	1	1					
Automobile mechanics.....	1		1					
Sheet-metal work.....	1		1					
Type of assignment not reported.....	24						24	
No assignment.....	172							172
No report as to assignment.....	4							4

Although the case schedules show that these boys were given various kinds of trade training and had many varying combinations of assignments, no tabulation was made to show the periods because the number of boys for each of the many combinations was so small that no usable data would be obtained. However, it may be noted that relatively many boys were assigned to farm work and those so assigned spent long periods in it, although only 6 percent of them had come from farm homes and might be expected to live and work in rural areas after release. (See p. 18.) Furthermore, only one institution placed great emphasis on farm placement for boys on release (see p. 54), and evidently such placement was by no means satisfactory to a great number of the boys, as they remained on the farms a very short time. The field agents had the impression that when boys left these farms nothing much was done about it, that such placements provided an easy solution for the problem of first placement on parole when the boy's own home was so obviously deleterious as to make his return to it liable to severe criticism.

However, it is not the first few days of placement that count, but the long and difficult months following release, in which adjustment to a new way of living and a new kind of work must be made. As has been pointed out, a fairly large proportion of boys spent most of their so-called "training period" in the tailor shops, where much work connected with institution maintenance usually is done; and the laundries, also closely associated with maintenance, gave occupation over long periods of time to a relatively large number of boys—next largest after the group assigned to printing. As more than half the boys apparently remained in some one assignment comparatively steadily they should have had opportunity to gain considerable knowledge of the trade and to acquire at least a beginner's skill in it, if it was a well-planned and well-operated course. If, however, it was work in which a boy had no personal interest and which he definitely disliked, such training would be likely to be of little or no use to him when he was released from the compulsion to do it; therefore it would be in no way contributory to social adjustment after leaving the institution. As a matter of fact, the trade training received by these boys appeared to be determined largely by the institutional needs, the amount of work to be done, and the opportunities for practice work thus afforded. The training did not consist primarily of instruction based on study of the boys' individual abilities, aptitudes, interests, and probable opportunities for employment on release. (For the relation between institutional trade training and later employment adjustment, see p. 103.)

Whether the boys received only one type of training or several types during their entire institutional stay was of interest as indicating the extent of reassignment. As has been shown, 172 boys had no trade assignments. Of the 447 boys who had some trade training, 311 (70 percent) remained in 1 assignment, 108 (24 percent) had 2 assignments, 22 (5 percent) had 3, and 6 (1 percent) had 4. Obviously there was not a great deal of reassignment.

No comparable data are available to indicate whether, under the more individualized study and treatment now in vogue in some of these institutions, more changes in trade assignment result from careful follow-up of a boy to see whether the original assignment proves satisfactory and suitable.

It is generally believed that better results may be expected from a program that is kept extremely flexible, so that if the first plan made for the boy does not meet his needs there will be no difficulty in making an adjustment. There are serious questions as to just what will most benefit the individual boy. These will have to be studied by the institutions in the light of present-day industrial developments. It has been suggested that the person who becomes extremely proficient in one line of work but knows nothing about anything else is not so well off today as the person who has attained a reasonable degree of skill in several different lines. If that is true, then vocational-training programs need to take account of it and to make use of it, not only in connection with their plans for particular boys, but in connection with their guidance work in shaping a boy's own thinking in relation to his employment future.

Work assignments

Work assignments were reported for 367 boys; for 251 there were no such assignments. The duties to which the most boys were assigned among the 340 for whom the type of work was reported were housework, then dining-room service, then miscellaneous chores. The types of longest work assignment so far as they were ascertained are shown in the following list:

	Number of boys		Number of boys
Total.....	623	Storeroom work.....	8
Housework.....	95	Cooking.....	5
Dining-room service.....	55	Teamster.....	5
Miscellaneous chores.....	52	Barn work.....	3
General force.....	31	Helping on truck.....	3
Kitchen work.....	26	Ironing room.....	2
Mending and sewing.....	25	Miscellaneous work.....	4
Hospital service.....	10	Type of work not reported.....	27
Office work.....	8	No assignment.....	251
Preparing fruit and vegetables.....	8	No report as to assignment.....	5

Information on these assignments is believed to be none too exact; nevertheless it gives some idea as to the way in which many of the boys spent a good deal of their time in the institution.

Some information was available as to the length of work assignments of 311 boys. Seven (2 percent) spent less than 1 month in any work assignment, 33 (11 percent) spent 1 month but less than 3, 43 (14 percent) spent 3 months but less than 6, 99 (32 percent) spent 6 months but less than 12, 83 (27 percent) spent 12 months but less than 18, 22 (7 percent) spent 18 months but less than 2 years, and 24 (8 percent) had the same kind of work 2 years or more.

As was noted in case of the trade assignments, there was comparatively little transfer from one work assignment to another. Of 366 boys who had work assignments and for whom the number of such assignments was reported, 228 (62 percent) had but 1 work assignment during the entire institutional stay, 92 (25 percent) had 2 assignments, 36 (10 percent) had 3, 7 (2 percent) had 4, and 3 (1 percent) had 5 or more. In 1 case there was no report as to the number of such assignments; in 251 cases (41 percent) there was no work assignment, as has been stated; and for 5 boys there was no report.

CONDUCT RECORD

How a boy behaved while in the institution and what disciplinary action was taken when he misbehaved would seem to be important items in considering his institutional treatment. Unfortunately the records on this subject were found to be incomplete in many regards; those in the Michigan and New Jersey institutions were especially meager. Despite their inadequacies, the information that was obtained is here presented. The records of only 55 boys showed no misconduct for which they had been formally disciplined. Of the 371 boys whose conduct reports showed some misconduct the most common offenses reported were insubordination, escape, stealing,

and sex offense. These occurred both alone and in various combinations, as is shown in the following list:

	Number of boys		Number of boys
Total.....	623	Insubordination, sex offense, and stealing.....	6
Insubordination.....	96	Escape, insubordination, and stealing.....	5
Escape.....	57	Sex offense and stealing.....	4
Insubordination and stealing.....	25	Insubordination, escape, sex offense, and stealing.....	3
Stealing.....	24	Misconduct of other type ¹	85
Escape and insubordination.....	15	No misconduct.....	55
Sex offense.....	13	No report as to misconduct.....	197
Insubordination and sex offense.....	13		
Escape and sex offense.....	11		
Escape and stealing.....	7		
Escape, insubordination, and sex offense.....	7		

Another item of some interest is the number of times a boy got into such difficulty in the institution that he was subjected to formal discipline of which a record was made. The common term for formal disciplinary action in most of the institutions was "penalized for misconduct." Even the more progressive institutions still use much of the old-time terminology, speaking frequently of "penalties", and in some ways this is not really objectionable. Back of it sometimes lies not the idea of punishment in the sense of revenge because a rule has been broken or the dignity of some officer has been offended but rather the philosophy that in social living the individual has a responsibility, and that when he is unfaithful to that responsibility he must sacrifice something in payment for his failure.

Of the 433 boys for whom the information was available 371 (86 percent) had been disciplined for misconduct and 62 (14 percent) had not. Of the 330 boys disciplined for whom the number of times was reported, almost two-thirds had been disciplined as many as 3 times and more than one-sixth had been disciplined 10 or more times.

The number of times a boy was disciplined seemed to have very little relation to precommitment recidivism. Reports were available for 427 boys as to discipline for misconduct in the institution and as to the number of times each had appeared in court prior to the case that resulted in commitment. Of the boys who appeared in court at the time of commitment only, 87 percent had been disciplined by the institution—31 percent as many as six times; only 13 percent had not been disciplined. Of those who appeared in court twice or oftener before commitment to the institution, 86 percent had been disciplined—30 percent as many as 6 times; 14 percent had not been disciplined (table 21).

¹ These included a variety of offenses, the most frequent being smoking and the possession of forbidden articles.

TABLE 21.—Number of times boy was disciplined while in institution and number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment to institution

Number of times boy was disciplined while in institution	Total boys		Number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment			
	Number	Percent distribution	None	1	2 or more	Not reported
Total.....	623	-----	142	165	307	9
Report as to discipline.....	433	100	94	113	220	6
Once.....	79	18	18	21	37	3
Twice.....	43	10	9	15	18	1
3 to 5 times.....	85	20	21	22	42	-----
6 to 10 times.....	65	15	18	17	30	-----
More than 10 times.....	58	13	11	9	37	1
Number of times not reported.....	41	9	5	10	26	-----
Not disciplined.....	62	14	12	19	30	1
No report as to discipline.....	190	-----	48	52	87	3

The types of misbehavior for which the Negro boys were disciplined were similar to those reported for the white boys, although insubordination seemed to appear especially frequently; the records for 10 of the 30 Negro boys for whom records on conduct were available showed insubordination, and that of 11 others showed insubordination together with one or more offenses of other types. Only 1 of these 30 Negro boys maintained an absolutely clear conduct record during his entire institutional stay.

Whether the white boys were of foreign or of native parentage likewise seemed to make no great difference with respect to the maintenance of a clear conduct record. Of the 147 sons of native parents for whom there were reports on conduct, only 19 (13 percent) had no misconduct reported; and of the 184 sons of foreign-born parents for whom there were such reports, only 27 (15 percent) had no record of misconduct. Their offenses ranged through the whole gamut of misbehavior and combinations of types of misconduct shown on page 44 for the total number for whom the data were available, insubordination appearing frequently, both alone and in combination with other offenses.

Whether the boys came from homes in which good or poor standards had prevailed seems to have made surprisingly little difference, so far as their conduct in the institution was concerned. Of the 210 from homes with poor standards for whom data on conduct were available 89 percent had a record of misconduct while in the institution, but 90 percent of the 52 boys from homes with good standards for whom such reports were available had misconduct records. Although comparison of data on conduct with the character of the neighborhood at the time of the boys' commitment showed a slightly greater difference in the percentage of boys from bad and good neighborhoods with records of misconduct at the institution, the difference is still too small to be significant. Of 177 boys from bad neighborhoods for whom institution records were available 86 percent had

misconduct records, and of the 63 from good neighborhoods 81 percent had such records.

TOTAL TIME SPENT IN THE INSTITUTION

Table 22 shows for the total group studied and for the several State groups the length of time the boys spent in the institution, as computed by adding to each boy's stay from first commitment to first parole any time he spent in the institution as a result of return from parole. The median for the whole group is slightly less than 2 years.

There was considerable variation among the institutions, Michigan and Ohio giving much shorter training; 42 and 43 percent, respectively, of their boys spent less than a year in the institution. California, on the other hand, had kept 72 percent of them 2 years or more. There is some difference of opinion among institutional executives as to whether a long or a relatively short period of training is most effective. With the increasing emphasis on individualization of treatment there probably will be less tendency to regard any arbitrary length of training as of maximum or minimum benefit, unless future study of boys under highly individualized treatment shows some specified period of training to be best.

TABLE 22.—*Total time spent in institution*

Total time spent in institution	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	100	123	122	124	128	126
Less than 1 year.....	126	20	-----	51	11	10	54
1 year, less than 2.....	301	48	35	51	66	97	52
2 years, less than 3.....	146	23	78	19	24	14	11
3 years or more.....	50	8	10	1	23	7	9

SUMMARY

1. Some sort of psychological test was given to 393 of the boys while they were in the institutions. The records contained intelligence quotients for 321 of them. Of these 20 percent fell below 70, which usually leads to classification as mental defective, and 25 percent were border-line cases, with intelligence quotient of 70 but below 80. Only 8 percent had an intelligence quotient of 100 or higher.

2. Institutional school records were not available in such form as to permit analysis of the boys' experience or progress in academic education. In 587 cases the records showed whether or not the boy had attended school while in the institution; 85 percent attended school, although only 45 percent were in school during their entire institutional stay. In view of the evidence presented in the preceding chapter relating to educational maladjustments prior to commitment it is to be regretted that more data could not be obtained to show in what specific way the institutions attempted to meet these pressing problems.

3. Of the 619 boys whose records yielded data on the point, 172 (28 percent) were not assigned to any so-called "trade" during the train-

ing period. In 386 cases for which data as to length of trade-training period were available, the largest groups were those whose longest time in **any one** trade course fell between 6 months and 1 year, and 1 year and 18 months. There was considerable variation in this respect among the **five** institutions.

Among the types of training the agricultural activities led, as 29 percent of the 447 boys who were reported as having trade assignments were assigned to the dairy, the garden, or general farm work—although only 6 percent of the boys had been living on farms before their commitment and might be expected to live and work in rural areas after release. The next largest group was assigned to the tailor shop, with the print shop and laundry next. Considered against the background of the narrative in the schedules, the figures offer convincing testimony to the fact that at the time these boys were under care major emphasis was placed on maintenance and production for the institution. The training was determined largely by the character and extent of the institutional needs, with such opportunity for practice work as this afforded, rather than by study of the individual boy's abilities, aptitudes, interests, and probable opportunities for employment on release.

4. A number of boys spent long periods in work assignments, such as housework, dining-room and kitchen service, and miscellaneous chores, that offer little or no opportunity for acquiring trade skills and hold little interest for boys.

5. Reports on formal discipline for misconduct were available for 433 boys. Of that number only 62 (14 percent) had maintained a clean conduct record. The remaining 371 had been disciplined, and more than one-sixth of the 330 for whom the number of times was reported had been disciplined 10 or more times.

6. The total length of time the boys spent in the institution varied greatly in the five States. In California nearly three-fourths of the boys remained 2 years or more, whereas in Michigan and Ohio more than two-fifths remained less than a year.

Chapter V.—THE PAROLE PERIOD

PREPARATION FOR PAROLE

Each of the institutions included in the study had provision for conditional release on parole, as has been stated. (See pp. 5-6.) The methods used to determine when a boy was ready to be released differed considerably. Each institution had adopted some specific period as a sort of minimum training period. At the end of that time a boy became eligible for release on parole if his record was considered to warrant it. Frequently the release was fairly automatic, postponement being occasioned only by very frequent or serious misconduct. Credit and grading systems were not used, although they were adopted later in two of the institutions (in New Jersey and New York).

Home investigations generally were made only a short time before the date of the boy's release on parole. Outside references usually were required, and if they were provided and approved the boy was released. No great effort seems to have been made to get jobs for the boys of employable age, that service being left to the parents, to other relatives, or to the boy himself.

The clinical method of determining when a boy was ready to make the readjustment back into community life had not yet been developed to any extent, although some experimentation was going on, especially in the New Jersey institution, in which a classification committee decided each boy's eligibility for parole and outlined on the basis of accumulated data the plans that should be followed in regard to placement. Clinical procedure was later adopted and developed in the institutions in California, New Jersey, and New York; it now plays an important part in determining when a boy shall be released, under what conditions he is to be placed, and what services the parole officer should render in order to help him make a successful adjustment.

Boys remained under the supervision of parole officers for varying periods of time. It was difficult to obtain reliable information concerning the amount and character of supervision exercised, and it is not only possible but highly probable that many services rendered by parole officers were never recorded and no evidence of them was discovered by the field workers in the later inquiries which they made. Such records as were kept seemed to be largely for the purpose of enabling the administrative officers to know something about the amount of work the officers were doing. Certainly the character of the records was such as to reveal that there was little thought of their usefulness in evaluating the work itself in terms of results.

AGE OF THE BOYS AT THE TIME OF FIRST PAROLE

The ages at which the boys were first placed on parole are shown in table 23. New Jersey had the largest number paroled under 14 years of age, but it must be remembered that more of the boys in this State

were committed while quite young. The California and Ohio groups had the largest numbers of boys paroled between the ages of 16 and 18. The distribution of ages at the time of first parole differs because of the difference in age at commitment and in length of institutional training period within the institutions and between the States.

TABLE 23.—Age at first parole

Age at first parole	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	100	123	122	124	128	126
Under 10 years.....	2	(1)			2		
10 years, under 12.....	12	2	1		10		1
12 years, under 14.....	60	10	4	15	17	10	14
14 years, under 16.....	255	41	41	65	43	70	36
16 years, under 18.....	272	44	71	42	48	47	64
18 years and over.....	22	4	6		4	1	11

¹ Less than 1 percent.

FREQUENCY OF PAROLE, AND PLACES TO WHICH BOYS WERE PAROLED

If home conditions, family standards, and the character of the neighborhood play a prominent part in determining conduct, it would seem that one of the most vital points in a boy's treatment is his placement on termination of the institutional training period. When the strict supervision exercised during his life in the institution is relaxed, the environment in which he is placed during the parole period would seem to be a matter of extreme importance.

Information was sought regarding the places to which the boys were paroled on leaving the institutions, both on first parole and on subsequent paroles. Many had been returned to the institution at least once, and a number of them had been returned more than once. The following list shows in detail the number of paroles and the places to which the boy was paroled each time:

	Number of boys
Total.....	623
Paroled once.....	483
Home.....	413
Relatives.....	24
Free home (farm).....	9
Free home (other than farm).....	1
Wage home (farm).....	23
Wage home (other than farm).....	7
Other place.....	5
Place not reported.....	1
Paroled twice.....	99
Home only.....	63
Relatives only.....	3
Free home (farm).....	4
Wage home (farm).....	1
Other place only.....	2
Home and relatives.....	4

	<i>Number of boys</i>
Paroled twice—Continued	
Home and free home (farm)-----	2
Home and wage home (farm)-----	7
Home and wage home (other than farm)-----	4
Home and other place-----	5
Relatives and wage home (farm)-----	1
Free home (other than farm) and wage home (other than farm)-----	1
Free home (farm) and wage home (farm)-----	2
Paroled 3 times-----	27
Home only-----	14
Home and relatives-----	1
Home and free home (farm)-----	2
Home and free home (other than farm)-----	1
Home and wage home (farm)-----	4
Home and wage home (other than farm)-----	1
Home and other place-----	1
Home and free home (farm) and wage home (farm)-----	1
Wage home (farm), wage home (other than farm), and other place-----	1
Wage home (other than farm), other place, and place not reported-----	1
Paroled 4 times-----	8
Home only-----	6
Relatives only-----	1
Home and wage home (farm)-----	1
Paroled out of the State-----	6

Table 24 shows the frequency and place of parole in comparison with the ratings on home conditions at the time of commitment. Of the 217 boys from poor homes for whom data on placement were available, 164 had been paroled once, and 141 of them were returned to the same home; 32 were paroled twice, and 23 of them were returned to the same home; 12 were paroled three times, and 7 of them were returned each time to the same home; and 6 who had been paroled four times were returned every time to the same home. In addition, 5 boys who had been paroled twice and 5 who had been paroled three times were returned at least once and in some instances twice to their own homes. A similar frequency of release to families in which standards were poor and to neighborhoods that were bad is indicated in tables 25 and 26, which give the detailed comparisons on these items.

TABLE 24.—*Number of times and place to which boy was paroled, and home conditions at time of boy's commitment*

Number of times and place to which boy was paroled	Total boys	Home conditions			
		Good ¹	Fair	Poor	Not reported
Total-----	623	107	209	217	90
Paroled once-----	483	85	173	164	61
Home-----	413	76	153	141	43
Relatives-----	24	2	5	9	8
Other place-----	45	7	14	14	10
Place not reported-----	1		1		

¹ Includes 16 cases in which home conditions were reported as excellent. In 12 of these cases the boy was paroled once (10 to own home, 1 to relatives, and 1 to other place). In 4 cases there were 2 paroles (3 to home both times, 1 to home once and to relatives once).

TABLE 24.—Number of times and place to which boy was paroled, and home conditions at time of boy's commitment—Continued

Number of times and place to which boy was paroled	Total boys	Home conditions			
		Good	Fair	Poor	Not reported
Paroled twice.....	99	20	27	32	20
Home both times.....	63	13	20	23	7
Relatives both times.....	3	2			1
Home once, relatives once.....	4	1	1		2
Home once, other place once.....	18	3	6	5	4
Relatives once, other place once.....	1				1
Other place both times.....	10	1		4	5
Paroled 3 times.....	27	1	6	12	8
Home 3 times.....	14	1	5	7	1
Home and relatives.....	1			1	
Home twice, other place once.....	5		1	1	3
Home once, other place twice.....	5			3	2
Other place 3 times.....	1				1
Other place twice, place not reported once.....	1				1
Paroled 4 times.....	8		2	6	
Home 4 times.....	6			6	
Relatives 4 times.....	1		1		
Home 3 times, other place once.....	1		1		
Paroled out of the State.....	6	1	1	3	1

TABLE 25.—Number of times and place to which boy was paroled, and family standards at time of boy's commitment

Number of times and place to which boy was paroled	Total boys	Family standards			
		Good	Mediocre	Poor	Not reported
Total.....	623	77	179	298	69
Paroled once.....	483	62	146	223	52
Home.....	413	56	135	181	41
Relatives.....	24	2	3	16	3
Other place.....	45	4	7	26	8
Place not reported.....	1		1		
Paroled twice.....	99	12	23	52	12
Home both times.....	63	9	16	28	10
Relatives both times.....	3		1	2	
Home once, relatives once.....	4			3	1
Home once, other place once.....	18	3	5	10	
Relatives once, other place once.....	1			1	
Other place both times.....	10		1	8	1
Paroled 3 times.....	27	3	4	16	4
Home 3 times.....	14	2	3	6	3
Home and relatives.....	1			1	
Home twice, other place once.....	5	1	1	2	1
Home once, other place twice.....	5			5	
Other place 3 times.....	1			1	
Other place twice, place not reported once.....	1			1	
Paroled 4 times.....	8		4	4	
Home 4 times.....	6		2	4	
Relatives 4 times.....	1		1		
Home 3 times, other place once.....	1		1		
Paroled out of the State.....	6		2	3	1

TABLE 26.—*Number of times and place to which boy was paroled, and character of neighborhood at time of boy's commitment*

Number of times and place to which boy was paroled	Total boys	Character of neighborhood			
		Good	Mediocre	Bad	Not reported
Total.....	623	86	217	260	60
Paroled once.....	483	68	171	202	42
Home.....	413	59	154	173	27
Relatives.....	24	2	4	11	7
Other place.....	45	7	13	17	8
Place not reported.....	1			1	
Paroled twice.....	99	16	34	37	12
Home both times.....	63	11	22	28	2
Relatives both times.....	3	1	1		1
Home once, relatives once.....	4		2	1	1
Home once, other place once.....	18	3	7	5	3
Relatives once, other place once.....	1		1		
Other place both times.....	10	1	1	3	5
Paroled 3 times.....	27	2	8	12	5
Home 3 times.....	14	2	5	7	
Home and relatives.....	1			1	
Home twice, other place once.....	5		2	2	1
Home once, other place twice.....	5		1	2	2
Other place 3 times.....	1				1
Other place twice, place not reported once.....	1				1
Paroled 4 times.....	8		1	7	
Home 4 times.....	6			6	
Relatives 4 times.....	1			1	
Home 3 times, other place once.....	1		1		
Paroled out of the State.....	6		3	2	1

These are some of the most interesting data obtained in the whole study. They should be of considerable value in guiding the thinking of institutional executives who know that at the expiration of every boy's training period they will face the problem of placement for the boy they sought to train. It seems most unreasonable to expect that with so short a period of training under a controlled environment in an institution a boy in this formative period, without more preparation of the home and more help after release than was available through the parole system, could be so changed and strengthened as to be able readily to resist or to ignore the influences that so short a time previously had contributed to his unsatisfactory behavior.

It was not possible to discover whether the homes had improved while these boys were in the institutions. The lack of information on this point is regrettable, as it would be significant in connection with any evaluation of the treatment. The general impression received was that little change had been effected or even attempted by the social agencies in the boys' communities, the officers of the institutions, or the two working in conjunction. In certain institutions emphasis is now being placed on attempts to develop corrective work with the family and the home during the boy's absence.

Many parole officers expressed the belief that placement in any home except his own is very unwise for any boy of the age which most of the boys included in the study had reached before they were paroled. They state that if in the boy's own home, no matter how

poor it may be, there is any affection or family feeling, or any one person to whom he is genuinely attached, it is almost impossible to prevent him from leaving a foster home and going back to his own people. Even if he stays in the foster home a considerable period—from fear of the consequences if he fails to observe this condition of his parole—it is at best only temporary adjustment and not likely to be of permanent value to him, for he will leave as soon as his parole period ends and the compulsion is removed. If the parole officers are correct in this belief, which many of them base on considerable experience, then certainly the only intelligent procedure is to attempt to improve the home conditions while the boy is in the institution. This would require the establishment of very much closer working relations between the institution, the juvenile court, and the family and child-welfare agencies than had been developed at the time these boys were under treatment. Relatively little progress has been made even yet in this tremendously vital matter.

SERVICE FROM PAROLE OFFICERS

Number of visits made by parole officers

In 567 cases the records showed the number of visits a parole officer reported having made to a boy; in 73 cases (13 percent) apparently no visits were made (table 27). The fact that the New York records show no visiting in 27 of the 89 cases on which information was available suggests failure to record visits, since even at that time the New York institution was making a point of exercising much closer supervision over its parolees than most such institutions claimed to give. No reports of any kind on this subject were available in 33 cases, so there is an excellent chance that these figures do not do justice to the parole supervision actually given from this New York institution. There was considerable variation among the institutions in the number of visits reported to have been made. On the basis of these records it would seem that parole officers in New Jersey kept in very much closer contact with their cases than those in any other State, with New York and Ohio coming next. It is difficult to interpret these figures in relation to what is known of the character of the parole work from the impressions gained by the field agents and from the information in the schedules.

TABLE 27.—Number of visits made by parole officer during parole period

Number of visits made by parole officer	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Number of visits reported.....	567	100	111	118	123	89	126
None.....	73	13	15	22	-----	27	9
1.....	59	10	16	22	5	10	6
2 to 5.....	265	47	72	59	19	29	86
6 to 10.....	71	13	6	12	18	12	23
11 or more.....	99	17	2	3	81	11	2
Number of visits not reported.....	50	-----	12	4	1	33	-----
Boy paroled out of the State.....	6	-----	-----	-----	-----	6	-----

It was seldom possible to tell from the records whether the parole officer had actually seen the boy at the time he made the visit. The boy's statements in case after case indicated that he seldom saw the parole officer, who often called at his home or place of employment when he was not there. In any event, the number of contacts is of no very great consequence as compared with their character. What counts is not how often a parole officer sees a boy, but what his relations with the boy are and how much friendly help he is able to give when he does see him.

Types of service rendered by parole officers

Every effort was made to obtain information about the character of the services rendered by the parole officers to the boys during their parole periods, but records were deplorably incomplete in this regard, and it was felt that a boy's own statement that the parole officer did not give him any help could not be considered wholly dependable. What a boy would consider help might differ materially from a social worker's conception of what constitutes service. In 441 of the 616 cases in which information on this point was obtained from the records and from the boys themselves, no services were recorded or recognized (table 28). The services reported were mainly home placement, securing employment, assistance in working out better family relations, and help in making connection with social organizations or recreational groups.

TABLE 28.—Type of service rendered to boy during parole period by parole officer

Type of service	Total boys		Califor- nia	Mich- igan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distrib- ution					
Total.....	623		123	122	124	128	126
Report as to service.....	616	100	123	121	124	122	126
None.....	441	72	98	83	59	88	113
Home placement only.....	8	1	3	2	1		2
Employment only.....	74	12	12	10	33	15	4
Home placement and employ- ment (with or without other service).....	65	11	10	26	20	5	4
Employment and other than home placement.....	20	3			8	11	1
Other than home placement or employment.....	8	1			3	3	2
No report as to service.....	1			1			
Boy paroled out of the State.....	6					6	

The fact that home placement and employment far outranked the other types of service recorded must not be taken to imply high standards of case work in home and employment placement; the field agents were uniformly impressed with the very superficial character of all the placement service. In Michigan, where boys frequently were placed on farms to work, the agents' impressions were that the suitability of the farms for either homes or employment was very inadequately investigated. Lists of farms were kept, and when a boy was about to be released and the county welfare agent reported that the boy's home was altogether unsuitable, these lists were consulted and

the boy was sent to take one of the farm jobs available. Presumably there had been at least a casual investigation before the farms were listed, but just how suitable a home would be for a particular boy and how his life in that home would be likely to affect him did not appear to enter into consideration. Many of the boys visited who had been placed on farms left them very soon, a fact to which the county welfare agents and other persons responsible seemed to pay little attention. On the other hand, the agents reported that in a number of instances in New Jersey they found evidence of genuine effort on the part of parole officers to place boys in homes in which they would be reasonably happy and in which they would have opportunity to develop such capacities as they had.

As the primary interest in this study is in the various aspects of treatment, it was thought that a comparison of the services rendered by parole officers with the character of the boys' environment prior to commitment might give data of some value. Such services, however, had been rendered by parole officers in only 175 instances, and a report on home conditions was available for only 142 of these 175 boys, on family standards for only 154, and on character of the neighborhood for only 153. These figures are too small to have any value statistically.

The data obtained from the records, together with the statements made by the boys, give the impression that in most States relatively little effort was made to give the boys genuinely friendly personal service while they were on parole. There were outstanding exceptions, of course, and some States seemed slightly superior to others in this regard; but for the most part the parole reports were of deplorably routine character, and much reliance was placed on the mere receiving of written reports from the boy or on making hasty visits to the boy's home, many times without seeing the boy at all. There is small wonder that many of the boys seemed to assume that parole supervision existed solely for the purpose of checking up on them to see whether they were getting into any further trouble. Some of the boys even expressed the belief that this checking up was a distinct handicap.

SCHOOLING AND EMPLOYMENT

School attendance during the parole period

Information indicating whether or not the boy attended regular full-time day school during his parole period was obtained in 603 cases. This indicated that 339 (56 percent) did not attend school as compared with 264 (44 percent) who attended. Among the boys who did not attend were 148 of compulsory school age at the time of first parole (under 18 in Ohio, under 16 in the other States studied). These included 129 boys who were old enough to have employment certificates and to have gone to work legally, and who may have done so, and 19 who had not reached such an age when they were first placed on parole. Among the 264 boys who had attended school were 120 of compulsory school age not old enough to receive employment certificates under the law, 114 of compulsory school age who were also of employable age, and 30 over compulsory school age.

Among these boys for whom a report on school attendance was obtained 14 percent of the 221 over compulsory school age, and 31

percent of the 464 over the minimum age for employment certificates under the law, attended school while on parole.

Use of institutional training in employment

The records, the parole officers, and the boys themselves were the sources of information obtained in 591 cases as to whether or not boys utilized in the jobs they had had while on parole the training which they received in the institution. Of these 591 boys 456 (77 percent) found the training given at the institution had no relation to the jobs which they obtained (or which were obtained for them) when they were released. The report for the remaining boys showed that 73 (12 percent) made use of their institution training in 1 job while they were on parole, 36 (6 percent) in 2 jobs, and 26 (4 percent) in 3.

These figures suggest that the institutions gave the boys relatively little that was of specific practical value to them in their employment problems on release. This, of course, does not mean that certain work habits which were built up as a result of the institution trade activities were not helpful, but inculcation of habits is of course impossible to measure. Possibly, also, insufficient aid was given the boys in finding employment in which they could use such simple skills as they had acquired in the institution.

RETURNS TO THE INSTITUTION

Returns for violation of parole

Of the 623 boys, 494 (79 percent) were not returned to the institution for violation of parole. One hundred and twenty-nine (21 percent) were returned for some violation—98 (16 percent) once, 20 (3 percent) twice, and 11 (2 percent) three or more times.

As the policies and procedures with respect to returning a boy to the institution for parole violation differed widely in the several States, these figures cannot be taken to indicate the measure of the boys' so-called "success" on parole. For example, in California the policy was such that boys were seldom returned to Whittier State School for parole violation; many boys charged with misconduct that in another State would have caused their return to the institution as delinquents were transferred (or committed) to the Preston School of Industry, a California institution for boys older than those sent to Whittier. A similar situation existed in New York, most of the older boys who violated parole being sent to some other institution instead of being returned to the school for juvenile delinquents at Industry.

These figures may be very greatly affected by the amount and character of supervision exercised. A high percentage of returns for violation of parole might mean merely that an institution was keeping in very close touch with the boys whom it had sent back to community life and so was always aware of any danger of their continuing delinquent. On the other hand, an institution which because of few returns for violation of parole would seem to have a high percentage of successes might have built up that record through parole service so inadequate that parole violations were unknown unless they reached a serious stage and drew attention because of new police or court action. It is necessary therefore to be very cautious about drawing conclusions as to the degree of successful results from the percentage of recorded parole violations. The figures are given merely because, as this is

one of the measures sometimes used in an effort to determine whether or not institutional treatment has been successful, it seems worth while to show what such a measure would mean in connection with these cases at the same time that some of the objections to its use in reaching a conclusion are stated.

Returns for other reasons

In 22 instances boys who had been placed on parole were returned to the institutions for other reasons than violation of parole, such as the fact that a wage home had been found unsatisfactory and the parole officer was unable to find another placement immediately or that conditions in the home which were independent of any misbehavior on the part of the boy required him to return to the institution. Returns for such reasons, of course, have no bearing on the question of the degree of success in the boys' training for independent living. They may offer evidence that some of the parole work was characterized by sincere and watchful interest in the boy's welfare instead of being almost wholly of the watchdog variety.

Offenses constituting the violations of parole

For 126 of the 129 boys returned to the institution for violation of parole the reason for return from the first parole was reported. It will be recalled that some form of stealing had been the reason for the original commitment in 65 percent of the cases (see p. 30), and a similarly high proportion of thefts of various types appeared among the offenses constituting violation of parole, inasmuch as 83 cases (66 percent) were returns for violation of parole due to a new charge of stealing. One boy had been charged with robbery, 15 boys with burglary or breaking and entering, 13 with automobile theft, and 54 with larceny or other theft. Except for 28 boys who were returned on the general charge of juvenile delinquency, it is apparent that boys were not returned as parole violators unless they had committed some new offense of fairly serious character. The figures in the following list (based on the standard classification of offenses for criminal statistics) show the types of offense reported for these boys:

	Number of boys		Number of boys
Total.....	623	Weapons; carrying, possessing, etc.	2
Larceny—theft.....	54	Rape.....	1
General charge of juvenile delinquency.....	28	Sex offense (except rape).....	1
Burglary and breaking and entering.....	15	Robbery.....	1
Automobile theft.....	13	Offense against family and children.....	1
Disorderly conduct and vagrancy.....	4	Suspicion.....	1
Assault, not aggravated.....	3	Offense not reported.....	3
Forging and counterfeiting.....	2	No violation.....	488
		Paroled out of the State.....	6

There are two ways of looking at the figures in this list, depending on one's point of view. It might seem that the parole officers were disposed to give the boys every chance to adjust themselves to life in the community, and therefore did not return them to the institution except for serious new offenses. To some this might appear to be a highly desirable parole policy. Others might consider that it indicated a certain carelessness in parole supervision and that boys might be aided to a greater extent if they were more generally sent back to the institution for further training or for different placement when

problems arose, before they drifted into the commission of serious new offenses.

Number of offenses during the parole period

In 616 cases there was a report on the number of offenses committed while the boy was on parole. For 323 boys (52 percent) none was reported, 162 (26 percent) committed 1 new offense, 71 (12 percent) committed 2 new offenses, and 60 (10 percent) committed 3 or more. Records were found of a very much larger number of offenses committed during parole than of cases of return to the institution for parole violation. This was due to several causes. For example, if the offense was minor, the boy was not always returned to the institution but might be given further opportunity to adjust himself in the community. If the offense was serious and the boy had reached an age at which he could be sent to an institution for slightly older delinquents, he might be committed to that institution instead of being returned to the one from which he had been paroled.

Interval between first release and first violation of parole

The length of the interval between first release on parole and the first return for a violation of parole was ascertained for the 129 boys returned to the institution. Of the 617 boys placed on parole, 488 (79 percent) were never returned for parole violation; 45 (7 percent) were returned in less than 6 months after release; 52 (8 percent) after a period of 6 months but less than 1 year; 17 (3 percent) had been on parole 1 year but less than 2 when returned; and 15 (2 percent) 2 years or more.

AGE OF THE BOYS AT DISCHARGE FROM PAROLE

Table 29 shows for the group as a whole and for each institution the age of the boys at date of discharge. The differing statutory requirements with respect to commitment and discharge and the varying policies of the institutions caused considerable variation in the ages at which boys were entirely freed from institutional supervision and control.

TABLE 29.—Age at discharge from parole

Age at discharge from parole	Total boys		Califor- nia	Michi- gan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distrib- ution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Age reported.....	613	100	123	122	124	118	126
Under 16 years.....	28	5	8	1	-----	2	17
16 years.....	67	11	19	9	8	11	20
17 years.....	193	31	32	90	5	27	39
18 years.....	120	20	34	22	4	31	29
19 years.....	74	12	16	-----	7	31	20
20 years.....	33	5	8	-----	9	15	1
21 years.....	94	15	6	-----	87	1	-----
22 years.....	4	1	-----	-----	4	-----	-----
Age not reported.....	4	-----	-----	-----	-----	4	-----
Boy paroled out of the State.....	6	-----	-----	-----	-----	6	-----

Reason for discharge

The varying policies with respect to discharge are reflected in the figures in table 30. Boys were committed to the Michigan institution until they became 17 years of age (or 18 in some exceptions which the court was permitted to designate) (see appendix A, p. 130) and so these boys were recorded as discharged because of the expiration of their term. The customary commitment to all the other institutions was for the period of minority. In California, New York, and Ohio the institutions frequently exercised their power to issue a final discharge after a period of satisfactory conduct—which in most instances meant merely that the institution had no knowledge of misconduct during the time—or for some other reason before the boys reached the age of 21. In New Jersey this power was exercised less often and only for specific reasons. In Ohio the period during which satisfactory conduct was expected as a condition precedent to discharge from parole was usually a year. If during that time a boy did not get into any serious trouble for which he had to be returned to the institution he was automatically discharged. This policy of a 1-year period which the institution authorities had adopted became so thoroughly established that it amounted practically to use of a fixed "term." In New York a 3-year period had been adopted, but it was not adhered to so strictly. A number of boys from California, New Jersey, and New York were discharged because they had been committed to other correctional institutions while still on parole. Service enlistment was another reason for discharge, particularly in California and in New York, the custom being to give a final release to boys who entered the Army or the Navy.

TABLE 30.—Reason for discharge from parole

Reason for discharge from parole	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623		123	122	124	128	126
Reason reported.....	595	100	120	121	123	105	126
Term expired.....	114	19	1	113			
Boy reached majority.....	102	17	6		95	1	
Honorable dismissal, satisfactory conduct.....	233	39	51		1	62	119
Service enlistment.....	35	6	19		4	12	
Sent to other correctional institution.....	65	11	19	2	23	14	7
Sent to noncorrectional institution.....	3	1				3	
Boy moved out of State or country during parole period.....	8	1	5	3			
Marriage.....	4	1				4	
Other reason.....	22	4	19	2		1	8
Whereabouts unknown.....	9	2		1		8	
Reason not reported.....	22		3	1	1	17	
Boy paroled out of the State.....	6					6	

¹ Includes 4 boys discharged shortly before reaching their twenty-first birthday.

SUMMARY

1. A large proportion of boys who came from poor homes with questionable standards and in bad neighborhoods were permitted to return when paroled to the same homes, where they would be surrounded by the same destructive influences from which they had been removed but a few months earlier. There was no evidence that consistent effort had been made to improve these home situations in the meantime. All the evidence supported the belief that efforts generally had been concentrated on the boy himself during his stay in the controlled environment of the institution. Many boys who failed of adjustment were returned to the institution but on release were sent back to the same homes again and again.

2. The amount of supervision exercised by the parole officers as evidenced by the number of visits reported varied decidedly. The boys were never visited in 13 percent of the cases for which data were available and were visited only once in 10 percent of them. Parole officers made 2 to 5 visits in 47 percent of the cases, 6 to 10 in 13 percent, and 11 or more in 17 percent. Thus it is apparent that in a very heavy percentage of these cases there was very little of that close personal contact which would enable a parole officer to maintain friendly and helpful relations with the boys under his supervision, based on a knowledge of the problems each boy was facing.

3. So far as could be ascertained, in more than 70 percent of the cases parole officers rendered no specific service. In most cases in which placement services were rendered there was little evidence that the work was done in accordance with any reasonably good standards of social work.

4. Among 591 boys for whom information was obtained as to whether or not they utilized the training they had received in the institution in the jobs they obtained while on parole, 456 (77 percent) had not been able to make any use of such knowledge or skill as they had acquired. This is strong testimony to the effect that either the boys did not acquire usable knowledge or skill, that they were trained in work for which there was no market in their home communities, or that the parole service given them was inadequate to enable them to make the necessary contacts in the fields of employment in which they had been given some experience at the institution.

5. Of the 623 boys, 494 were not returned to the institution for violation of parole, 129 were returned for some violation; 98 were returned once, 20 twice, and 11 three or more times. This item is in no sense a measure of the degree of success of the boys on parole, owing to the widely differing policies in the several States in regard to methods of parole and return.

6. The records of 162 boys showed that they had committed 1 new offense on parole—hence while still under the institution's legal control; 71 committed 2 new offenses; and 60 committed 3 or more. The principal types of offenses involved theft.

7. The age at which a boy was given his final discharge varied in the several States, according to legal provisions and the institution policies. The differences in such provisions and policies reveal the different attitudes in the five States toward the retention of control over parolees for supervisory purposes.

Chapter VI.—POST-TREATMENT HISTORIES

EXTENT OF THE DATA OBTAINED

In their interviews with the boys themselves the field agents found that the boys, once they understood the reason for the inquiry, would state with surprising frankness their attitudes toward their precommitment delinquencies and the institution to which they had been committed, their later experiences and present situation, and their ambitions and expectations for the future. Therefore the information received from the boys themselves is believed to be fairly complete.

The findings based on the tabulations of such items in the post-treatment history as proved susceptible of statistical treatment are given in the following sections. They seem curiously inadequate against the vivid background created by perusal of the individual case schedules in their entirety, with their startlingly obvious social problems differing from case to case.

INTERVAL BETWEEN THE INTERVIEW AND THE LAST RELEASE FROM THE INSTITUTION

The length of time the boys had been away from the institution—that is, the interval between the date of their last parole and the date of the interview—is shown in table 31 for the groups from each of the five institutions. All the Ohio boys had been away 6 years or more, the majority of the New York boys 7 years or more, and almost two-thirds of the New Jersey group 8 years or more. The California and Michigan groups showed more variation than those from the other States. Nine California boys had been away only 5 years, and 6 had been away 10 years or longer. About a third of the Michigan boys had been away 5 years but less than 6, and another third had been away 6 years but less than 7.

TABLE 31.—Interval between date of last parole and date of interview

Interval between date of last parole and date of interview	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	100	123	122	124	128	126
3 years, less than 4.....	1	(1)	-----	-----	-----	1	-----
5 years, less than 6.....	51	8	9	42	-----	-----	-----
6 years, less than 7.....	194	31	33	41	-----	23	97
7 years, less than 8.....	240	39	41	28	47	103	21
8 years, less than 9.....	114	18	20	9	76	1	8
9 years, less than 10.....	17	3	14	2	1	-----	-----
10 years or more.....	6	1	6	-----	-----	-----	-----

¹ Less than 1 percent.

This means, of course, that the boys studied had quite dissimilar periods of time in which to demonstrate their ability or inability to live without further social conflict. In studies of this kind the time element always is of very great importance, and its variability leaves the findings open to some question. For example, the cases of the 33 boys who were studied after they had been away from the California institution 6 years might show a different record of subsequent delinquency if they had been studied after 8 years or a still longer interval. Similarly the 76 boys who had been away from the New Jersey institution 8 years might have had a more favorable record if they had been studied after a lapse of more than 8 years. Obviously therefore all the evaluations given in the following sections must be taken as a rough indication of the probable character of the boys' lives; the percentages must not be regarded too seriously nor regarded as representing final outcomes.

AGES OF THE BOYS AT THE TIME OF INTERVIEW

The ages of the boys at the time they were interviewed differed considerably, as has been shown. (See table 2, p. 6.) The ages of the California group ranged from 19 to 28, those of the New York group from 20 to 27. In the Michigan group three-fourths were 22 years old, and none was under 21 nor so old as 24. The median age at the time of the interview was about 2 years younger for the Michigan boys than for the New Jersey boys. If the boys from Michigan had not been studied until they had reached the same age as those from New Jersey, their record might have been different. As this study presents only the information on the histories of these boys at the end of a definite period after the end of their institutional training, it could by no means be assumed that the findings would be the same if the cases were all reviewed at a later date. The differences in the groups in the different States that have been mentioned in foregoing chapters make it unwise to draw any conclusions from comparison of so-called "results" in the several States.

HOMES AND FAMILIES AT THE TIME OF THE INTERVIEW

Mobility of the boys

It is interesting to note the relative stability of the boys. It seemed reasonable to call a boy "settled" if he was apparently stabilized and fairly well satisfied to remain in one community, fairly stable if he had shown a tendency to move about from one locality to another but had had fairly good reasons for moving and had none of the characteristics of the perpetually restless nomad, and nomadic if he showed strong tendencies to wander and if his record showed a great amount of roaming about the country. Information was available for 576 boys. Of that number 320 (56 percent) could be described as settled and 197 (34 percent) as fairly stable; only 59 (10 percent) were classified as nomadic.

Fifty-one percent of the boys who were interviewed were found to be living in the same community from which they originally had been committed to the institution, 33 percent resided in the same State but in a different city or county, and 9 percent had moved to other States (table 32). There seems to be evidence of a higher intrastate mobility among the California boys than among some of the others. If com-

parable figures were available, it would be interesting to observe whether similar mobility is noted among nondelinquent persons of similar ages or whether there is greater restlessness among these maladjusted individuals.

TABLE 32.—*Residence at time of interview and at time of commitment*

Residence at time of interview and at time of commitment	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	100	123	122	124	128	126
Same city.....	315	51	40	59	71	75	70
Same county, different city.....	47	8	15	7	9	10	6
Same State, different county and city.....	207	33	62	48	26	33	38
Other State.....	53	9	6	8	18	9	12
Other country ¹	1	(²)				1	

¹ Residence in Canada at time of interview.

² Less than 1 percent.

Place of residence

By the time these boys were interviewed some of them had established homes of their own; others had not done so but had left the parental home and were in boarding or lodging houses or were living with employers. However, the largest group (33 percent) were still in the parental home. Only 135 (22 percent) had established homes of their own, 56 (9 percent) were boarding or lodging, and 27 (4 percent) were in the employer's home or living at the place of employment. One hundred and twelve boys (18 percent) were in correctional or other institutions when interviewed; Michigan, California, and Ohio had more boys in institutions than the other two States (table 33). Claims as to successful results of institutional treatment have sometimes been based on the number of former inmates not in other correctional or penal institutions at the time the claim was made. By that gage 82 percent of the boys included in this study would have been rated "successes." The lack of validity attached to such judgments is again emphasized by this figure, in comparison with the other facts about these boys. Many boys who had been unemployed a long time were found living with other relatives than their parents. As these were not listed separately they increase the general group classified as having "other" place of residence.

TABLE 33.—*Place of residence at time of interview*

Place of residence at time of interview	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Place reported.....	622	100	122	122	124	128	126
Parental home.....	207	33	25	36	45	51	50
Own home.....	135	22	36	25	31	22	21
Correctional or other institution.....	112	18	25	27	16	19	25
Lodging house.....	30	5	8	3	6	6	7
Boarding house.....	26	4	3	13	2	3	5
Employer's home or place of employment.....	27	4	6	4	6	8	3
Other place.....	75	12	15	14	16	17	13
Enlisted service.....	8	1	4		2		2
No home (vagrant).....	2	(¹)				2	
Place not reported.....	1	-----	1				

¹ Less than 1 percent.

Marital status, number of children

Of the 623 boys included in the study, 383 (61 percent) were still single when visited, 201 (32 percent) were married and living with their wives, and 39 (6 percent) had been married but were either divorced or separated at the time they were interviewed. There was very little difference in this regard among the several State groups. Whether the wife was employed was ascertained for 217 of the boys. The wives were working in 60 instances (28 percent). Reports as to whether or not there were children were obtained for 236 of the 240 boys who had been married. At the time they were interviewed 107 (45 percent) had no children, 88 (37 percent) had 1 child, 36 (15 percent) had 2 children, 4 (2 percent) had 3, and 1 had 5.

Character of the neighborhood

The neighborhood in which the boy was living at the time of the interview was rated by the same standards as were used in rating the neighborhood in which he was living at the time of his commitment.¹ Table 34 shows to what extent these boys had established themselves in good, mediocre, and bad neighborhoods. Although only 15 percent were living in good neighborhoods prior to their commitment to the institutions included in the study, 29 percent lived in good neighborhoods when they were interviewed. Whereas before commitment 46 percent were in bad neighborhoods, only 33 percent lived in bad neighborhoods at the time of the interview.

TABLE 34.—*Character of neighborhood in which boy was living at time of interview*

Character of neighborhood at time of interview	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Character reported.....	560	100	99	115	115	117	114
Good.....	162	29	38	38	23	34	29
Mediocre.....	213	38	47	55	37	30	44
Bad.....	185	33	14	22	55	53	41
Character not reported.....	63	-----	24	7	9	11	12

The detail for the several States shows percentages so different as to make it seem that the differences may be significant. For example, both California and Michigan have much smaller percentages living in bad neighborhoods than New Jersey and New York. Ohio's percentage is not so high as either New Jersey's or New York's, but it is greater than California's and Michigan's. New Jersey had the lowest percentage of boys living in good surroundings. The fact that California and Michigan had a somewhat higher percentage of boys committed from small cities and towns may have something to do with this distribution in relation to neighborhood characteristics. It is regrettable that there has not been more study which would make it possible to determine whether or not this factor may give a decided advantage to the California and Michigan boys irrespective of the

¹ See p. 19. For the 112 boys who were in correctional or penal institutions at the time of the interview the ratings related to the neighborhoods and homes just prior to the boys' commitment to those institutions.

institutional treatment; that is, it may be that boys from small cities and from metropolitan areas who receive the same treatment and who respond in much the same way while under institutional care would be likely to make quite different records on their return to their respective communities. Many opinions have been expressed, but no studies supported by extensive field investigations have been presented in support of them.

So far as this particular institutional group is concerned, the fact that in California and Michigan the smaller cities and towns contributed somewhat more than their share in the original commitments would indicate that these less populous communities contained hazards not unlike those in the larger centers in their effect on boys' behavior.

Home conditions

The conditions in the boys' homes were rated by the same criteria as were used in rating home conditions prior to commitment (see p. 24). It is interesting to compare these ratings with those on the home conditions before the boys were committed, shown on page 25. Considerably fewer of the boys were found in poor homes at the time of the interview, about twice as many were found in homes rated excellent, and about twice as many were found in good homes (table 35).

TABLE 35.—Home conditions at time of interview

Home conditions at time of interview	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623		123	122	124	128	126
Home conditions reported.....	557	100	99	115	113	116	114
Excellent.....	31	6	7	6	6	8	4
Good.....	183	33	32	46	30	41	34
Fair.....	190	34	42	36	42	30	40
Poor.....	153	27	18	27	35	37	36
Home conditions not reported.....	66		24	7	11	12	12

EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC HISTORY SINCE LEAVING THE INSTITUTION

In considering the material presented in this section it is necessary to bear in mind that the field work on this study was begun in the fall of 1929, just when the depression was beginning to be felt. Furthermore, the field work began in California, which State admittedly did not suffer the effects of the depression for some time after it had become quite severe in the areas farther east. The Michigan group was studied next (March to November 1930). In the fall of 1930 the field agents moved on to New Jersey. They went to Ohio in the late spring of 1931 and to New York in the late fall of that same year. Thus it is likely that the figures on employment data for Ohio and New York would reflect the increasing unemployment, and those for New Jersey and Michigan might reflect it to a somewhat lesser extent, whereas the California cases would be almost free from unemployment traceable to this depression period.

Way in which first job was obtained

The first jobs the boys had when they left the institution were obtained in several ways. In 609 cases it was learned whether the first job was found by the boy himself or through the assistance of the parole officer, the boy's family, an employment office, or some other individual or agency. So far as could be ascertained from the records or from the interviews with the boys and the parole officers and from other sources, 298 boys (49 percent) got their own first jobs on leaving the institution; 101 (17 percent) were placed in their first employment by parole officers, and 153 (25 percent) were aided in job placement by their families. Only 7 boys (1 percent) found work through employment agencies and 50 (8 percent) through other sources. Only 4 boys were reported never to have had any employment after leaving the institution.

As a matter of fact, these boys, unskilled or—if they had any training at all—ranking as partly trained, did not seem to have had the benefit of any intelligent and helpful placement service when they sought their first jobs. The general impression the field agents received, which is borne out by the work histories of great numbers of boys, is that the employment entered was determined more or less by chance, and that they continued to drift about on the labor market until one of three things happened: They found work for which they were suited and in which they were reasonably contented; they continued to change jobs frequently, failing to find places which suited them and in which they gave satisfaction; or they became restless and discontented and acquired an aversion to work that rendered them practically unemployable.

Number of jobs held

The majority of these boys had a large number of jobs since leaving the institution. Excluding the 4 who had never had any job, 14 had had 1 job, 21 had had 2 jobs, 55 had had 3, 42 had had 4, 42 had had 5, 185 had had 6 to 9, 130 had had 10 to 19, and 125 had had 20 or more; for 5 the number of jobs was not reported.

Closely related to the number of jobs is the length of time that a boy remains on any job. This information was obtained for 616 boys, as follows: 45 had never remained so long as 6 months in any job; 89 reported that the longest time they had stayed on any job was 6 months but less than a year; 149 had stayed on some one job at least 1 year but less than 2; 128, 2 years but less than 3; 99, 3 years but less than 4; 55, 4 years but less than 5; and 51, 5 years or longer. These figures suggest that a higher proportion of the boys were fairly stable than the data as to number of jobs would seem to indicate. This may mean, of course, that some of them changed jobs very frequently during the early part of their employment careers, growing more stable as they found work for which they were suited and in which they were correspondingly more contented. It would also indicate an urgent need for greater development of vocational guidance and placement work in connection with institutional training.

Occupations at the time of the interview

At the time the boys were interviewed 381 of them were employed. The occupations covered a wide range and were difficult to classify within any fixed or formal occupational groups on the basis of the descriptions obtained. They could not be classed strictly by indus-

tries because in many instances there was overlapping; for example, boys working in the painting trade might be employed either in building and construction or in the automobile industry. When the problem was approached from a different angle and an attempt was made to classify by occupation only, still other problems were encountered. In spite of these difficulties the study would not be complete without an effort to indicate the places the boys had achieved in the occupational world. The types of work they were reported to be doing at the time of the interview are given in the following list:

	<i>Number of boys</i>
Total.....	623
Employed.....	381
Foremen and overseers.....	12
Operatives.....	52
Automobile factories and repair shops.....	11
Laundries and dry cleaning.....	6
Printing industries.....	5
Lumber and furniture and other woodworking industries.....	4
Other operatives.....	26
Laborers.....	97
Farm and forestry.....	36
Automobile factories.....	6
Building and construction.....	4
Electric light and power plants.....	3
Other laborers.....	48
Painters and enamellers.....	14
Mechanics (not otherwise specified).....	9
Compositors and printers.....	4
Electricians.....	4
Plumbers, gas and steam fitters, and helpers.....	4
Machinists.....	3
Bakers.....	2
Carpenters.....	2
Workers in other manufacturing and mechanical industries.....	16
Truck drivers and teamsters.....	39
Chauffeurs (taxi and bus drivers).....	13
Workers in other types of transportation.....	4
Salesmen, collectors, agents.....	17
Store owners, auto dealers, junk dealers.....	13
Workers in other trades.....	5
Clerical workers.....	15
Cooks.....	5
Waiters and countermen.....	5
Janitors.....	4
Other domestic and personal workers.....	19
Soldiers, sailors, and marines.....	8
Musicians.....	2
Recreation workers.....	8
Workers in other occupations.....	5
Not employed.....	130
In institutions.....	112

Use made of institution training

Although the case-schedule material did not yield data that could be subjected to precise analysis on the subject, an effort was made to find out to what extent the training the boys had received in the institution proved useful to them in the jobs held since leaving it. Work

and trade experience were both considered training. A boy was rated as having made primary use of the vocational training he had received in the institution if in all or most of his working time since release he had made use of the training he received during his institutional life. He was rated as having made secondary use if he had used his institutional training on some jobs but during only a small proportion of his total working time. If a boy claimed, and his work record corroborated his statement, that he had never made use of the experience which he had had in the institution, he was listed as having made no use of it. As table 36 shows, almost two-thirds of the boys (63 percent) claimed never to have made any use of their training. Only 43 boys (7 percent) had made primary use of it. The remainder had found it useful to some extent. California seems to have had the most success in providing training appropriate to later opportunities and needs, Michigan the least. Possibly part of the Michigan situation was due to the lack of a well-organized parole system, but as the parole work in some of the other States was notably weak, this lack cannot have been entirely responsible. It has already been noted that a large percentage of the whole group of boys obtained at least their first jobs through their own efforts or through their families rather than through parole officers.

TABLE 36.—*Use made of institution training during parole period and after discharge from parole*

Use made of institution training	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Report as to use.....	606	100	114	120	123	127	122
Primary.....	43	7	19	3	5	9	7
Secondary.....	179	30	39	18	46	40	36
None.....	384	63	56	99	72	78	79
No report as to use.....	4	-----	3	1	-----	-----	-----
No training.....	9	-----	6	-----	-----	-----	3
Boy never worked.....	4	-----	-----	1	1	1	1

Earnings and degree of self-support

The weekly earnings of each boy at the time he was interviewed—or, if he was not employed at that time, his weekly pay on the last job held—were recorded so far as they could be learned. The amount of the last weekly earnings was not reported in 179 cases. Of the 440 boys for whom weekly earnings were reported, 46 (10 percent) had earned less than \$10; 103 (23 percent) had earned \$10 but less than \$20; 147 (33 percent), \$20 but less than \$30; 99 (23 percent), \$30 but less than \$40; 24 (5 percent), \$40 but less than \$50; and 21 boys (5 percent), \$50 or more per week (table 37).

Some interesting variations appear among the several States. It will be noted that more of the boys in New York and Ohio were in the lowest paid group, receiving less than \$10 a week. This may be due to some extent to the fact that the depression had gained more headway by the time the investigators reached these States. In New York fewer boys were in the wage group receiving \$30 or more per

week. In all States there was great diversity of earnings. Much of this information is based entirely on the boy's own statement as to the amount; it was accepted unless there was reason to believe that the boy was misrepresenting the case, very little checking with employers being undertaken because of the danger of embarrassing the boy on his job or in an attempt to get a job if he had none.

TABLE 37.—*Weekly earnings at time of interview, or in last job if not employed at that time*

Weekly earnings	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Amount reported.....	440	100	85	60	104	96	95
Less than \$10.....	46	10	4	4	3	15	20
\$10, less than \$15.....	42	10	4	6	8	17	7
\$15, less than \$20.....	61	14	11	8	10	18	14
\$20, less than \$25.....	74	17	9	11	23	19	12
\$25, less than \$30.....	73	17	15	8	24	15	11
\$30, less than \$40.....	99	23	27	16	25	8	23
\$40, less than \$50.....	24	5	11	5	4	1	3
\$50 or more.....	21	5	4	2	7	3	5
Amount not reported.....	179	-----	38	61	19	31	30
No earnings (boy never worked).....	4	-----	-----	1	1	1	1

The extent to which the boy was supporting himself was an item of interest in connection with his social adjustment. This was ascertained in all except two of the cases studied. It was found that 155 boys (25 percent) were classed as dependent; in addition to those dependent on parents, other relatives, or social agencies, this group includes all boys who were in institutions of any kind at the time their cases were under investigation. Only 356 (57 percent) were supporting themselves, but 110 others (18 percent) were supporting themselves in part. There was some variation among the States, California having a larger proportion who were entirely self-supporting and New York and Ohio the smallest proportion.

Of the 466 who were supporting themselves entirely or in part, 265 (60 percent) were also supporting other persons (their own families or their parents) or were contributing to the upkeep of both their own homes and those of their parents; 178 (40 percent) were supporting themselves but not contributing to the support of a family. In 23 cases there was no family or no report on assistance. Of the 265 who were contributing to the support of a family, 132 (50 percent) were entirely supporting the family (either their own or that of their parents), 123 (46 percent) were contributing to its support but not taking full responsibility for it, and 10 (4 percent) were reported to be supporting a family of their own and also contributing to the support of their parents.

Self-support in relation to vocational training

Whether the boy was supporting himself or was dependent on someone else was studied in relation to the use he reported that he had been able to make of the vocational training which had been given in the institution. In 455 of the 605 cases for which this information

had been obtained the boys were reported to be supporting themselves either wholly or in part. Of these 455 boys 282 (62 percent) had made no use of their institutional training, 137 (30 percent) had made secondary use of it, and only 36 (8 percent) were found to have made primary use of it. Of the 150 boys who were dependent 101 (67 percent) claimed to have made no use whatever of their institutional training, 42 (28 percent) had made secondary use, and only 7 (5 percent) had made primary use of it after leaving the institution.

Service enlistments

Twenty-six of these boys, either while on parole or later, had enlisted in the Navy, 48 in the Army, 8 in the Marine Corps, and 3 in the Coast Guard; the type of 1 enlistment was not reported. Of the 86 enlistments 25 were from California, 19 from Ohio, 18 from New York, 17 from New Jersey, and 7 from Michigan.

As in some States a service enlistment brought immediate discharge from parole, it was felt that in some cases that might have been an inducement to enlist. However, not all the boys had enlisted soon after release on parole. Information was obtained as to the length of time between such release and enlistment in 78 cases. In 21 the boy enlisted within 6 months after he left the institution; in 12 he had been away from the institution 6 months but less than a year; in 20 cases, 1 year but less than 2 years; in 13 cases, 2 years but less than 3; and in 12 cases, 3 years or more.

The length of time the boys had remained in the service was recorded in 81 cases. Thirty-two of them had been in service 3 years or more. Some had completed their term of service and had been honorably discharged before they were interviewed for this study. Others had been dishonorably discharged. Of the 86 boys for whom enlistments were reported, 8 were found to be still in active service, 35 had been honorably discharged, 37 had been dishonorably discharged, and 4 were deserters not yet discharged. No report was obtained in 2 cases. These figures reveal that nearly half of these boys had given unsatisfactory service. Possibly the disciplinary methods of the Army and Navy were not particularly successful for boys of this description. If these cases are at all typical, they may also suggest one explanation why Army and Navy recruiting officers often hesitate or decline to enroll boys who are known to have been in a correctional school.

Religious and social contacts

An attempt was made to find out how many of the 623 boys were definitely affiliated with churches and with social organizations. Some church connection was claimed by 172 boys. The following list gives the details:

	<i>Number of boys</i>
Total.....	623
Attended regularly.....	122
Attended irregularly.....	50
No affiliation.....	382
No report as to affiliation.....	69

Membership in some social organization, such as clubs of any kind, labor unions, fraternal orders, church societies, Boy Scouts, or the Y. M. C. A., was reported for only 131 of the boys, as follows:

	<i>Number of boys</i>
Total.....	623
Clubs.....	69
Unions.....	19
Fraternal orders.....	20
More than one.....	23
No affiliation.....	448
No report as to affiliation.....	44

Only 77 boys reported affiliation with both church and a social organization. Information as to the character of the boys' associates other than those connected with such organizations as those mentioned—dependent as it was for the most part on the unverified statements of the boys themselves or of members of their families—left too much to their judgment to be reliable for statistical use. Many boys were continuing friendly relations with boys whom they had known in the institutions. Some openly boasted of "pals" in the world of vice and crime, whereas others vigorously denied any contact whatever with undesirable companions.

CONDUCT SINCE LEAVING THE INSTITUTION

Conduct at the time of the interview

One of the main items observed as indicating the adjustment of the boys subsequent to release from the institution was the character of their conduct at the time of the interview. This was rated as satisfactory, unsatisfactory, or doubtful. In making their ratings the field workers took into consideration the following items:

How long a time had elapsed since the boy was in difficulty of any kind because of misconduct? How long since he had been arrested or convicted? If he had never been apprehended, was he known to have been recently (or to be at the time of the interview) engaged in illegal activity of any kind? Was he drinking heavily, associating with known gangsters, bootleggers, prostitutes, gamblers, criminals, or narcotic addicts?

As table 38 shows, slightly more than half of the boys were considered to be conducting themselves satisfactorily. There was some variation among the States, a slightly higher proportion being considered satisfactory in New Jersey and Michigan than in the other States. The doubtful group is small. It includes those which the field agents felt that they did not have enough evidence to justify rating Unsatisfactory but suspected that conduct and associations were not such as to warrant rating them Satisfactory.

TABLE 38.—*Conduct of boy at time of interview*

Conduct at time of interview	Total boys		Califor- nia	Michi- gan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distrib- ution					
Total.....	623	100	123	122	124	128	126
Satisfactory.....	364	58	65	77	81	74	67
Unsatisfactory.....	212	34	47	36	36	43	50
Doubtful.....	47	8	11	9	7	11	9

That good conduct is closely associated with good neighborhoods and good homes would seem to be demonstrated by the ratings in comparison with the figures on character of the neighborhood and conditions in the homes at the time of the interview (tables 39 and 40). However, it is uncertain whether a causal relation can be attributed to the coincidence of poor environment and unsatisfactory conduct. Back of both may lie the same basic causal factors inherent in certain personal attributes of the boys themselves. Further study with properly selected cases would be necessary in order to reach final conclusions. The figures show that a poor environment was associated with the unsatisfactory conduct of these boys very much oftener than a good environment. The conduct of boys from bad neighborhoods was rated unsatisfactory three times as often as that of boys from good neighborhoods. This finding is significant enough to warrant the expenditure of a great deal more effort to bring about some correction of the bad situation in the boy's home and general environment during his institutional treatment, in preparation for his return on release.

TABLE 39.—*Conduct of boy at time of interview, and character of neighborhood in which he was living at that time*

Conduct	Total boys	Character of neighborhood			
		Good	Mediocre	Bad	Not reported
Total.....	623	162	213	185	63
Satisfactory.....	364	127	131	97	9
Unsatisfactory.....	212	24	59	76	53
Doubtful.....	47	11	23	12	1

TABLE 40.—*Conduct of boy and home conditions at time of interview*

Conduct	Total boys	Home conditions			
		Good ¹	Fair	Poor	Not reported
Total.....	623	214	190	153	66
Satisfactory.....	364	162	124	69	9
Unsatisfactory.....	212	40	47	69	56
Doubtful.....	47	12	19	15	1

¹ Includes 31 reported as excellent; in 21 of these cases the boy's conduct was satisfactory, in 8 unsatisfactory, and in 2 doubtful.

Interval between first parole and first subsequent offense

The time that elapsed between a boy's first parole from the institution and his first subsequent offense is of interest in the history of his conduct. Citations for minor traffic violations and speeding were not considered as indicating misconduct in this connection, but all other misdemeanors and more serious offenses were included. Approximately a third of the boys had no misconduct record, the California group having a slightly better record than the other State groups. Only 34 boys (6 percent) for whom this information was available were reported to have committed offenses less than 3 months after leaving

the institution; 65 (11 percent) apparently kept free from violations of law for 3 months but had reports of offenses before 6 months had elapsed, and 101 (16 percent) had such reports during the second 6 months after their release (table 41).

TABLE 41.—Interval between first parole and first offense after parole

Interval between first parole and first offense after parole	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623		123	122	124	128	126
Interval reported.....	617	100	121	121	123	127	125
Less than 3 months.....	34	6	6	10	6	4	8
3 months, less than 6.....	65	11	9	7	19	13	17
6 months, less than 1 year.....	101	16	15	15	24	20	27
1 year, less than 2.....	83	13	18	20	13	20	12
2 years, less than 3.....	57	9	11	18	9	13	6
3 years, less than 4.....	27	4	4	4	7	6	6
4 years, less than 5.....	17	3	3	5	2	3	4
5 years or more.....	35	6	5	4	10	8	8
No offense.....	198	32	50	38	33	40	37
Interval not reported.....	6		2	1	1	1	1

In all, about a third of the boys were reported to have committed offenses during the first year after they left the institution, and a third were reported to have committed offenses at intervals of a year or more after release from the institution. Though for 35 boys no offenses were reported within 5 years or more after their release, it cannot be assumed that the 198 who had only good records would always maintain such records. The scattering of the first instances of offenses through these later years after release offers striking evidence that boys may go along for a considerable period without delinquency, just as patients released from a tuberculosis sanitarium may continue for some years without breaking down; then circumstances may combine to overcome their resistance, and they take their place in the ranks of those who have come in conflict with the law.

Arrests, convictions, and commitments

The question as to what shall be the measure of success or failure in adjustment for persons who have had training periods in correctional institutions is very difficult. At first it might appear that any one of a number of perfectly obvious measurements might be applied, such as subsequent arrests, convictions, or commitments, but soon it becomes apparent that no one of these measurements is entirely satisfactory. So far as arrests are concerned, a man may be suspected of a crime without being guilty of it. This becomes very much more likely to happen when he has a commitment record behind him. Many arrests are followed by releases without prosecution, the police themselves turning the individuals loose if they believe, on closer examination, that their evidence is insufficient. Prosecutors may refuse to prosecute because of the weakness of the evidence, grand juries or courts conducting preliminary hearings may dismiss the cases because of the insufficiency of the evidence, and finally the trial court may find the accused individual not guilty.

This leads to the question of convictions. If arrests are not a satisfactory measurement, it might seem that the number of convictions would serve as a satisfactory gage. In general, however, this is considered unsatisfactory because many persons guilty of the offenses of which they are suspected and with which they are charged are never proved guilty. Therefore the number of convictions would not necessarily represent the actual number of instances of misconduct. Moreover, in connection with these particular cases the use of convictions as a measurement is dubious, as there were variations in procedure in the several States, even among the different courts within the same State. For example, a judge might dismiss a case against a boy who was on parole on condition that the parole officer return him to the institution. A court record would show a dismissal, but the actual facts would show guilt. Also, in the matter of convictions, there comes up the question whether prejudice operates to the disadvantage of an individual with a correctional-school record. (See p. 81.)

Statements frequently are made regarding the percentage of successes in institutional treatment which are based almost exclusively on whether the individual is known to have been committed to other correctional institutions after release from the institution under observation. This criterion is open to numerous objections. Many forces operate, even after he has been found guilty of some offense, to determine whether an individual shall be committed to an institution. The possibility that he may be placed on probation instead of being sent to the institution must also be taken into consideration.

In spite of the fact that none of these criteria can be regarded as absolute, the figures on arrests, convictions, and commitments of the boys included in the study are to be taken into consideration in a study of results of institutional treatment, and are presented herewith.

Arrests.—The information obtained on number of arrests shows that approximately one-third of the boys were not reported to have been arrested after their release from the institution (table 42). It will be noted that California had the highest proportion among the several institutions. It is surprising to see how many times some of these boys had been arrested; almost a third of them had been arrested three or more times.

TABLE 42.—Number of arrests after first parole from institution

Number of arrests after first parole	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Number of arrests reported.....	620	100	121	122	124	128	125
None.....	209	34	56	38	37	42	36
1.....	132	21	20	30	27	32	23
2.....	88	14	13	16	19	18	22
3.....	65	10	13	13	11	12	16
4.....	58	9	13	13	9	11	12
5.....	24	4	3	4	9	3	5
6 to 9.....	36	6	3	8	9	8	8
10 or more.....	8	1	-----	-----	3	2	3
Number of arrests not reported.....	1	-----	1	-----	-----	-----	-----
No report as to arrests.....	2	-----	1	-----	-----	-----	1

Comparison of the number of arrests after the boys' first parole from the institution with the number of times they had appeared in court before commitment showed, as was to be expected, that a considerably lower percentage of boys for whom no delinquency was reported prior to the case resulting in commitment to the institution were subsequently arrested than of boys who had appeared in court twice or oftener prior to commitment. Still more significant are the figures for boys who had been arrested three or more times after their first parole. Of the boys who had not been brought into court before the case resulting in commitment, 18 percent had been arrested three or more times after their release, whereas of the boys having two or more court appearances before commitment 40 percent had been arrested three or more times after release. There are only slight differences for the boys arrested once or twice since their first parole (table 43).

TABLE 43.—Number of arrests after first parole from institution, and number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment to institution

Number of arrests after first parole	Total boys	Number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment			
		None	1	2 or more	Not reported
Total.....	623	142	165	307	9
None.....	209	63	65	78	3
1.....	132	32	35	63	2
2.....	88	22	22	44	2
3.....	65	10	16	37	2
4.....	58	6	13	39	1
5 or more.....	68	9	13	45	1
Number not reported.....	1				1
No report as to arrests.....	2		1	1	

Convictions.—Review of court records yielded data as to the number of times each of these boys had been convicted. The findings of military and naval courts were included. Records of subsequent conviction were found for 363 (58 percent) of the 621 boys for whom information on this point was obtained. More than half the boys in each State had been convicted once or more than once after release from the institution. California boys had the fewest convictions (table 44).

TABLE 44.—Number of convictions after first parole from institution

Number of convictions after first parole	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623		123	122	124	128	126
Number of convictions reported.....	618	100	121	122	122	128	125
None.....	258	42	60	50	47	52	49
1.....	140	23	24	25	30	34	27
2.....	86	14	14	20	18	14	20
3.....	68	11	16	16	9	15	12
4.....	34	5	5	7	8	5	9
5 or more.....	32	5	2	4	10	8	8
Number of convictions not reported.....	3		1		2		
No report as to convictions.....	2		1				1

The proportion of convictions found among this group of boys 5 years or more after the termination of their institutional-training periods compares very favorably with the figures reported by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck in their studies of certain groups of juvenile and adult delinquents during a similar post-treatment period. They found records of subsequent conviction in 82 percent of 921 Boston juvenile-court cases examined by the Judge Baker Foundation clinic and in 62 percent of 375 graduates of the Massachusetts Reformatory.¹

Because of the popular interest in the relative incidence of delinquency among boys of native and of foreign parentage, to which reference has been made on page 21, it is worth while to note that the white boys of native and of foreign parentage included in the study showed almost identical proportions of subsequent convictions (table 45).

TABLE 45.—Number of convictions after first parole from institution, race of boys, and parent nativity of white boys

Number of convictions after first parole	Total boys	Parent nativity of white boys				Negro boys	Other colored boys	Boys whose race was not reported
		Native parentage	Foreign parentage	Mixed parentage	Parentage not reported			
Total.....	623	198	275	28	62	49	8	3
None.....	258	78	113	16	26	18	5	2
1.....	140	45	71	3	14	7	-----	-----
2.....	86	30	38	1	8	8	-----	1
3.....	68	26	22	4	9	5	2	-----
4.....	34	11	11	2	3	6	1	-----
5 or more.....	32	7	17	2	2	4	-----	-----
Number not reported.....	3	-----	2	-----	-----	1	-----	-----
No report as to convictions..	2	1	1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

As a large proportion of these boys came from bad neighborhoods (see p. 19), the extent of difference in neighborhood characteristics for the sons of native and of foreign-born parents was observed. Only 41 (24 percent) of the white boys of native parentage were living in bad neighborhoods at the time of the interview, as compared with 99 (39 percent) of those of foreign parentage. Sixty (35 percent) of the native-parentage group, as compared with 99 (39 percent) of those of foreign parentage, were living in mediocre neighborhoods. Seventy (41 percent) of the native-parentage group, as compared with 57 (22 percent) of the foreign-parentage group, were in good neighborhoods. In spite of the presumed handicap of bad neighborhoods, present more often in the case of sons of foreign-born parents than among boys of native parentage, the proportion of subsequent convictions among sons of foreign-born parents did not differ significantly from that among the sons of native-born parents.

In general, however, the percentage of boys with subsequent convictions was greater among those living in bad neighborhoods than among boys living in good neighborhoods when interviewed. Fifty-two percent of the 161 residing in good neighborhoods and 67 percent of the 184 in bad ones for whom there was a report on convictions were reported to have been convicted one or more times after release from the institution.

¹ One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, p. 165.

Some relation might be expected between the number of convictions subsequent to release from the institution and the number of times the boy had been brought into court as delinquent before his commitment. That is, it would be natural to assume that it would be more difficult to adjust by means of institutional treatment the boys who had become habitual offenders. As table 46 shows, there appears to be evidence of such relation. Of the boys who had been committed to the institution the first time they were brought before the court, 52 percent had no convictions after their first parole, whereas only 34 percent of those who had appeared in court twice or more often prior to the appearance resulting in commitment had avoided conviction subsequent to their release.

TABLE 46.—Number of convictions after first parole from institution, and number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment to institution

Number of convictions after first parole	Total boys	Number of appearances in court prior to case resulting in commitment			
		None	1	2 or more	Not reported
Total.....	623	142	165	307	9
None.....	258	74	76	105	3
1.....	140	33	39	66	2
2.....	86	18	19	49	-----
3.....	68	9	12	45	2
4.....	34	4	8	21	1
5 or more.....	32	4	9	19	-----
Number not reported.....	3	-----	1	1	1
No report as to convictions.....	2	-----	1	1	-----

Institutional administrators will find in these figures some support for their often-expressed belief that if they could be given a chance to work with a boy before he had become fixed in his antisocial habits they would be able to do much more for him. On the other hand, persons who are skeptical of the value of institutional treatment in general will be likely to feel that many of these boys who were committed on the first offense might have been adjusted to community life by other forms of treatment. The information obtained in this study furnished no basis for determining whether or not these particular boys could have been treated successfully without some training in a controlled environment through institutional commitment. The figures are significant, but the problem needs much more intensive study and analysis.

The boys who had married had a better record in regard to convictions after leaving the institution than those who had remained single. The 621 boys for whom information on convictions was obtained include 383 who had remained single, 199 who were married and living with their wives at the time of the interview, and 39 who were divorced or separated. Approximately two-thirds of those who had remained single and of those who had married but were divorced or separated, but less than half of those who were married and living with their wives, had a record of one or more convictions subsequent to release from the institution. Among the group who had been divorced or separated the conviction may have been of importance in connection with the divorce or separation.

Probation.—To what extent these boys were placed on probation after conviction subsequent to their release from the institution is of some interest. There was a report as to probation for all except 4 of the 363 boys who had been convicted once or more often; 102 of them had been granted probation following a conviction. Probation seems to have been used somewhat more frequently in New York and in Michigan than in the other States; 30 boys (39 percent) of those convicted in the New York group and 27 (38 percent) of those convicted among the Michigan group had been placed on probation, as compared with 19 (25 percent) of the New Jersey boys, 16 (21 percent) of the Ohio boys, and 10 (17 percent) of the California boys.

Commitment to other institutions.—The next step in following these 623 boys' careers was to discover how many of them were later committed to other correctional or penal institutions. As table 47 shows, New York had the smallest number of boys committed to penal institutions, Ohio the largest; 361 boys had not been committed to any institution after their release from the institution for delinquents.

TABLE 47.—*Commitment to other penal or correctional institutions after release from institution for delinquents*

Institution to which committed	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	100	123	122	124	128	126
Subsequent commitments.....	262	42	58	57	46	38	63
Jail only.....	56	9	11	9	9	12	15
Reformatory only.....	68	11	14	20	17	10	21
Penitentiary only.....	18	3	9	7	1	1	1
Other only.....	27	4	14	3	1	7	2
Jail and reformatory.....	17	3	5	5	4	3	5
Jail and penitentiary.....	9	1	3	2	1	1	2
Jail and other.....	11	2	5	1	1	1	4
Reformatory and penitentiary.....	18	3	8	8	2	1	7
Reformatory and other.....	9	1	1	1	2	2	4
Penitentiary and other.....	12	2	10	1	1	1	1
Jail, reformatory, and penitentiary.....	9	1	2	2	6	1	1
Jail, reformatory, and other.....	1	(¹)	1	1	1	1	1
Jail, penitentiary, and other.....	4	1	4	1	1	1	1
Reformatory, penitentiary, and other.....	2	(¹)	1	1	1	1	1
Jail, reformatory, penitentiary, and other.....	1	(¹)	1	1	1	1	1
No subsequent commitment.....	361	58	65	65	78	90	63

¹ Less than 1 percent.

A comparison of the subsequent commitments with the mental levels of the boys as indicated by the intelligence quotients on record at the institutions is shown in table 48. Although some 20 percent were classified as having an intelligence quotient below 70, thus falling into the group usually considered mentally defective, only 23 percent of the boys who were subsequently committed to correctional institutions had an intelligence quotient below 70, and 18 percent of those having no subsequent commitment had intelligence quotients below 70. Apparently the mental level as determined by the tests on record bore no close relation to the matter of subsequent commitment to a correctional institution. Identical proportions of boys with border-line intelligence (I. Q. 70-80) were found in the commit-

ment and no-commitment groups. The percentage of boys with intelligence quotients of 100 or higher was slightly lower among those with subsequent commitments than among those with none.

TABLE 48.—*Intelligence quotient as given in institution records, and commitment to penal or correctional institution after release from institution for delinquents*

Intelligence quotient	Total boys		Subsequent commitment		No subsequent commitment	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	623		262		361	
Intelligence quotient reported.....	321	100	133	100	188	100
Less than 60.....	10	3	3	2	7	4
60, less than 70.....	55	17	28	21	27	14
70, less than 80.....	80	25	33	25	47	25
80, less than 90.....	85	26	29	22	56	30
90, less than 100.....	64	20	31	23	33	18
100, less than 110.....	20	6	7	5	13	7
110 or more.....	7	2	2	2	5	3
Intelligence quotient not reported.....	72		26		46	
No examination.....	219		100		119	
No report as to examination.....	11		3		8	

The majority of the 262 boys committed to penal institutions after parole were committed to jails and reformatories. Seventy-three of the boys had been committed to penitentiaries. Some had been sent to other industrial schools or to military prisons. A number had served terms both in jail and in a reformatory or a penitentiary. Some had had both reformatory and penitentiary sentences, and a few had been in several types of correctional and penal institutions. In connection with commitments it must be kept in mind that institutional facilities in the various States differed widely. In California the Preston School of Industry, which admits boys 15 to 21 years of age, is a training school similar to the Whittier State School. It is not considered a reformatory, and therefore in the tabulations for this study it was classed in the "other institution" group. It was found that in California some of the more serious offenders, who would have gone to reformatories in other States, were considered unsuitable for the Preston School of Industry and therefore were sentenced to the penitentiary. The other four States had reformatories for the group of intermediate age.

Examination of the extent to which these boys were committed to some institution after their first parole showed that 515 (83 percent) of the 623 boys studied had never been sentenced to jail after release from the institution, 72 (12 percent) had been sentenced to jail once, 23 (4 percent) twice, 10 (2 percent) 3 times; 2 boys had had 4 jail terms. The number of times was not reported for 1 boy known to have been in jail. There were 498 boys (80 percent) who had not had a reformatory sentence; this includes the 29 California boys who had been committed to the Preston School of Industry. Eighty-nine boys (14 percent) had had 1 reformatory term, 28 (4 percent) had had 2 terms, 7 (1 percent) had had 3 terms, and 1 had had 4 terms.

One penitentiary sentence appeared in the records of 59 boys (9 percent), and two such sentences in 14 cases (2 percent); 550 boys (88 percent) had not been sentenced to a penitentiary.

Other disposition of cases.—In a considerable number of cases the disposition was neither probation nor commitment. Cases of this description were more frequent among the boys from the New Jersey and the New York institutions than among those from the other institutions studied. They were relatively infrequent for the California group—only 4 as compared with 22 for the New York group. Principal types of other dispositions were suspended sentences, fines for lesser misdemeanors, and return to the institution from which the boy was on parole.

Age of the boys at the time of subsequent commitment

An item of some interest in connection with the boys' subsequent commitments is the age at which they were sentenced to the various penal or correctional institutions. Five boys were only 16 years old when they were sentenced to jail after release from the industrial school, 11 were 17, 20 were 18, 15 were 19, and 16 were 20. Thus 67 of these boys, after release from their training periods, were sentenced to serve a term in jail before they had reached 21, the age at which legal responsibility of the institution for their supervision and training would have expired (except in Michigan, where the seventeenth—or in certain cases the eighteenth—birthday was the legal date for discharge). Three of the boys were committed to a reformatory while only 15 years old, 18 when 16 years old, and 25 at the age of 17. Thus 46 of the boys who had been in these institutions for delinquents were sent on to the reformatory before they were 18 years of age. Three boys (1 in California, 1 in Michigan, and 1 in New York) were sentenced to the penitentiary while they were 17 years old, 11 while they were 18, 11 others while they were 19, and 13 while they were 20, so that a total of 38 went on to penitentiary terms before they were 21.

Types of offense committed after discharge from parole

For 300 of the 623 boys no offense after discharge from parole was reported. The type of offense committed was ascertained for 316 boys, 156 of them having committed more than one type of offense. Table 49 shows the type of offense and the number of times each was committed. Some form of stealing (including robbery, burglary, and larceny) was reported for more boys than any other type of offense; 257 boys had been arrested for this cause, some of them two or more times. Disorderly conduct and vagrancy was the cause in a large number of cases, 62 boys having been arrested on such charges.

TABLE 49.—*Offenses committed after discharge from parole*

Type of offense ¹	Number of boys committing offenses	Number of times each specified offense was committed				
		1	2	3	4 or more	Not reported
Criminal homicide.....	2	2				
Robbery.....	40	35	4	1		
Aggravated assault.....	6	6				
Other assault.....	21	17	3	1		
Burglary—breaking or entering.....	78	63	14		1	
Larceny, except auto theft.....	78	64	12	2		
Auto theft.....	61	40	15	4	2	
Embezzlement and fraud.....	10	10				

¹ Based on the standard classification of offenses for criminal statistics.

TABLE 49.—Offenses committed after discharge from parole—Continued

Type of offense	Number of boys committing offenses	Number of times each specified offense was committed				
		1	2	3	4 or more	Not reported
Forgery and counterfeiting.....	14	8	6			
Rape.....	6	6				
Sex offenses (except rape).....	8	7	1			
Weapons, carrying, possessing, etc.....	4	4				
Nonsupport or neglect of family or children.....	21	21				
Violations of liquor laws.....	13	9	4			
Violations of traffic and motor-vehicle laws (including 2 driving while intoxicated).....	7	6			1	
Drunkness.....	31	15	12	3	1	
Disorderly conduct and vagrancy.....	62	45	9	6	1	1
Gambling.....	11	9	2			
All other offenses.....	72	62	9		1	
Type not reported.....	6	6				
No offense committed.....	300					
No report as to offense.....	1					

Discrimination against the boys

As the claim frequently is made that persons known to have been in correctional institutions are at a disadvantage, an attempt was made to find out whether the boys included in this study believed they had been discriminated against by the police, by the courts, or in other ways—such as in obtaining employment—because of their institutional records. Table 50 presents the facts obtained, which were almost wholly deduced from statements of the boys themselves, perhaps influenced to some extent by the field agents' conversation with the police, with parole and probation officers, and with other court officers. Whatever the statements may be worth, they indicate that only a small proportion (24 percent) of the boys felt that there had been discrimination against them. There was not much variation among the State groups, though the Ohio boys claimed rather more discrimination than the other groups.

TABLE 50.—Discrimination against boy after release from institution for delinquents

Discrimination against boy after release	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623		123	122	124	128	126
Report as to discrimination.....	615	100	119	121	124	128	123
Yes.....	146	24	21	19	26	35	45
No.....	469	76	98	102	98	93	78
No report as to discrimination.....	8		4	1			3

SUMMARY

1. The group shows considerable mobility. Only 56 percent of the 576 for whom information on this point was obtained were considered really settled as to residence. About half were found to have remained in the same community from which they had been committed. Unfortunately no comparable figures on mobility of nondelinquent persons of similar ages are available to show whether there is greater restlessness among these particular maladjusted individuals.

2. Of the 623 boys, 32 percent had married and were living with their wives, and 6 percent had married but had been divorced or separated by the time they were interviewed; 61 percent had not married.

3. The homes of 33 percent were in neighborhoods described as bad; those of 29 percent were in good neighborhoods.

4. The homes in which 27 percent of the boys were living when interviewed were described as poor, 34 percent were fair, 33 percent were good, and 6 percent were excellent.

5. The employment histories gave evidence of the receipt of little intelligent aid in job placement; the vocational training received at the institution had been of relatively little direct use; there was considerable instability in employment, 20 percent of the boys having changed jobs 20 or more times in their few years at work and an additional 21 percent having held 10 to 19 jobs. A great diversity of occupations was represented in the jobs they held at the time they were interviewed.

6. A large proportion had remained at a low economic level. Of those reporting the last weekly earnings, 34 percent were shown to have received less than \$20, and only 10 percent had reached a wage level of \$40 or more a week at the time of the interview or in the last job held. Several in the higher-earning level were engaged in illegal activities, such as bootlegging.

One-fourth of the boys were dependent on parents, relatives, or social agencies or were in institutions. Eighteen percent were only partly self-supporting. A small group (4 percent) were not only supporting families of their own but also were contributing to the support of their parents. Only 8 percent of those who were supporting themselves wholly or in part had made primary use of such vocational training as the institutions had given; 30 percent had made secondary use of it, and the remainder seemed to have made no use of it.

7. Eighty-six service enlistments were noted. Eight of the boys were still in active service, 35 had been honorably discharged, 37 had been dishonorably discharged, and 4 were deserters not yet discharged. No report was obtained in 2 cases.

8. Among the boys reporting on the matter, 69 percent had no church affiliation and 77 percent had no affiliation with fraternal or social organizations of any kind.

9. Conduct at the time of the interview was reported to be satisfactory in slightly more than half the cases. Except for a small "doubtful" group, the rest were not conducting themselves in a socially satisfactory manner. Record of arrest once or oftener after release from the institution was found for 66 percent of the 621 boys for whom there was a report on this subject. Record of conviction subsequent to release was found in 58 percent of the 621 cases in which there was a report. The white boys of native and of foreign parentage showed almost identical proportions of subsequent court records of this kind. Boys who had been committed to the institution on their first appearance in court were convicted relatively less often after release than those with a record of court appearance prior to commitment. Those who were married and living in their own homes had a lower rate of subsequent convictions than those who had remained single or who were separated or divorced from their wives. Subsequent commitment to one or more correctional or penal institutions was reported for 42 percent of the 623 boys studied.

Chapter VII.—DEGREE OF ADJUSTMENT

METHOD OF ESTIMATING ADJUSTMENT

Any criteria that may be adopted in an effort to appraise the degree of success of institutional treatment will be open to question, for all of them must be arbitrarily fixed in relation to specific happenings or must be reached through subjective processes that are variable because they depend to some extent on the persons judging. As there are no hard and fast boundaries by which the groups who have made satisfactory adjustment or failed to do so can be distinguished clearly, it seemed desirable to appraise each case by rating it first in relation to certain types of adjustment, then in relation to general adjustment considered as a composite of the whole. In most instances the rating was given by the field agent who had interviewed the boy and so was familiar with all aspects of his case. The ratings of the agents were reviewed carefully by the supervisors who had prepared the material for statistical use. The results of appraisal are presented in the following sections, with brief case histories that illustrate the various types and degrees of adjustment and emphasize the fact that many personalities and problems lie back of the figures.

EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT

Each case was rated in terms of the employment adjustment the boy had made as Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor. In making these ratings the agents were asked to consider the following questions:

How long had the boy held the job which he had at the time of the interview? Was he comparatively or particularly happy in his job, or was he unhappy and dissatisfied? Did this job seem to be suited to his general mental level and aptitudes as known from the records?

How frequently had he changed jobs? Had he held any one job a considerable length of time? Had job changes been more or less aimless, resulting from restlessness, indolence, incompetence, unreliability, etc., or made in a definite attempt to better himself, whether or not the result was in that direction? Had he made fairly regular progress in employment toward steadier work and better wages? How many times, and for how long periods, had he been unemployed, and for what reasons?

Had he some particular trade in which he was genuinely interested and in which he desired to gain skill and to remain? Was he ambitious and, if so, was his ambition to be an outstandingly good and successful workman, with a pride in accomplishment, or was he thinking primarily of increased earnings?

Had he a sense of loyalty to the job and to his employer, or would he be likely to "soldier" on the job? What was his general attitude toward work? Did he accept it as a regular, wholesome activity, or would he prefer to go through life without working?

The following cases illustrate the several types of employment adjustment represented in these ratings. The names, of course, are fictitious.

Case no. 1. Excellent. At the time he was interviewed Stephen T—— had been employed by a State highway commission 8 years and 5 months. He had secured a job as messenger with that commission when he left high school to go to work, about a year after release from the State industrial school. He had had regular raises in pay until at the time of the study he was drawing double his original wages. He was reported to be hard-working, honest, and reliable. He was supporting himself and helping to support his mother, with whom he was living. He owned an inexpensive automobile and had over \$200 in savings. Stephen had been committed to the industrial school at the age of 14, charged with having passed some fictitious checks. It was his second offense of this description; he had been placed on probation the first time but within a few months had forged other checks. Stephen's own father, who was a machinist by trade, making a reasonably good income, had been divorced by his mother because of drunkenness. The mother had remarried, and at the time of Stephen's difficulties there had been no trouble with the stepfather, though later he deserted the family. Stephen remained in the institution 2½ years. His vocational training consisted of work in the plumbing and print shops.

Case no. 2. Good. Ned S——, a Negro, was interviewed about 7 years after his release from the State industrial school. He had had four jobs since his release, but for the 3 years prior to the interview he had been janitor in the same office building. He was working regularly and had acquired a reputation for industry. He had married and was managing to support himself and his wife on his very meager earnings, although he was in debt to an installment house for some of the furnishings of his home.

Ned was almost 16 years of age when he was committed to the industrial school. He had been on probation to the juvenile court, his first offense having been theft of some money, and while on probation he was accused of having sexual relations with a 16-year-old colored girl. He remained in the institution a little less than a year. He attended school and progressed from the sixth to the seventh grade. His vocational training consisted of work in the butcher shop during practically his entire institutional period. He had been in no difficulty of any kind since leaving the institution.

Case no. 3. Fair. Edward R—— was interviewed slightly more than 5 years after his release from the State industrial school. On release he had obtained a job as bread wrapper in a baking firm, but quit after 6 months because of his unwillingness to work on Sundays. His next job was in an automobile plant which closed down at the end of 10 months. After a few months of only odd jobs with short unemployment periods in between, he secured work as an inspector of parts in another automobile factory. Then he was arrested for automobile theft and committed to the State reformatory.

When he was interviewed, Edward had been out of the reformatory 3 months, following a second commitment. He had been working steadily all that time as a laborer for a public-utility company. He expressed the hope that he would be able to keep the job and would be promoted to something considerably better. He was living at home and contributing to the support of the family. His mother was devoted to him, and he seemed to be fond of her and to be making an effort to settle down again to steady work.

Edward had been brought to court when he was about 15 years old, charged with being drunk and disturbing the peace. His mother was an invalid (paralytic), and his father admitted that he had lost all control over the boy, who had left school after finishing the ninth grade. Edward was placed on probation at that time, but finally was committed to the State industrial school a year later when it was discovered that he was making false reports to his probation officer, was keeping late hours, and was again beyond his father's control.

Edward remained in the institution only 6½ months. He did not attend school and was not in any regular trade course, his assignment being to "general industrial training." This was described as consisting of miscellaneous jobs in connection with various maintenance shops as additional help was needed.

Case no. 4. Poor. Leo Y—— had been unemployed 3 years when interviewed. He was living with his father and a brother in two attic rooms, very barren and dirty. The father was earning \$8 a week, and the three men received

additional help of \$4 a week from the city charities during the winter months. Leo seemed content to live under any kind of conditions if he could get along without working. He had made no effort to find a job, and though apparently capable of self-support would work only on compulsion.

Leo had accumulated a record of several arrests for truancy and one for stealing by the time he was 13 years old. He was then committed to the State industrial school as ungovernable and having repeatedly violated probation. Although he was a habitual truant the records showed him to be a good student when he did attend school. The children were reported to have "run wild" since the death of the mother 3 years previously. Leo remained at the institution only a little over a year. During that time he progressed from fifth to sixth grade and was considered a good student. His only vocational work was on the farm. When paroled he was returned to the industrial community from which he had come. While on parole he went to school and progressed to the seventh grade, but quit as soon as he became 15 years old in order to work in a button factory. At the end of 7 months he left the job because he thought the work too hard and the wages too low. After 3 months of unemployment he got a job in a shoe factory, where he earned about \$16 a week on piecework. He was untrained for it and did such poor work that he repeatedly damaged the materials he handled. He was finally laid off after an argument over the requirement that he pay for the damage. That was the last job he had.

As table 51 shows, 242 (39 percent) of the boys to whom ratings could be given were considered poorly adjusted in relation to employment and only 78 (13 percent) were considered outstandingly successful. The remainder were about evenly divided between the good and the fair groups. Some slight variations in the State groups will be noted. For example, the New York cases show a higher percentage of good and excellent adjustments, although, as New York was the last State in which field work was done, unemployment due to the depression was more widespread there than had been observed in some of the other States at the time their cases were being studied. The California group was relatively low in Poor ratings but high in Fair ones.

TABLE 51.—*Employment adjustment at time of interview*

Employment adjustment	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	-----	123	122	124	128	126
Adjustment reported.....	618	100	123	121	122	127	125
Excellent.....	78	13	19	9	17	19	14
Good.....	142	23	21	28	26	37	30
Fair.....	156	25	42	39	25	21	29
Poor.....	242	39	41	45	54	50	52
Inapplicable ¹	5	-----	-----	1	2	1	1

¹ Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness, 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years, and 3 other boys who never worked.

ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT

For appraising the economic adjustment which each boy had made, the ratings used were Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Very poor. In considering each case the agent asked himself the following questions:

To what extent had the boy been self-supporting? To what extent had he been supported by relatives? Had he been dependent

on private or public relief funds? If he had dependents, or relatives needing his aid, had he helped them to the limit of his ability?

Did he live in a manner consistent with his earnings or beyond his means? Had he any savings in reserve? Had he contracted debts? If so, had he paid them off, or was he paying on them regularly? Were such debts reasonable obligations, or out of all proportion to his earnings?

Were there logical reasons why he had been wholly unable to meet reasonable financial obligations (such as ill health, unemployment through no fault of his own, etc.)?

The varying degrees of economic adjustment indicated by these ratings are illustrated by the following cases:

Case no. 5. * Excellent. Karl N—— was married and was supporting himself and his wife by working as an interior decorator for his brother, who was a contractor. Karl took great pride in the painting and decorative plaster work which he did on many of their jobs. For the 2½ years prior to the time he was interviewed he had been averaging \$8 a day in earnings. For the 5 years preceding that he had been working as a plasterer's helper for his father, who was also a contractor. In that work he had made from \$4 to \$8 a day. Karl's wife was employed as a stenographer and was earning \$35 a week. They had an equity of \$7,500 in a property worth more than \$10,000. They were living in an attractive 4-room apartment over the garage on the rear of their property. The house in front brought them \$60 a month in rent. Karl was reported to be hard-working, honest, and thrifty.

Karl's parents were both foreign born. His mother had died while he was quite young. His father had not remarried. There were two other children, both older than Karl.

At the age of 14 Karl had been committed to the State industrial school. The record showed that he had been taught to steal by another boy when he was about 12 or 13 years old and had rather consistently committed thefts from that date. He had been before the court once before for burglary. At the school he was given a psychological examination and credited with an intelligence quotient of 81. He completed the eighth grade while in the institution, where he remained 2 years. For more than a year his vocational training consisted of work in the paint shop, in which he made an excellent record. Karl himself said this training was of very practical use to him in connection with his later work.

Case no. 6. Good. Martin E—— was supporting himself, his wife, and one child at the time he was interviewed. He had never received assistance from any outside source. He was making only \$26.50 a week, but he had a bank account of nearly \$200 and was carrying \$1,200 in life insurance. He was living in a fairly good residential neighborhood.

Martin was working as a laborer in a garage at the time he was interviewed. He had held that same job for 2 years. Before that he had had seven jobs since leaving the institution. He had been errand boy in a bookbinding works, helper on an ice-cream truck, in a laundry, in garages, and at lubrication stations. He was reported to be an industrious and steady worker and to have had one promotion in his present employment.

Martin had been committed to the State industrial school when he was 14 years old, charged with petty larceny in that he had stolen two cakes from a store. He had been before the court twice previously, both times for stealing. On both the prior occasions he had been placed on probation. Martin's mother had died when he was 3 years of age and he had been 5 years in an institution for dependent children. Then a sister who had married undertook to take care of him.

He remained at the industrial school a year. In the psychological examination given him he was found to have an intelligence quotient of 81. He reached the eighth grade in the institution school. With the exception of 2 months during which he was assigned to farm work he spent practically his entire time in the institution assigned to housework.

Case no. 7. Fair. Dan P—— had remained single and was living in a rooming house in a disreputable neighborhood. However, he was entirely self-supporting and was working quite steadily. His employment at the time he was interviewed was that of truck driver for a dry-cleaning concern. He had held that job about 3 years and had received several raises. He was making \$35 a week. In spite of this income and his lack of responsibility for any dependents he was more than \$200 in debt and was driving a new automobile. He was not satisfied with his present job. He was reported to spend a good deal of time idling around pool rooms and to be spending his money as fast as he earned it. He seemed perfectly contented with his living conditions in the obviously disreputable neighborhood.

He had been committed to the State industrial school at the age of 15 for violation of probation. He had been before the court for larceny and had been placed on probation but had run away from the detention home and had failed to report. Dan's own mother had died when he was 3 years of age, and he had lived in an orphanage until he was 7. Then his father remarried and took him home. While on probation to the juvenile court he had run away from home a number of times, apparently to get away from his stepmother, whom he was said to dislike heartily. The police often found him sleeping in the streets or in parked automobiles. A psychological test given to him at the juvenile court showed him to be of normal intelligence (I. Q. 88). He had completed the eighth grade before commitment.

Dan remained in the institution a year, attending the ninth grade in school and working most of the time in the print shop and some time in the machine shop. He was paroled and returned to the parental home. Within 2 months he was again charged with larceny and returned for violation of parole. When paroled the second time he went to work for his aunt in a restaurant which she managed. After that he worked for an electrical shop and as a truck driver. He had never been able to make any use of the vocational training received in the institution.

Case no. 8. Poor. David L—— had a wife and one child, but was unable to support them without assistance. He was in debt to the extent of about \$300, incurred mainly for doctor's bills; one grocery bill for \$35 was in the hands of a collecting agency. Two of his children had died, and the county welfare bureau had aided with their burial. The director of this bureau was personally interested in the boy and his family and had been giving them service in connection with their personal problems for many years. At the time of the interview David had been working about a month as a taxi driver, making \$12 to \$15 a week. He and his family were living in a cheap lodging house, but were to move shortly to a garage on the rear of his father's property, where they were to have free rent. David seemed to be entirely satisfied with a bare subsistence.

David had been committed to the State industrial school when he was 17 years old on a charge of sex delinquency. His delinquencies were said by his probation officer to have begun at 14 years of age. He had also been accused of stealing.

At the institution he was given a psychological examination and was said to have an intelligence quotient of 70. The psychologist gave the boy an unfavorable prognosis at the time of his release, saying that he had not made good in the institution and that he probably would be "a menace" because of his "weak morals" and "low resistance." David did not attend academic school while in the institution, it being thought best to have him devote all his time to vocational training. He was placed in the bakery but at the end of 3 months was transferred because of uncleanliness in his work. He was then assigned to the garden, where he worked more than a year and made a fairly good record.

After leaving the institution he followed the baker's trade for 3 months. Next he joined the United States Marine Corps, but in 2 years was dishonorably discharged because of overstaying leave. He then spent 2 years "on the road." His wanderings covered 14 States, and he worked at a great variety of odd jobs during that period. His longest consecutive period of employment was 26 months, during which he worked as an extra driver for a beverage-distributing concern. His income during that period did not exceed \$8 a week. He had been charged once with burglary, but was acquitted. He was said to have an extensive acquaintance among poolroom habitués and to number among his friends some men in the State penitentiary.

Case no. 9. Very poor. Nick F—— was living with a married brother in a medium-grade working-class neighborhood at the time he was interviewed. Nick seemed to have no sense of economic responsibility. He had been unemployed approximately 6 years. The longest job he had ever held had been about 2 months on automobile-repair work, immediately after his release from the State industrial school. He was said to refuse to take jobs and to leave jobs that he did take within a very short time. He had been dependent on others for the last 6 years, having stayed with various relatives as long as possible. His reputation was that he would not work so long as he could get a meal without earning it. His associates were said to be a group of pool-room and speak-easy loafers, and he was accused of stealing money from the relatives with whom he was staying, though they had placed no formal charges against him.

Nick was committed to the industrial school at the age of 16, on the charge of theft of \$5 that had been given him to pay the family light bill. The father said the boy was completely beyond his control. He had been a persistent truant and had been accused of stealing on other occasions. He had been placed on probation, having been before the court three times prior to the appearance on which he was committed. His mother had been dead several years, and an older sister was keeping house for the family. The home was comfortable, but there was little control over the younger children.

At the institution Nick attended school the entire time and was reported to have completed the seventh grade. Psychological tests recorded an intelligence quotient of 77. His vocational training consisted of about 5 months on general maintenance detail and about 5 months in the storeroom. He had remained in the institution only about 10 months. Since leaving it he had managed to keep out of any open difficulty with the authorities and had never been arrested.

Table 52 shows the ratings given. No ratings had been given in two cases. It will be observed that somewhat similar percentages of the 621 cases rated were placed in the Excellent and the Very poor classifications, and in the Good and Poor groups. On the whole the groups for the various States were constituted similarly in regard to the economic adjustments made, although Michigan and Ohio fall somewhat below the others in their proportions of Good or Excellent ratings.

TABLE 52.—*Economic adjustment at time of interview*

Economic adjustment	Total boys		Califor- nia	Michi- gan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distrib- ution					
Total.....	623		123	122	124	128	126
Adjustment reported.....	621	100	123	122	122	128	126
Excellent.....	80	13	15	13	17	21	14
Good.....	171	28	41	29	40	34	27
Fair.....	121	19	22	27	23	24	25
Poor.....	148	24	20	36	23	31	38
Very poor.....	101	16	25	17	19	18	22
Inapplicable ¹	2				2		

¹ Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness and 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years.

SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

Each field agent was asked to grade his cases in relation to social adjustment, using the ratings Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, and Very poor. In assigning their ratings they took into consideration the four following aspects of adjustment:

First, the boy's relations with his immediate family and his relatives; that is, whether he was on friendly terms with them and

whether he was considered an acceptable or desirable unit in the family group.

Second, his relations with his neighbors and his fellow workers; that is, whether he had many or few friends or none at all, the general character and reputation of his associates, what his neighbors and fellow workers thought of him, and whether they considered him a desirable person to have around.

Third, his relation to his community; that is, whether he was affiliated with church, fraternal, or other social groups; whether he took any active part or interest in civic affairs, in general community welfare; whether he was in general considered an asset or a liability to the community by his friends, neighbors, fellow workers, employers, the pastor, social workers, the police, and others.

Fourth, his attitude toward society in general and toward his own immediate social circle in particular.

The following case histories are as nearly typical of those classified under the several ratings as any one case may be said to be typical of histories based on the lives of individuals no two of whom have the same characteristics and problems:

Case no. 10. Excellent. Paul N——— was married and maintaining a well-furnished home in a good neighborhood. He was earning \$42 a week and his wife was earning \$28. He was reported to be thrifty and to have several hundred dollars of cash savings at the time of the interview. He was socially prominent among the people of his own nationality in the city in which he lived, and he and his wife entertained a wide circle of friends in their home. Paul was found to be ambitious and was studying economics and business administration by correspondence in order to help him advance in his work. He hoped to go into the printing business for himself. He was a skilled printing pressman and was active in the employees' association of his company. He had an excellent reputation and good personal habits and was described as being reliable, conscientious, and intelligent.

Paul's social adjustment was a credit to him. His parents were of the laboring class and of foreign birth. The father deserted the family when Paul was a small boy. The mother had been committed to a hospital for the insane some time prior to Paul's commitment to the State industrial school. When his own home broke up he had been put under the supervision of the juvenile court and had been placed in many private homes and in some private institutions. He was repeatedly described as being unruly, irresponsible, and bad-tempered. The probation officer's report said that he had never committed any serious offense but was believed to be guilty of petty thieving.

Paul was committed to the industrial school at the age of 15 years on a charge of incorrigibility. The psychological test given him there showed him to have an intelligence quotient of 96. He remained at the institution slightly more than 2 years and spent the entire time working in the print shop. He had made excellent use of this printing training, having remained in that trade ever since his release.

Case no. 11. Good. Arthur S———, a Negro, was found living with his wife in an attractive 2-room flat in a poor Negro section of a large industrial city. He belonged to the Methodist church in his neighborhood, to the Y. M. C. A., and to a social club affiliated with the church. His reputation was very good in his neighborhood and he was said to spend his leisure time in constructive activities.

Arthur not only supported himself and his wife, but also was helping to take care of an aunt and contributing to the support of his father and his brother-in-law. He was working as a clothes presser and hat cleaner for a small firm where he was reported to be a very industrious and satisfactory employee. He liked his work and was planning to try to go into business for himself. He had saved \$150 for that purpose at the time of the interview.

Arthur had been committed to the State industrial school when he was 14

years of age, for running away from home. He had run away from home a number of times previously but had never been before the court prior to that time. He was considered of border-line intelligence (I. Q. 70) by the juvenile-court clinic. He stayed in the institution a year, attending school half the time and working on general maintenance detail the other half.

Case no. 12. Fair. Sam C—— was supporting himself working as a shipping clerk for a motor-car company at the time he was interviewed, making \$33 a week. He had remained single and was boarding with an uncle. He was driving a new automobile and was \$250 in debt. He was reported to pass much time with young companions of both sexes, on whom he spent his money lavishly. He was reported not to attend church or to be associated with any organized social clubs of any kind. While spending money freely on his friends he had refused financial help to his parents, though they had been in dire need several times.

Sam had been committed to the State industrial school when 15 years of age for breaking and entering a post office and stealing money. He had been before the court once before on a similar charge. The psychological test given him in the institution credited him with an intelligence quotient of 87. He remained slightly over a year, completing the seventh grade and being employed in the officers' kitchen for his work assignment. He had no later conflict with the law.

Case no. 13. Poor. Larry S—— was found living with three other unemployed men in a 2-room shanty which they rented for \$5 a month, sharing the expense. Larry was married, but he and his wife had recently separated. Larry and his wife had received clothing and other material relief from various social agencies in his home city. He was under care of the social-service bureau at the time of the interview. It was estimated that he had had more than 50 different short jobs since release. He was reported to be a heavy drinker and to spend much time carousing. He had a long record of misconduct since release from the State industrial school, having been arrested a number of times for breaking and entering. He also had served in the State reformatory for burglary, having been paroled after 3 years. His associates since then were reported to have been strictly of the criminal class. At the time of the interview he was making about \$5 a week serving as "stool pigeon" for the police.

Larry came from a large family which had extremely low economic status and frequently received public aid. In his childhood he had been taught to beg by his parents, whose mentality was reported to be low. The family lived in a very poor home in a poor neighborhood, and Larry grew up with a gang of young hoodlums. Most of his early delinquencies were associated with the activities of this gang. He had been before the juvenile court five times before he was finally committed to the State industrial school at the age of 15, on a charge of truancy. He and other members of the gang were said to have been responsible for a long series of petty thefts of various kinds. Apparently, although he was placed on probation repeatedly, he was never removed from his unfit home and neighborhood. After a year in the institution, in which he was in the fifth grade in the school and worked mostly in the mending room, he was paroled and was returned to the same unfit parental home.

Case no. 14. Very poor. Oliver S—— had been in trouble rather consistently ever since his release from the State industrial school. For 5½ years prior to the time he was interviewed he had spent the major part of his time in correctional institutions. He was reported to have no respect whatever for the property of other persons. When he was at large he had very poor associates and spent a good deal of time with a group of ex-convicts. At the time of the interview he was in the county jail, awaiting trial on a robbery charge.

Oliver was committed to the industrial school at the age of 14, on a charge of habitual truancy. He had been before the court repeatedly for several years and had been sent to the county parental school six times before he was finally committed to the State institution. His commitment papers stated that his father kept a saloon and that the boy was brought up in the barroom. It was said that the parents made no attempt to control the boy and seemed to have no particular interest in any of the children (of whom there were seven) except as possible

future wage-earners. The home was in a tenement basement in a very poor neighborhood, with pool rooms, liquor establishments, and other demoralizing agencies. The family standards were very low.

The psychological test at the institution indicated that the boy was of normal intelligence (I. Q. 97). He attended school all the time, and his vocational training consisted of work in the paint shop, in which his record was good. The institution records showed a statement by the examining psychologist that "in spite of his long previous record, the training he had should make his chances of success on parole good." This was qualified by the remark that it would be likely to happen only if his home conditions were suitable. Oliver remained in the institution only a year and then was returned to his parental home. At the time of the interview the family occupied a 4-room apartment on the third floor of a 4-story frame house in a tenement area.

Oliver had a long history of unemployment. The longest time he remained in any job was when he worked 6 months as a machine operator in a cigarette factory immediately after being placed on parole. He had a long police record for petty and grand larceny. The charges on which he was awaiting trial at the time he was interviewed were robbery and carrying concealed weapons.

Table 53 shows the classification of the cases by social adjustment. It was concluded that this adjustment had been excellent in 64 cases (10 percent), good in 162 (26 percent), fair in 119 (19 percent), poor in 175 (28 percent), and very poor in 103 (17 percent). California had the highest percentage in the excellent group, and Michigan and Ohio had the lowest percentages.

TABLE 53.—*Social adjustment at time of interview*

Social adjustment	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	100	123	122	124	128	126
Excellent.....	64	10	21	6	12	15	10
Good.....	162	26	28	37	33	35	29
Fair.....	119	19	27	25	24	22	21
Poor.....	175	28	23	29	36	40	47
Very poor.....	103	17	24	25	19	16	19

GENERAL ADJUSTMENT

To evaluate the success of institutional treatment by noting what conflict the boy has had with the law since his release from institutional supervision does not seem wholly sound, nor does it seem very satisfactory to determine the degree of his general adjustment to community life by a method which takes a certain number of minor or major offenses as the criterion. The offenses must be measured in terms of arrests, convictions, and commitments; yet the very knowledge that a boy had been arrested once and had an industrial-school record might lead to other arrests on suspicion, so that the number of arrests would itself be influenced by that factor.¹

¹ In their study of 500 reformatory cases Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck set up very specific definitions of success and failure based on such factors. For example, their definition of "total failure" is as follows: "Cases in which there had been arrests for 3 or more serious offenses not followed by conviction (there was only one such instance), or arrests for more than 3 minor offenses (except drunkenness) not followed by conviction (actually there were no such instances); or convictions for 1 or more serious offenses; or convictions for more than 5 charges of drunkenness (comprising but a few cases); or desertion or dishonorable discharge from the Army or Navy; or the status of fugitive from justice or being wanted for escape; or the known commission of serious offenses, or a continual course of minor offenses, for which the men were somehow not arrested or prosecuted" (500 Criminal Careers, p. 189). The first category in this definition seems open to serious question, and it does not seem entirely reasonable to draw an arbitrary line which would mean calling a man who had 5 convictions for drunkenness a partial failure whereas one who had more than 5 on the same charge would go into the failure group.

In this study no numerical methods for defining varying degrees of "success" have been used. The figures on the boy's experience of arrest, conviction, and commitment have been presented without classification of "success" or "failure" according to the number of such experiences since their release from the institution for delinquents. A somewhat different evaluation was attempted instead. This consisted first of assembling for each case the ratings which had been given the boys on the following points: Economic adjustment, employment adjustment, social adjustment, standing in present employment, satisfactory or unsatisfactory character of present conduct, and post-parole conduct. On the basis of these six ratings, with the whole set of case schedules at hand for review in cases in which there was any doubt, the 623 boys were classified in three groups representing successful, doubtful, and unsuccessful adjustment. Staff conferences in which the supervisor of the field work and the general supervisor of the study participated were held for discussion of the cases in regard to which the field agents felt any indecision, and a final rating was given by general agreement. (For sample ratings see appendix C, p. 135.)

The following case histories illustrate in general the sum of adjustments considered to constitute successful, doubtful, or unsuccessful adjustment.

Case no. 15. Successful. Peter C—— came from a home maintained at a low economic level by foreign-born parents of Slavic extraction. His father, who had been a boiler-maker's helper, was a heavy drinker. The mother had died when Peter was quite young, the father had remarried, and the juvenile-court records described the home conditions as "discordant." The father and stepmother were said to have no control over the boy. The family lived in dark, crowded quarters in a congested tenement area in an industrial city. The neighborhood contained many places of demoralizing character. There were no parks, playgrounds, nor vacant property close at hand where children might play.

Peter had been committed to the State industrial school at the age of 15 years, the charge being habitual truancy and petty larceny. He had been a persistent truant since the age of 9 and had been before the court four times for truancy and once for breaking windows in the county parental school, to which he had been committed twice. On other occasions he had been placed on probation but left in his own home, and he was returned to his own home from the parental school. His probation officer described him as disobedient and insolent.

In the psychological test at the institution he was rated as of normal intelligence (I. Q. 87). He had a physical handicap, having lost the sight of one eye. During the year and 2 months of his stay in the institution he remained in the fifth grade, which he never completed. His vocational training consisted of work in masonry.

When paroled he was 16 years old and was placed again in his parental home. Within a short time after his release he found himself a job as clerk in the production department of a large manufacturing company, where he was paid \$16 a week. In about a year and a half he was laid off because business was slack, but he got another job almost immediately as clerk in the production department of another large firm. At the time of the interview he had held this same job 6½ years, had been raised from \$20 to \$30 a week, and had \$350 in cash savings.

Peter had married and was living with his wife and one child in a small apartment that was in a congested tenement area in his home city but was nicely furnished and quite attractive. He and his wife attended motion pictures regularly together, and their home contained daily papers and current magazines for recreational reading.

Peter was reported to be very much interested in his work and well liked by his employers, who considered him dependable and reliable. He was an assiduous reader of technical works in the field of his industrial interests. He had been in no difficulty since leaving the institution.

Case no. 16. Successful. Ernest L—— was committed to the State industrial school when he was 15 years old, on his second court appearance. He had first been brought to court 6 months earlier for stealing a bicycle and had been placed on probation. The second charge was breaking and entering, larceny, and theft of an automobile. He and several other boys had stolen the automobile and broken into a grocery store.

Ernest's parents had been divorced when he was about 6 years old, and he and his father had lived together in a rooming house about 6 years. Then his father remarried; the family standards were fair and the home atmosphere was described as congenial. His father and stepmother were said to be of fair reputation, hard-working but "close-fisted." Ernest had completed the fifth grade in school and had been playing truant. His own statement was that he wanted to go to work and get money to go to his own mother, who was living in another State.

Ernest's psychological test in the institution resulted in his being classified as dull normal (I. Q. 84). He attended school and worked in the laundry. When he was paroled at the end of about 6 months he was placed in a farm home, but in another 6 months he was returned for parole violation, charged with being incorrigible and having committed a theft. Ernest himself claimed that this accusation was wholly without any basis and was a great injustice to him. He declared that he was "framed 100 percent" by the farmer for whom he was working. His story was that the farmer attempted to overwork him and that when he objected the farmer threatened to get him back to the industrial school and did so on false charges. Ernest stated that he protested to the institutional authorities but they took the farmer's word against his. He then remained at the institution 5 months, not attending school but assigned to maintenance work. When released he went to his mother, who was living on a farm in another State, and he remained with her about a year, working on the farm. Then he returned to the home of his father, who had moved to another city. There he got a job in a steel plant and worked steadily for a year. Next he went to work for a cheese-making plant, that being his father's trade. At the end of a year he was having trouble with one of his arms because of the low temperature in which he had to work. On the doctor's advice he left that job and went to a baking company; at the time of the interview he had been holding this position more than 2 years, earning \$20 a week. The employer considered him conscientious and reliable.

Ernest had married and at the time of the agent's visit he was living with his wife and one child in a comfortably furnished flat in a respectable residential section of the city. The flat was modern, well arranged, and generally attractive, although the neighborhood was somewhat deteriorated. Ernest had \$150 in cash savings and had recently purchased an automobile, paying cash. He seemed to be happily married and was said to associate only with people of good reputation. He had been in no trouble whatever since leaving the institution the second time, except that on two occasions he was arrested for being drunk. Each time he was released the following day after sobering up. These arrests were not in the city in which he was residing at the time of the interview and were prior to his marriage. He had no police record in the city in which he was living. He was said to drink occasionally but only at home or in the homes of friends.

Case no. 17. Doubtful. James G—— was 1 of a family of 7 children whose parents were foreign born. The father "followed the fruit" and worked in fruit and vegetable packing houses. The mother, who had died shortly before James was committed, was said to have been a good housekeeper and very industrious. The home, which was very modest but remarkably clean and neat, was in a foreign colony in a medium-sized city.

James was committed to the State industrial school when he was a little less than 14 years old. He was accused of having broken into a garage and stolen an automobile and gasoline, which had been used in joy-riding. He had been before the juvenile court on several previous occasions as ungovernable and having committed thefts. He had spent considerable time in the detention home.

In the psychological test he was given at the institution he was credited with an intelligence quotient of 84. James was in the sixth grade in school in the institution; his vocational work, so far as reported, consisted of 5 months in the boys' dining room and 6 months in the laundry. He had been sent to the segre-

gation cottage for disciplinary purposes eight times, his principal offenses being insubordination and creating a disturbance in the dining room or dormitory. The record showed that the examining psychologist had considered the outlook unfavorable for the boy because of his intelligence level (dull normal) and his lack of moral stamina but thought he might get along fairly well in some locality other than his old environment.

After 3 years and 3 months in the institution James was paroled to his father, and for a while he had irregular employment picking fruit and doing odd jobs. When he had been away from the institution little more than a month the parole officer's report included the statement, "I have not much faith in James." In less than a year the institution recorded him as discharged because he was committed to a correctional institution for older boys, having been found guilty of burglary.

This correctional institution released him on parole in 14 months. He then worked as truck driver for a produce merchant during more than 3 years. Thereafter he found rather irregular employment with produce merchants or on ranches and in fruit-packing plants. He had no further conflict with the law.

At the time of the interview James and a brother were picking cotton on a ranch and living in a 2-room bunk house under very insanitary conditions. When not out on some kind of seasonal agricultural job, James made his home with his father and brothers in the loft of a barn. This place was fitted out as bachelor quarters and was found to be clean and in perfect order. All this family worked at seasonal or casual labor in the fruit and vegetable industry.

Case no. 18. Doubtful. Harry M—— was 1 of a family of 10 children. The father was a boss in a glass factory and made a fair wage. The family of 12 persons, however, was crowded into a small 5-room house. The home was plainly furnished but was clean and orderly. It was situated in a cheap residential section surrounded by a highly industrialized area containing steel mills and factories of all kinds. Harry was committed to the State industrial school on his third court appearance, when he was 13 years old, the charge being that he had enticed another boy to run away from home with him. On the two previous occasions he had been accused of theft; the first time he was placed on probation; the second time he was sent to a private institution, in which he remained but a week, being released again on probation. He was then in the sixth grade at school but was reported to be a truant. His statement was that he "hated school."

Harry remained in the institution a little over a year and a half. The psychological test given there credited him with an intelligence quotient of 91. The only record of misconduct was one escape. He progressed from the sixth to the seventh grade; and, according to his own statement, helped to cook in the kitchen all the time he was in the institution. He was paroled and returned to his own home, where he attended school for a very short time and then left to work. While still on parole he was arrested several times and was found guilty of petty larceny. He was granted probation on condition that he make restitution. At another time he was fined \$10 and sentenced to 10 days in jail for trespassing on railroad property. Still later he was found guilty of grand larceny, second degree, and was placed on probation under suspended sentence to the State reformatory.

At the time of the interview Harry was living with his wife in a two-room apartment near his parent's home. The apartment was one of low rental and showed considerable evidence of poverty. Harry had worked as a laborer in various factories. At the time of the interview he had a job as laborer which he had held for 2 years. He was earning \$17 a week. The only difficulty with the law which he had had for nearly 4 years was a commitment to the county jail on a charge of violation of probation and driving a car without a license. His past record was known in the community, and some people distrusted him, but others regarded him as careless but not criminal. His family relations were pleasant, and he was supporting his wife to the best of his ability.

Case no. 19. Doubtful. Thomas P—— came from a family home maintained in fairly comfortable fashion. His father owned his own bakery business. The juvenile-court records indicated that the Italian father and mother were slow to adopt American customs and to understand American attitudes toward children. They were good, law-abiding people, and all the children except Thomas were reported to be well behaved. The home was in a tenement area in

a large city. There were no parks and no organized playgrounds within easy reach, so there was no place for children to play except the streets. The neighborhood was said to have a high delinquency rate and to be lacking in constructive influences but abounding in vicious ones.

When nearly 12 years of age Thomas was committed to the State industrial school for stealing some money and a bicycle. It was his fifth court appearance, all the charges having been larceny. He had been on probation to the juvenile court for some time prior to commitment. He had also been in a private institution two terms.

At the State institution he was given a psychological examination and classed as of superior intelligence (I. Q. 109). Twice in the course of his institutional treatment he escaped. The first time he was returned almost immediately; the second he was away several months, during which apparently there was no attempt to return him, as he seems to have been at his own home. He returned voluntarily after he had stolen considerable money from his father and spent it. His story was that he came back for protection from his father because he was afraid of him after this offense. The psychological clinic recommended that he be kept for a short disciplinary stay and then again paroled, but that he should be given to understand that he could not come to the institution for refuge every time he got into difficulty because of his thefts.

Thomas' first period in the institution covered slightly more than 2 years. He completed the sixth grade and his assignments were to housework and to the truck garden. He also played in the band. The next time he stayed 10 months and spent all his vocational periods in the bake shop except for his band work. The institution's appraisal of Thomas was that he was very bright, mild in conduct, and of attractive personality, that his institutional record had been "ace high", and that it was difficult to understand his unsatisfactory conduct outside. He was finally paroled at the age of 16 and returned to his parental home, but in 4 months he was returned for violating parole, the violation having been theft. After another year he was again paroled and placed to work in a bakery. He stayed only a day or two on this job and went home to help his father, who he said needed help in his own bakery, but almost immediately he was sent back to the institution for violation of parole. After a short period he was again paroled, this time to his own home to work in his father's bakery.

When Thomas was interviewed some 7 years later he had married, and he and his wife were living with his parents. Following the parole period he had worked part of the time for his father and part of the time for an uncle, but as times became hard he had tried to get other work and had some employment as a longshoreman. His wife was also working, but finally was laid off. They had lived part of the time with her people and part of the time with his. Although the home itself was quite satisfactory, it was in a tenement neighborhood harboring many cheap commercialized amusements and other demoralizing influences. Thomas seemed to lack a sense of responsibility for self-support and to be willing to work only when relatives threatened to cut off their aid. He was spending his time loafing with other irresponsible companions, drinking and occasionally gambling, making no effort to support himself or his wife. Thomas admitted that among his friends were a number of boys who had been in the industrial school and later in the State penitentiary. He claimed that he was now having only casual association with them.

Case no. 20. Unsuccessful. John J—— was one of 6 children in a family reported to be ignorant and shiftless, notorious in the community for misconduct of various kinds. One sister had been in the State home for girls. Their home had been in a shanty town along the river. John ran the streets with a gang of boys who engaged in petty larceny of various types. When he was 12 years old—but had completed only the second grade of school—he was committed to the State industrial school on a charge of larceny. He had been in court five times for truancy and larceny but had been placed on probation each time. Apparently, however, he had been left in the same low-standard home.

John's psychological test at the institution resulted in his being rated of borderline mentality (I. Q. 68). His conduct record was not characterized by frequent formal discipline, though he was not considered a particularly good boy. He was placed in a special class and was assigned to work in the dairy.

At the end of a year he was paroled. The examining psychologist had recommended that John be placed in a farm home, but first he was allowed to go home

for a brief visit. When the parole officer placed him on the farm he remained only 1 day and then went back home, where he was finally permitted to stay. Within a year he was arrested for stealing and was returned to the institution. He remained another year and a half and was again paroled. He did not attend school during this second period in the institution. His work was on the farm and in the dairy and was considered good.

At the time of the interview some 8 years later the boy was an inmate of the State reformatory. He had been committed to the State prison for carrying weapons unlawfully but had been transferred to the reformatory after about 6 months, to serve the balance of his term there. He had a long police record for a number of offenses, which included driving without license, drunkenness, disorderly conduct, adultery, and one prior charge of larceny, which was not followed by conviction. He had served some short terms in the county jail and the county workhouse.

John had married, and his wife and their two children were living with her people. He had the general reputation of being lazy and not dependable and was said to associate with all the most undesirable persons in his home county. He had had a long series of jobs of various duration, practically all at common labor. He himself estimated that he had had about 20 jobs altogether.

Case no. 21. Unsuccessful. William T—— came from a family disrupted by divorce. The mother had remarried after divorcing William's own father and then had divorced her second husband. Her reputation was said to be very poor. The mother and grandmother lived together part of the time and were said not to get along very well together. William was committed to the State industrial school when he was 15 years old. About a year earlier he had come before the juvenile court for incorrigibility but was released to his mother to remain under "strict supervision." In about a month he had violated his probation by stealing \$5 and running away. He was then placed in a work home on probation. He stayed there less than a month, was disobedient and difficult to manage, and ran away. He was again tried in a foster home, but after 2 weeks the foster mother declined to keep him any longer. Still another foster home was found for him, but after about a month he stole some money and ran away. He was found by his own mother and returned to the juvenile court. The court placed him again in the home from which he had last run away, but he stole a watch and was then committed to the institution.

In the institution he was given two psychological tests about a year apart and was classed as average or dull normal. The first test showed an intelligence quotient of 91, but this dropped to 81 in the second test. The psychologist's record contained a statement that "the boy will probably become decidedly psychopathic." While in the institution he was formally disciplined 15 times for theft, persistent smoking, fighting, and insubordination. He completed the eighth grade but finally was dropped from academic classes because of his frequent absences due to disciplinary action. His first vocational assignment was to the dairy, where he remained for a year but never did well. He was then assigned to the carpenter shop, where he remained about 7 months.

After he had been at the institution slightly over 2 years he was paroled to his grandmother's home, but the prognosis in the institutional records was that because of his bad habits and criminalistic point of view he might always need institutional care. Within the year he was convicted of burglary and committed to the State correctional institution for older boys. He was paroled from this institution after about a year and a half. Within a few months he was arrested for burglary but was turned over to the parole officer, and the case was "adjusted." Less than 6 months later he was convicted of second-degree burglary and committed to the State penitentiary on an indeterminate sentence of 1 to 15 years. After serving a year and a half he was paroled. In less than a year thereafter he was convicted of first-degree robbery and committed, on an indeterminate sentence of 5 years to life, to the State prison for recidivists. He was still in this prison at the time he was interviewed.

During the time William was at liberty he had worked intermittently as a carpenter's helper. He had had three different jobs of that kind but had been unemployed for 3 months prior to his last arrest. He was said to have been rooming in a disreputable section of the city, and his mother stated that he had been living with "prostitutes and crooks." He was reported to be a heavy drinker and an inveterate gambler.

Case no. 22. Unsuccessful. Dick G—— was reported never to have had any good home life. He was the youngest of six children. The mother and father were separated, the mother having left the father because of his attentions to another woman. The father and two brothers had police and court records. An older brother was serving a term in prison for theft of Liberty bonds, and another brother had been in the State industrial school. The home conditions were said to be very poor and the family standards extremely low. The home was in an industrial city in a neighborhood that once had been good, but became thoroughly deteriorated. There were numerous pool halls and other amusements of questionable character, and no organized recreational facilities for children. The population in the neighborhood was mostly foreign born. Dick's family, however, was of native stock. The family was known to a number of different social agencies.

Dick attended schools until he was old enough to work. Then he got a job tending furnaces and entered continuation school, where he was placed in the tool-making class. The principal stated that no other boy in the school had made better progress. When Dick was almost 16 years old he was committed to the State industrial school on a charge of stealing automobile tires and electric-light bulbs valued at about \$25. Juvenile-court records showed that he had been before the juvenile court twice previously for theft and had been placed on probation, but apparently he had been left in the unsatisfactory home and subjected to the same bad neighborhood influences.

A psychological test at the institution credited him with an intelligence quotient of 75. The records did not show any particular misconduct except that he was reported twice for fighting. He attended school in the fifth and sixth grades, and he was assigned to work in the laundry for 6 months. After a little more than a year he was paroled to his mother. While on parole he was convicted of third-degree burglary and was placed on probation.

When interviewed about 7 years after his release from the industrial school Dick was a charity inmate of the county tuberculosis sanitarium, where he had been for a little over a month. Prior to hospitalization he had been living in a brother's home, which was very sparsely furnished, dirty, and disorderly when visited by the field agent. Dick and his father had been living with this brother and paying board when they were employed. When they were unemployed, aid was received from the city. The home was in an industrial city in a poor slum neighborhood which abounded in speak-easies and pool halls and was considered a center for vice and crime. Dick had done considerable roaming about the country; he had occasionally worked as an electrician; he had also tended bar and worked in the liquor business. He and one brother had done some professional boxing, but he gave this up after the brother was killed in a boxing bout. For 2 years prior to the interview he had remained almost continuously in his home city, working a little in speak-easies, begging and panhandling, often going hungry and sleeping in the streets.

He had been arrested only once in recent years and that was for petty larceny. He had spent 20 days in jail as a result. Dick's brothers and sisters, though not having particularly high standards of their own, were inclined to look down on him for his willingness to beg rather than work. His general reputation was that of a vagabond, whose associates were prostitutes and criminals.

Case no. 23. Unsuccessful. Tony G—— came of a family whose economic circumstances were always quite good, although they were based on a business that would not seem to be desirable for a young boy. During the prohibition period the father was operating a saloon. Tony often helped in the saloon and spent much of his time there. The home was in a large industrial city, with practically every type of cheap and undesirable commercial amusement in the vicinity. The parents were reported to have been extremely indulgent toward Tony. His public-school record showed truancy and assignment to the opportunity room because he did not do good work. The father repeatedly complained to the court that the boy was ungovernable. Twice the court placed the boy on probation to his father. Finally when he was 14 years old he was considered entirely beyond his parents' control and was committed to the State industrial school. Prior to that time he had had one period of 6 months in a private institution.

The juvenile-court records contained a statement that psychological tests showed the boy to be a moron; no test was recorded as having been given at the institution. Tony was required to attend school and reached the fifth grade.

There was no record of his having any vocational-training assignment, nor was there any record of discipline except for smoking.

At the end of a year he was paroled to his home. While on parole he ran away from home twice; the second time he was returned to the State school for violation of parole, having been found guilty of stealing an automobile. He remained there another year and was again paroled to return home, where he helped his father in the store, restaurant, and saloon, in connection with which a gambling room was said to be operated.

After leaving the State institution Tony worked a while for his father in a variety of jobs, such as waiting on customers, assisting with the purchase of supplies, tending the cash register, and managing various phases of the business. For about 5 years prior to the interview he had been in business for himself, his father having helped him to become established. At the time of the interview, somewhat more than 7 years after his release from the institution, he was living with his parents at the family home in a neighborhood some distance from their place of business and was operating a roadhouse night club across the United States border. According to Tony's own statement he and his associates were selling liquor at this roadhouse without paying the tax, and Tony was receiving about \$300 a week as his share of the profits. He openly admitted that he was in partnership on the American side of the border in the management of several speak-easies and in some rum-running enterprises. For the interview he met the agent by appointment at his father's saloon, arriving in a large car with a chauffeur. He usually traveled with a bodyguard. There was no attempt to conceal any of the illegal activities going on all the time on the father's premises, as they claimed to have no fear of interference of any kind.

Tony had not been arrested since his last release from the industrial school except for gambling, for which he was placed on probation.

It seemed hard to believe that the parole officer could have been ignorant of the type of establishment in which the boy was working while on parole with his father. Nevertheless, the institutional record showed "boy has done well while on parole."

Table 54 presents the ratings on general adjustment. Slightly fewer than a third of these boys were considered to have made a successful adjustment and to be fairly certain to be useful citizens, with whom society need expect to have no particular difficulty. Another third were classified as having made a doubtful adjustment. These gave evidence of ability to get along fairly well, but there were certain weak points in their general adjustment or they had had occasional conflict with the law, so that it was uncertain whether or not society might expect further trouble from them. Slightly more than a third were failures beyond any doubt. The several State groups did not differ markedly in this final evaluation, ranging from New York's top figure of successful adjustment (36 percent) to Ohio's low one (28 percent), or, viewed from a different angle, ranging from New Jersey's low rate of unsuccessful adjustment (31 percent) to Ohio's high one (40 percent).

TABLE 54.—General adjustment at time of interview

General adjustment	Total boys		California	Michigan	New Jersey	New York	Ohio
	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	100	123	122	124	128	126
Successful.....	200	32	39	38	42	46	35
Doubtful.....	203	33	42	40	43	38	40
Unsuccessful.....	220	35	42	44	39	44	51

SUMMARY

1. Employment adjustment in the 618 cases in which the necessary data for evaluation had been obtained was rated as excellent in 78 (13 percent), good in 142 (23 percent), fair in 156 (25 percent), and poor in 242 (39 percent).

2. Economic adjustment in the 621 cases for which data were obtained was rated excellent in 80 cases (13 percent), good in 171 (28 percent), fair in 121 (19 percent), poor in 148 (24 percent), and very poor in 101 (16 percent).

3. Adjustment in social relations was regarded as excellent in 64 (10 percent) of the 623 cases, good in 162 (26 percent), fair in 119 (19 percent), poor in 175 (28 percent), and very poor in 103 (17 percent).

4. The final evaluation of the adjustment the 623 boys had made to the general requirements of community life, based on consideration of all the adjustment ratings on specific phases of adjustment, resulted in a rating of generally successful in 200 cases (32 percent), doubtful in 203 (33 percent), and unsuccessful in 220 (35 percent).

Chapter VIII.—RELATION BETWEEN ADJUSTMENT AND CERTAIN FACTORS

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RELATIONS OBSERVED

When certain factors appearing in the cases of these 623 boys are studied in connection with the ratings for the degrees of adjustment to social responsibilities and to the exigencies of community life that had been achieved following institutional treatment, some relation between these factors and successful or unsuccessful adjustment is clearly apparent. In the case of certain other factors, however, the tabulations as clearly suggest the absence of any relation. Social data of this kind, as has been said, do not lend themselves readily to the mathematical exactitude of statistical treatment. In weighing the apparent relation between successful or unsuccessful adjustment in later careers and certain factors appearing in the case histories, many combinations of factors as well as single factors need to be considered in connection with one another. In the present study, with so limited a number of cases, it was impossible to make an analysis of factor combinations, the groups of cases with the same combinations being too small for statistical treatment. It must be reiterated too that the mere preponderance of certain factors in cases of successful or unsuccessful adjustment does not necessarily indicate a causal connection. Until a great deal more has been discovered as to why people act as they do, such studies as this can merely point out possible avenues for exploration because of evidence that certain actions are associated with adjustment or maladjustment. Moreover, so far as this study is concerned, much material that was considered desirable for comparative study could not be obtained.

RELATION OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENT TO CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS

The data obtained in the course of this inquiry were studied with a view to possible relationship of employment adjustment to subsequent delinquencies and to certain other factors in the lives of the boys.

As one of the factors given considerable weight in determining the degree of success in adjustment to community life was whether or not there had been convictions for offenses subsequent to release from the institution for delinquents, the convictions were compared with ratings of the boys' employment adjustment (table 55). Relatively few (15 percent) of the boys who were poorly adjusted in employment had avoided subsequent conviction. Among the boys who made only fair adjustment in employment the proportion with subsequent convictions was considerably higher than among those who had made good or excellent employment adjustment. It is necessary to proceed somewhat cautiously, however, in interpreting even so conspicuous a disproportion as this. On the basis of information available it is not possible to tell to what extent the poor employment adjustment contributed to behavior that proved socially unsatisfactory to such a degree as to result in prosecution and conviction. The

behavior that brought about a conviction may have been entirely the product of other factors, or the convictions themselves might have been a contributing force in bringing about the poor adjustment.

TABLE 55.—*Employment adjustment at time of interview, and convictions after first parole from institution*

Convictions after first parole from institution	Total boys		Employment adjustment at time of interview								Inapplicable (1)
			Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623		78		142		156		242		5
Report as to convictions.....	621	100	78	100	142	100	156	100	240	100	5
None.....	258	42	51	65	95	67	73	47	36	15	3
1.....	140	23	21	27	25	18	37	24	55	23	2
2.....	86	14	4	5	12	8	20	13	50	21	
3.....	68	11	1	1	7	5	16	10	44	18	
4.....	34	5	1	1	2	1	5	3	26	11	
5 or more.....	32	5					4	3	28	12	
Number not reported.....	3	(2)			1	1	1	1	1	(2)	
No report as to convictions.....	2								2		

¹ Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness, 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years, and 3 other boys who never worked.

² Less than 1 percent.

Study of the figures in relation to race and nativity data showed that among the white boys there was little difference in the proportions whose parents were native or foreign born in the different adjustment groups. Among the 49 Negro boys the employment adjustment of 6 was excellent, that of 12 was good, that of 12 was fair, and that of 19 was poor, a range comparable to that found in the case of white boys (table 56).

TABLE 56.—*Employment adjustment at time of interview, race of boys, and parent nativity of white boys*

Employment adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Parent nativity of white boys								Boys whose race was not reported		
		Total		Native parentage		Foreign parentage		Mixed parentage ¹	Parentage not reported		Negro boys ¹	Other colored boys ¹
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	563		198		275		28	62	49	8	3
Adjustment reported.....	618	558	100	197	100	271	100	28	62	49	8	3
Excellent.....	78	71	13	19	10	39	14	5	8	6	1	
Good.....	142	130	23	50	25	62	23	3	15	12		
Fair.....	156	135	24	44	22	63	23	13	15	12	7	2
Poor.....	242	222	40	84	43	107	39	7	24	19		1
Inapplicable ²	5	5		1		4						

¹ Percent distribution not shown because number of boys was less than 50.

² Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness, 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years, and 3 other boys who never worked.

Comparison of employment adjustment and the standards of the family in which the boy was living when first committed to the institution shows that a relatively high proportion of the boys who at the time of their commitment to the institution had come from homes in which good standards were maintained, and a correspondingly low proportion of those who came from homes with poor standards, had made excellent or good employment adjustment (table 57). Likewise a considerably larger proportion of the boys from homes with poor standards had made poor adjustments than of those from homes with good standards. Although this is by no means conclusive, it suggests the desirability of further study to determine to what extent the early childhood influences set a pattern for the later attitude toward work, and whether in families with good standards the children receive more intelligent help and guidance in relation to a vocation, which presumably affects their whole career, including subsequent delinquencies.

TABLE 57.—*Employment adjustment at time of interview and family standards at time of boy's commitment to institution*

Employment adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Family standards at time of commitment						Not reported
		Good		Mediocre		Poor		
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623	77	-----	179	-----	298	-----	69
Adjustment reported.....	618	76	100	178	100	296	100	68
Excellent.....	78	16	21	22	12	32	11	8
Good.....	142	26	34	51	29	48	16	17
Fair.....	156	15	20	41	23	82	28	18
Poor.....	242	19	25	64	36	134	45	25
Inapplicable ¹	5	1	-----	1	-----	2	-----	1

¹ Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness, 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years, and 3 other boys who never worked.

When employment adjustment was compared with the frequency of the boys' appearance in court prior to commitment to the institution, the relation between this factor and employment adjustment appeared much less close than in the case of family standards (table 58). Exactly the same percentage of the boys who were committed to the institution the first time they were taken to court made good or excellent employment adjustment later as of boys who had been before the court twice or more often. However, a larger proportion of the boys brought before the court two or more times had made poor employment adjustment than of those with no previous court appearance.

TABLE 58.—*Employment adjustment at time of interview, and number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment to institution*

Employment adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment						Not reported
		None		1		2 or more		
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623	142		165		307		9
Adjustment reported.....	618	141	100	163	100	305	100	9
Excellent.....	78	14	10	30	18	34	11	
Good.....	142	34	24	39	24	69	23	
Fair.....	156	45	32	40	25	65	21	6
Poor.....	242	48	34	54	33	137	45	3
Inapplicable ¹	5	1		2		2		

¹ Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness, 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years, and 3 other boys who never worked.

The figures showing whether in their later employment adjustment the boys made primary, secondary, or no use of the vocational training received at the institution are given in table 59. There seems to have been very little difference in the proportion of boys found in excellent, good, or poor employment adjustment who claimed to have made no use of their institutional training and whose work histories support their claims. There was some difference in the proportions of boys making excellent or poor employment adjustment who had made secondary use of their institutional training. On the other hand, though the numbers are small, it appears that a considerably higher proportion of boys who had made excellent or good employment adjustment had made primary use of their institutional training.

TABLE 59.—*Employment adjustment at time of interview and use made of institution training in employment after leaving institution*

Use made of institution training	Total boys		Employment adjustment at time of interview								Inapplicable ¹
			Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623		78		142		156		242		5
Report as to use.....	606	100	77	100	136	100	153	100	238	100	2
Primary.....	43	7	13	17	16	12	6	4	8	3	
Secondary.....	179	30	15	19	32	24	64	42	68	29	
None.....	384	63	49	64	88	65	83	54	162	68	2
No report as to use.....	4		1		1		2				
No training or no employment.....	13				5		1		4		3

¹ Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness, 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years, and 3 other boys who never worked.

Because of the nature of the material and the small number of boys employed in each occupation recorded, their occupations at the time they were interviewed were not tabulated in relation to the training they had received in the institution; it is interesting, however, to recall the boys' occupations, keeping in mind the types of shops in which these boys were reported to have worked while in the institution. (See pp. 43 and 67.)

Of the 22 boys who were taught something about making and repairing shoes in the institutional shops, only 1 was reported to be engaged in that trade at the time he was interviewed; yet in some of these institutions were many boys from industrial communities in which shoe factories supplied employment for a great number of individuals.

Printing makes a somewhat better showing in relation to subsequent employment. For a total of 38 of the boys in this study the training period in the printing shop was the longest trade assignment; 10 boys were following this trade at the time they were interviewed, and 6 of them had received training in the institution's printing shop.

Nineteen boys had painting as their longest trade assignment, and 5 were painters or enamellers at the time of the interview; 9 other boys were found to have followed this trade.

Forty-two boys were reported to have spent most of their trade-training time in the institution in the tailor shop. One boy was found working as an operative in a clothing factory at the time of the interview, and his longest trade assignment had been on the general farm. Some were operatives in other kinds of factories.

Playing in the band was one of the activities frequent at these institutions, and 26 boys who were studied had been assigned to the institution band for their vocational training; but only 1 of these boys was found employed as a musician at the time of the study.

Of the 124 boys whose longest training assignment in the institution had been work in general farming, in the dairy, or in the truck gardens, only 13 were working on farms when interviewed.

At the time these boys were in the institutions the training for certain newer trades which are popular with many boys was relatively undeveloped. For example, the only one of these boys who had received any training in automobile mechanics in the institution was working as an automobile mechanic when later interviewed. Three boys had training in electrical work, and one of them was an electrician when interviewed.

Changes have been made in the programs at certain of the institutions since the boys were under treatment, and interesting developments were under way at some of the institutions when visited in 1931 and 1932.¹ The whole field of vocational guidance, training, and placement presents great difficulties, which are accentuated in dealing with boys under care in schools for delinquents. Even the best institutions, so far as is known, have not developed professional service that familiarizes itself with the employment opportunities in the communities from which the boys came, learns something about the boys' interests, aptitudes, and abilities, makes training assignments on the basis of the findings, and then follows up this work with careful and intelligent placement and guidance during the first year or two after entrance into the work world.

¹ See *Institutional Treatment of Delinquent Boys*, pt. 1, p. 262.

In the course of the study illustrations were found of vocational work of such character that it was useful to the boy in connection with his employment after his release. The following case history illustrates this:

Fred A—— came from a very poor environment, described in the juvenile-court records as "vulgar and vicious." The father was a heavy drinker, and the stepmother was considered a mental defective. Fred had been committed to the institution at the age of 14 years, charged with murder. He was reported to have planned the crime, in company with another boy, 2 or 3 days before the murder. At the time he was a ward of the juvenile court, having been charged previously with a number of offenses, principally running away, though he had been involved in some thefts and in a forgery.

At the institution he was classed as of dull normal intelligence, with an I. Q. of 88. Prior to coming to the institution he had been examined by a psychiatrist, who reported that he gave no evidence of psychosis of any kind, but was definitely mentally defective. The research worker from the institution who visited the home described it as "an utterly unfit place in which to bring up children" and as "the worst home visited by the writer." Fred progressed to the eighth grade in school while in the institution. His first assignment in vocational training was to the boys' dining room, where he remained about 4 months. He then worked on the farm 5 months and was placed next in the print shop, where he remained 11 months. The records showed that he made good progress in the print shop and that his conduct was good. However, he spent many days in the discipline cottage. He was in the institution a little over 3 years, somewhat longer than the usual stay. This was due in part to the community attitude toward him on account of his serious offense, and in part to his own desire to stay some additional time because he was very much interested in his printing work.

When he was paroled he was placed in a printing job in which he stayed 2 years. His employer took a real interest in him but finally laid him off because he felt the boy was no longer interested in his work and was not "playing square." For a short time Fred worked at common labor or was unemployed. He then obtained work as an apprentice in the printing trade. At the time he was interviewed, more than 4 years later, he had worked continuously in this trade and was a printer's helper, earning \$40 a week.

It seems reasonable to believe that the trade training this boy had received in the institution had been a considerable factor in the successful adjustment he had made in spite of the unfavorable conditions in the home to which he had been returned and the seriousness of his earlier conduct.

It might be expected that the amount of supervision given and the type of services rendered by the parole officers would have some bearing on the adjustment the boys had been able to make in relation to employment. At least it would seem that intelligent, helpful guidance during the first few months of work in the community to which the boy had been returned might favorably affect his later adjustment in employment. A correlation of these factors was not considered possible, however, on the basis of the data available. The amount of supervision given cannot be measured by the number of visits the parole officers were reported to have made, because it is not merely the number of visits but rather the nature of the contacts made and the kind of service actually rendered that are important in relation to adjustment. Evaluation of the character of the services rendered and of the amount of supervision given was not feasible, owing to the meagerness of the information obtained on this subject. It will be recalled that for 441 of the boys no service from a parole officer was recorded; and neither the exact nature of the service nor the amount of supervision was stated in the 159 cases in which some assistance in regard to employment was reported. (See p. 52.)

RELATION OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT TO CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS

Economic adjustment is, of course, very closely related to employment adjustment, but it seems worth while to present separate tables showing economic adjustment in comparison with the factors already discussed in relation to employment adjustment. Apparently there was a definite relation between the boys' economic adjustment at the time they were interviewed and their subsequent social conflict as indicated by their convictions after the first parole from the institution. Of those who had made excellent adjustment 80 percent had had no subsequent convictions, whereas only 8 percent of those whose economic adjustment was very poor had had no subsequent convictions. Though less striking, the contrast between the proportions in the groups whose adjustment was good or poor who had had no subsequent convictions is nevertheless marked (table 60). As was pointed out in the preceding section, it is not possible to determine the causal nature of this association because the convictions and the time spent in detention would affect economic adjustment. Moreover, there seems little doubt that a criminal record may seriously handicap the making of economic adjustment. On the other hand, the individual who by reason of certain personality defects has an unsatisfactory attitude toward his economic responsibilities may be much more likely to drift into crime under temptation of the "easy money" which he may believe can be obtained in that way. The fact of the association stands, but the interpretation must be made very guardedly without more intensive study of a sort not possible with the data at hand.

TABLE 60.—*Economic adjustment at time of interview, and convictions after first parole from institution*

Convictions after first parole from institution	Total boys	Economic adjustment at time of interview										
		Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Inap- pli- cable ¹
		Num- ber	Per- cent distrib- ution	Num- ber	Per- cent distrib- ution	Num- ber	Per- cent distrib- ution	Num- ber	Per- cent distrib- ution	Num- ber	Per- cent distrib- ution	
Total.....	623	80	-----	171	-----	121	-----	148	-----	101	-----	
Report as to convictions.....	621	80	100	171	100	121	100	146	100	101	100	2
None.....	258	64	80	105	61	46	38	33	23	8	8	2
1.....	140	12	15	37	22	34	28	34	23	23	23	-----
2.....	86	4	5	13	8	17	14	31	21	21	21	-----
3.....	68	-----	-----	13	8	11	9	23	16	21	21	-----
4.....	34	-----	-----	2	1	7	6	16	11	9	9	-----
5 or more.....	32	-----	-----	-----	-----	5	4	9	6	18	18	-----
Number not reported.....	3	-----	-----	1	1	1	1	-----	-----	1	1	-----
No report as to convictions.....	2	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	2	-----	-----	-----	-----

¹ Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness and 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years.

Because it is a popular belief that race and nativity may greatly affect social adjustment, and because economic adjustment plays a part in general social adjustment, the race and nativity data were

studied in relation to the boys' economic adjustment. The number of boys included is too small to give well-founded conclusions, but it is of interest to note that comparison of the data for the white boys of native and of foreign parentage, as shown in table 61, reveals practically no relation between economic adjustment and parent nativity; and the adjustment ratings for the Negroes are similar to those for the white boys.

TABLE 61.—*Economic adjustment at time of interview, race of boys, and parent nativity of white boys*

Economic adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Parent nativity of white boys							Negro boys ¹	Other colored boys ¹	Boys whose race was not reported	
		Total		Native parentage		Foreign parentage		Mixed parentage ¹				Parentage not reported
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	563		198		275		28	62	49	8	3
Adjustment reported.....	621	561	100	197	100	274	100	28	62	49	8	3
Excellent.....	80	74	13	21	11	42	15	5	6	5	1	
Good.....	171	150	27	53	27	71	26	10	16	16	4	1
Fair.....	121	109	19	32	16	57	21	2	18	10	1	1
Poor.....	148	137	24	56	28	63	23	8	10	9	2	
Very poor.....	101	91	16	35	18	41	15	3	12	9		1
Inapplicable ²	2	2		1		1						

¹ Percent distribution not shown because number of boys was less than 50.

² Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness and 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years.

Table 62 shows the ratings as to family standards prior to the boys' commitment to the institution in relation to their economic adjustment. About the same relation is shown here as existed between family standards and employment adjustment. More of the boys with families of good standards made better adjustment of both types.

TABLE 62.—*Economic adjustment at time of interview, and family standards at time of boy's commitment to institution*

Economic adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Family standards at time of commitment						Not reported
		Good		Mediocre		Poor		
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623	77		179		298		69
Adjustment reported.....	621	77	100	179	100	297	100	68
Excellent.....	80	18	23	24	13	32	11	6
Good.....	171	26	34	54	30	67	23	24
Fair.....	121	10	13	31	17	61	21	19
Poor.....	148	16	21	42	23	79	27	11
Very poor.....	101	7	9	28	16	58	20	8
Inapplicable ¹	2					1		1

¹ Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness and 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years.

The use the boys were able to make of the training given them in the institution was noted in relation to their subsequent economic adjustment. Exactly the same percentage of boys who had made excellent and very poor economic adjustment had made no subsequent use of such training as they had received. A somewhat smaller percentage of boys who had made good economic adjustment had made no subsequent use of the training received. As was the case in regard to employment adjustment, a much higher proportion of the boys who made good or excellent economic adjustment were reported to have made primary use of their institutional training than of those whose economic adjustment was poor or only fair (table 63). This is additional support of the significance of these findings as indicating the urgent need that more intelligent vocational guidance and training be developed in institutional programs.

TABLE 63.—*Economic adjustment at time of interview, and use made of institution training in employment after leaving institution*

Use made of institution training	Total boys	Economic adjustment										
		Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Very poor		Not reported ¹
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total	623	80	-----	171	-----	121	-----	148	-----	101	-----	2
Report as to use	606	76	100	167	100	119	100	146	100	97	100	1
Primary	43	11	14	20	12	4	3	3	2	5	5	-----
Secondary	179	13	17	58	35	43	36	39	27	26	27	-----
None	384	52	68	89	53	72	61	104	71	66	68	1
No report as to use	4	2	-----	2	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
No training or no employment	13	2	-----	2	-----	2	-----	2	-----	4	-----	1

¹ Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness and 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years.

For the same reasons as were stated in connection with discussion of employment adjustment, it was not possible to reach any conclusions as to the relation between the amount of supervision and service given to the boys while they were on parole and their economic adjustment.

Some relation between the boys' marital status and their economic adjustment seems indicated (table 64). A greater number of the boys who had married than of those who remained single appeared to have made excellent or good adjustment, having "settled down" and found satisfactory places for themselves in the communities. The group who had been divorced or were separated from their wives was too small for conclusions regarding adjustment. However, marriage is itself a selective factor, and the group who had assumed the responsibilities of married life unquestionably included a larger proportion of boys who were of stable types. Some of the unstable boys who married are probably among the 39 who were found to have been separated or divorced.

TABLE 64.—*Economic adjustment and marital status at time of interview*

Economic adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Marital status at time of interview				Divorced or separated ¹
		Single		Married		
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623	383		201		39
Adjustment reported.....	621	381	100	201	100	39
Excellent.....	80	38	10	41	20	1
Good.....	171	87	23	78	39	6
Fair.....	121	84	22	26	13	11
Poor.....	148	100	26	39	19	9
Very poor.....	101	72	19	17	8	12
Inapplicable ²	2	2				

¹ Percent distribution not shown because number of boys was less than 50.

² Includes 1 boy unable to work on account of partial blindness and 1 boy who was in a tuberculosis sanitarium 5 or 6 years.

RELATION OF SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT TO CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS

As subsequent conflict with the law was itself one of the factors to which importance was attached in determining the ratings in social adjustment, the number of subsequent convictions was not tabulated in comparison with social adjustment.

The figures for white boys of native or of foreign-born parents in relation to social adjustment, as presented in table 65, indicate again the lack of any significant difference between these two groups. Although the number of Negroes was too small to warrant the use of percentages, it would seem that they succeeded about as well as the white group in making social adjustment.

TABLE 65.—*Social adjustment at time of interview, race of boys, and parent nativity of white boys*

Social adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Parent nativity of white boys							Negro boys ¹	Other colored boys ¹	Boys whose race was not reported	
		Total		Native parentage		Foreign parentage		Mixed parentage ¹				Parentage not reported
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	563	100	198	100	275	100	28	62	49	8	3
Excellent.....	64	56	10	16	8	30	11	4	6	7	1	
Good.....	162	148	26	54	27	71	26	10	13	10	3	1
Fair.....	119	108	19	33	17	58	21	5	12	9	1	1
Poor.....	175	159	28	55	28	81	29	4	19	14	2	
Very poor.....	103	92	16	40	20	35	13	5	12	9	1	1

¹ Percent distribution not shown because number of boys was less than 50.

Family standards in the home at the time of a boy's original commitment seem to have some connection with his later social adjust-

ment. The figures are shown in table 66. This becomes most apparent in the groups at the two extremes—Very poor and Excellent—and practically vanishes in the group rated Fair in social adjustment.

TABLE 66.—*Social adjustment at time of interview, and family standards at time of boy's commitment to institution*

Social adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Family standards at time of commitment						Not reported
		Good		Mediocre		Poor		
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623	77	100	179	100	298	100	69
Excellent.....	64	15	19	16	9	28	9	5
Good.....	162	23	30	53	30	60	20	26
Fair.....	119	13	17	37	21	53	18	16
Poor.....	175	18	23	46	26	96	32	15
Very poor.....	103	8	10	27	15	61	20	7

Precommitment recidivism seems to have some relation to later social adjustment, though not perhaps so much as might be expected. Such relation stands out most distinctly in the Very poor and the Good groups (table 67). There seems to be little difference in the Fair and Poor groups between boys who were committed to the institution on their first appearance in court and those who had had two or more prior appearances.

TABLE 67.—*Social adjustment at time of interview, and number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment to institution*

Social adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment						Not reported
		None		1		2 or more		
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623	142	100	165	100	307	100	9
Excellent.....	64	12	8	19	12	33	11	-----
Good.....	162	48	34	52	32	59	19	3
Fair.....	119	28	20	30	18	58	19	3
Poor.....	175	41	29	36	22	95	31	3
Very poor.....	103	13	9	28	17	62	20	-----

The extent to which the boys were able to make satisfactory adjustment to the requirements of institutional life was studied in relation to their ability to adjust themselves to society's requirements after their release from the institution. Information on discipline in the institution had been obtained for about two-thirds of the boys, and table 68 shows the number of times they were disciplined for misconduct in the institution in comparison with their ratings on social adjustment. A larger proportion of the boys who made excellent or good adjustment (20 percent) than of those who made poor

or very poor adjustment (10 percent) had never been disciplined while in the institution. Among the boys for whom a report was available in regard to the number of times disciplined, a still greater difference is seen between the two groups in regard to the frequency of discipline; 44 percent in the group whose adjustment was excellent or good had been disciplined 3 or more times, and 7 percent more than 10 times, whereas of the boys who made poor or very poor adjustment 60 percent had been disciplined 3 or more times and 22 percent, 10 or more times.

TABLE 68.—*Social adjustment at time of interview, and number of times boy was disciplined while in institution*

Number of times boy was disciplined while in institution	Total boys	Social adjustment at time of interview		
		Excellent or good	Fair	Poor or very poor
Total.....	623	226	119	278
Disciplined.....	371	123	65	183
Once.....	79	34	14	31
Twice.....	43	15	9	19
3 to 5 times.....	85	31	20	34
6 to 10 times.....	65	21	9	35
More than 10 times.....	58	10	9	39
Number of times not reported.....	41	12	4	25
Not disciplined.....	62	31	10	21
No report as to discipline.....	190	72	44	74

When the figures showing the boys' marital status at the time of the interview were placed in relation to their ratings on social adjustment, those who were married appeared in considerably higher proportion in the group rated Excellent or Good in respect to social adjustment than their percentage in the total group would warrant if those who married and those who were single became adjusted at about the same rate (table 69).

TABLE 69.—*Social adjustment and marital status at time of interview*

Social adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Marital status at time of interview				Divorced or separated ¹
		Single		Married		
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	
Total.....	623	383	100	201	100	39
Excellent.....	64	31	8	33	16	7
Good.....	162	78	20	77	38	7
Fair.....	119	78	20	32	16	9
Poor.....	175	120	31	44	22	11
Very poor.....	103	76	20	15	7	12

¹ Percent distribution not shown because number of boys was less than 50.

RELATION OF GENERAL ADJUSTMENT TO CERTAIN OTHER FACTORS

It will be recalled that after various types of adjustment were considered, a total rating for general adjustment, in which all factors were considered, was made for each boy. Comparison of these ratings with the data on race and nativity of the parents is shown in table 70. The proportions of Negro boys in each classification is very similar to that for the white boys. Among the white boys those of native parentage show a somewhat higher percentage in the failure group than those of foreign-born parentage.

TABLE 70.—*General adjustment at time of interview, race of boys, and parent nativity of white boys*

General adjustment at time of interview	Total boys	Parent nativity of white boys								Negro boys ¹	Other colored boys ¹	Boys whose race was not reported
		Total		Native parentage		Foreign parentage		Mixed parentage ¹	Parentage not reported			
		Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution					
Total.....	623	563	100	198	100	275	100	28	62	49	8	3
Successful.....	200	181	32	60	30	92	35	12	17	16	3	2
Doubtful.....	203	184	33	56	28	96	35	9	23	14	3	2
Unsuccessful.....	220	198	35	82	41	87	32	7	22	19	2	1

¹ Percent distribution not shown because number of boys was less than 50.

With respect to the character of the neighborhood in which the boys were living at the time of their commitment to the institution, as compared with the rating given for general adjustment, it may be noted that 38 percent of the boys who had made successful adjustment had come from bad neighborhoods and only 21 percent had come from good neighborhoods. On the other hand, 55 percent of the boys whose adjustment was unsuccessful had come from bad neighborhoods and 14 percent from good neighborhoods (table 71).

TABLE 71.—*General adjustment at time of interview, and character of neighborhood in which boy was living at time of commitment*

Character of neighborhood at time of commitment	Total boys		General adjustment at time of interview					
	Number	Percent distribution	Successful		Doubtful		Unsuccessful	
			Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	623	-----	200	-----	203	-----	220	-----
Character reported.....	563	100	180	100	184	100	199	100
Good.....	86	15	38	21	20	11	28	14
Mediocre.....	217	39	74	41	81	44	62	31
Bad.....	260	46	68	38	83	45	109	55
Character not reported.....	60	-----	20	-----	19	-----	21	-----

A smaller percentage of the boys who had made successful adjustment had come from homes that had poor conditions at the time of their commitment than of the boys whose adjustment was considered unsuccessful (table 72).

TABLE 72.—*General adjustment at time of interview, and home conditions at time of boy's commitment to institution*

Home conditions at time of commitment	Total boys		General adjustment at time of interview					
	Number	Percent distribution	Successful		Doubtful		Unsuccessful	
			Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	623		200		203		220	
Conditions reported.....	533	100	170	100	174	100	189	100
Excellent.....	16	3	5	3	3	2	8	4
Good.....	91	17	41	24	25	14	25	13
Fair.....	209	39	68	40	74	43	67	35
Poor.....	217	41	56	33	72	41	89	47
Conditions not reported.....	90		30		29		31	

The group which failed of adjustment contains more than six times as many boys who had come from families with poor standards as from families with good standards. Relatively fewer boys from families with poor standards were in the group that had made successful general adjustment (table 73).

TABLE 73.—*General adjustment at time of interview, and family standards at time of boy's commitment to institution*

Family standards at time of commitment	Total boys		General adjustment at time of interview					
	Number	Percent distribution	Successful		Doubtful		Unsuccessful	
			Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	623		200		203		220	
Family standards reported.....	554	100	175	100	176	100	203	100
Good.....	77	14	36	21	21	12	20	10
Mediocre.....	179	32	64	37	59	34	56	28
Poor.....	298	54	75	43	96	55	127	63
Family standards not reported.....	69		25		27		17	

Figures relating to precommitment environment are subject to a number of different interpretations. They illustrate the difficulty of ascribing definite meaning to any single factor in a case history. It is impossible to determine the extent to which the good or the bad conditions in the home and in the neighborhood before a boy's commitment permanently affected his personality and conduct. First, of course, there is the question whether the boy returned on release to

the same home and the same neighborhood and how much of the later effect was due to the same or to different influences subsequent to release instead of prior to commitment. As most of the boys included in this study went back to their own homes, the figures on this subject have no particular significance in regard to this group; but they are presented because it may be of interest to note any indication of connection between the earlier influences and the later careers, the nature of which a more intensive study and more thorough analysis might reveal. As broken homes are often popularly blamed for careers of delinquency and crime, the presence of such conditions in the boys' homes, so far as it could be discovered (see p. 22), was observed in comparison to the ratings on degree of adjustment. As table 74 shows, there is no significant difference in the percentages in the three groups representing the three degrees of social adjustment.

TABLE 74.—General adjustment at time of interview, and marital status of parents at time of boy's commitment to institution

Marital status of parents at time of boy's commitment	Total boys		General adjustment at time of interview					
			Successful		Doubtful		Unsuccessful	
	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution	Number	Per cent distribution
Total.....	623		200		203		220	
Marital status reported.....	619	100	199	100	200	100	220	100
Parents married and living together.....	311	50	107	54	93	47	111	50
Parents dead, divorced, or separated.....	306	49	92	46	105	53	109	50
Parents not married to each other.....	2	(¹)			2	1		
Marital status not reported.....	4		1		3			

¹ Less than 1 percent.

When the number of times the boys had been in court before the appearance resulting in commitment to the institution was compared with their general adjustment, it was observed that about the same percentage of boys who had made successful adjustment and whose adjustment was doubtful were among those who had been committed to the institution on their first appearance in court (table 75). A slightly smaller percentage of the boys whose adjustment was unsuccessful were the so-called "first offenders." Some difference appears, however, in the proportions of boys making unsuccessful and successful general adjustment among the precommitment recidivists; 121 (56 percent) of the 217 boys making unsuccessful adjustment for whom there was a report on appearances in court, and 82 (42 percent) of the 197 making successful adjustment for whom there was such a report, had been brought into court twice or oftener before the case resulting in commitment. Even though these figures may seem to indicate a slight predisposition to later failure on the part of recidivists, they would scarcely justify placing any great weight on precommitment recidivism in arriving at a prognosis of future adjustment.

TABLE 75.—General adjustment at time of interview, and number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment to institution

Number of appearances in court on delinquency charge prior to case resulting in commitment	Total boys		General adjustment at time of interview					
			Successful		Doubtful		Unsuccessful	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	623		200		203		220	
Number of appearances reported.....	614	100	197	100	200	100	217	100
None.....	142	23	49	25	52	26	41	19
1.....	165	27	66	34	44	22	55	25
2 or more.....	307	50	82	42	104	52	121	56
Number of appearances not reported.....	9		3		3		3	

The reason for the boys' commitment to the institution was compared with the degree of general adjustment they had made (table 76). It is noteworthy that exactly the same percentage of those who made successful adjustment and of those whose adjustment was unsuccessful had been committed originally for some type of theft. It is particularly interesting that none of the four boys who had been committed on the serious charge of hold-up had been complete failures; three had made successful adjustment, and the adjustment of the fourth was doubtful. Boys who had been committed for stealing automobiles or for burglary or unlawful entry likewise were scattered fairly evenly in the three adjustment groups. No significant differences in relation to subsequent adjustment were noted in regard to any of the other lesser offenses which were reported as reasons for commitment. These figures support the common belief among students of boys' behavior problems that the nature of the specific offense is of little importance in making plans for treatment and that, if successful treatment is to be applied, it is far more necessary to discover the factors underlying the specific misconduct.

TABLE 76.—General adjustment at time of interview, and reason for commitment to institution

Reason for commitment	Total boys	General adjustment at time of interview		
		Successful	Doubtful	Unsuccessful
Total.....	623	200	203	220
Reason reported.....	621	199	202	220
Automobile stealing.....	47	16	16	15
Burglary or unlawful entry.....	150	46	54	50
Other stealing.....	205	72	51	82
Ungovernable.....	79	19	32	28
Truancy.....	63	17	24	22
Running away.....	25	7	9	9
Sex offense.....	25	10	7	8
Act of carelessness or mischief.....	12	2	6	4
Injury to person.....	10	7	2	1
Other reason.....	5	3	1	1
Reason not reported.....	2	1	1	

The amount of misconduct in the institution might be expected to have some relation to subsequent general adjustment. It was noted that more boys who were formally disciplined in the institution appear in the doubtful or unsuccessful group than among those successfully adjusted. Among the boys whose adjustment was unsuccessful are also found more of those who were disciplined very frequently—more than 10 times (table 77).

TABLE 77.—*General adjustment at time of interview, and number of times boy was disciplined while in institution*

Number of times boy was disciplined while in institution	Total boys	General adjustment at time of interview		
		Successful	Doubtful	Unsuccessful
Total.....	623	200	203	220
Disciplined.....	371	106	117	148
Once.....	79	28	28	23
Twice.....	43	15	11	17
3 to 5 times.....	85	25	33	27
6 to 10 times.....	65	20	17	28
More than 10 times.....	58	7	19	32
Number of times not reported.....	41	11	9	21
Not disciplined.....	62	29	16	17
No report as to discipline.....	190	65	70	55

A question occasionally discussed is whether the length of time boys are kept in an institution bears any relation to their successful adjustment in the community on release. Some institution workers believe that a short period is on the whole more effective than one of considerable length. Of the boys included in this study, 29 percent of those who made successful adjustment and 24 percent of those who were unsuccessful had spent less than a year in the institution (table 78). This difference is too slight to have any meaning. Even if the disproportion were greater, such data as these would not indicate that any particular length of institutional training would be of maximum benefit in all cases. For example, they do not reveal whether the 24 percent of unsuccessfully adjusted boys who had spent less than a year in the institution might have had a more favorable outcome if their periods of training had been longer. Nor do they reveal whether the 19 percent of successfully adjusted boys who had had 2 or more years of institutional training would have been able to make satisfactory adjustment to community life if they had been released earlier. A great deal of careful study of this matter would be necessary before conclusions could be drawn with any degree of safety.

TABLE 78.—General adjustment at time of interview, and time in institution before first parole

Time in institution before first parole	Total boys		General adjustment					
			Successful		Doubtful		Unsuccessful	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	623	100	200	100	203	100	220	100
Less than 1 year.....	154	25	58	29	43	21	53	24
1 year, less than 2.....	360	58	104	52	126	62	130	59
2 years, less than 3.....	101	16	36	18	32	16	33	15
3 years or more.....	8	1	2	1	2	1	4	2

Just as no conclusions were possible from the data available on parole supervision and services rendered in relation to employment adjustment, economic adjustment, and social adjustment, so none can be presented in regard to the relation of parole service to the boys' general adjustment.

When the ratings of the conditions in the homes in which the boys were living at the time they were interviewed were compared with those on the degree of general adjustment the boys were considered to have made, an unmistakable relation appeared between poor homes and unsatisfactory adjustment to community life. More than four times the proportion of boys whose adjustment was unsuccessful as of those successfully adjusted were living in poor homes at the time of the interview. As has been pointed out in the discussion of various factors, the character of the relation cannot be definitely determined on the basis of the information available; it may be that certain characteristics of the boy and of his family are common causes of the poor homes and of the maladjustment. Much research in the psychological and psychiatric fields may still be needed before final conclusions can be reached in regard to this association, and a difficulty is to be faced in the task of isolating the various factors which a scientific approach would require to be studied separately. All that the present study shows is the frequent coincidence of maladjustment and poor homes (table 79).

TABLE 79.—General adjustment and home conditions at time of interview

Home conditions at time of interview	Total boys		General adjustment at time of interview					
			Successful		Doubtful		Unsuccessful	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	623	-----	200	-----	203	-----	220	-----
Conditions reported.....	557	100	193	100	200	100	164	100
Excellent.....	31	6	15	8	9	5	7	4
Good.....	183	33	93	48	58	29	32	20
Fair.....	190	34	64	33	79	40	47	29
Poor.....	153	27	21	11	54	27	78	48
Conditions not reported.....	66	-----	7	-----	3	-----	56	-----

Table 80 presents the comparison of degrees of adjustment with the character of the neighborhoods in which the boys were living at the time of the interview. Here also is evidence that poor environment and unsuccessful adjustment are closely related in some fashion. Considerably more than twice as great a proportion of the boys who were unsuccessful were living in bad neighborhoods as of those successfully adjusted. The latter group contained proportionately twice as many boys who were living in good neighborhoods as were found in the failure group. The same comment should be made with respect to the meaning of this relation as was made in discussion of home conditions. Investigations of behavior as related to neighborhoods too often have been confined to maladjusted individuals who come out of bad neighborhoods. But boys and girls from extremely bad neighborhoods make successful adjustment, and boys and girls from very good neighborhoods become maladjusted. In any event, the fact of the association between neighborhood conditions and general adjustment calls for careful attention in connection with plans for after-care of boys released from institutions.

TABLE 80.—*General adjustment and character of neighborhood in which boy was living at time of interview*

Character of neighborhood in which boy was living at time of interview	Total boys		General adjustment at time of interview					
			Successful		Doubtful		Unsuccessful	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	623		200		203		220	
Character reported.....	560	100	193	100	200	100	167	100
Good.....	162	29	72	37	60	30	30	18
Mediocre.....	213	38	84	44	69	35	60	36
Bad.....	185	33	37	19	71	36	77	46
Character not reported.....	63		7		3		53	

In the group of boys who had become successfully adjusted to community life practically the same number were married and single. In the groups that were not successfully adjusted or about whom there was some doubt a much larger proportion were single (table 81).

TABLE 81.—*General adjustment and marital status at time of interview*

Marital status at time of interview	Total boys		General adjustment at time of interview					
			Successful		Doubtful		Unsuccessful	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	623	100	200	100	203	100	220	100
Single.....	383	61	96	48	129	64	158	72
Married.....	201	32	97	49	61	30	43	20
Divorced or separated.....	39	6	7	4	13	6	19	9

A relatively large number of boys who had made successful adjustment reported some affiliation with organized religious bodies or social groups, whereas a very small proportion of the boys who were considered to have failed had any social connections (table 82). Such contacts would seem to be useful in establishing satisfactory associations in the community. The evidence is certainly rich in suggestions for those responsible for each boy's placement on his release from the institution and for the educational, recreational, and work program which is to be designed to help him keep out of difficulty and to achieve a satisfying and satisfactory adult life in the community.

TABLE 82.—*General adjustment and religious and social contacts at time of interview*

Religious and social contacts at time of interview	Total boys		General adjustment at time of interview					
			Successful		Doubtful		Unsuccessful	
	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution	Number	Percent distribution
Total.....	623	-----	200	-----	203	-----	220	-----
Report as to contacts.....	584	100	198	100	199	100	187	100
Church only reported.....	95	16	42	21	38	19	15	8
Clubs, unions, fraternal orders only reported.....	54	9	25	13	19	10	10	5
Both church and clubs, unions, etc.....	77	13	50	25	21	11	6	3
No contacts.....	358	61	81	41	121	61	156	83
No report as to contacts.....	39	-----	2	-----	4	-----	33	-----

Although convictions and commitments to other correctional institutions were taken into consideration in the evaluation of general adjustment, the mere fact of subsequent conviction or commitment did not throw cases arbitrarily into the failure group. A comparison of the ratings on general adjustment with the figures on convictions and commitments subsequent to the boys' release from the institutions is shown in table 83. It will be noted that although 38 of the 200 boys who were successfully adjusted had a history of conviction after their release, none had been given a reformatory or penitentiary sentence. A considerable number of these convictions were for minor offenses for which sentence was suspended or a fine was paid. Others were the outcome of court action while a boy was still on parole and resulted in his being returned to the institution. If after the next release the boy had no major difficulty of any kind, he was considered to have made successful adjustment.

TABLE 83.—*General adjustment at time of interview, conviction, and institution to which boy was sentenced after first parole from institution for delinquents*

Conviction, and institution to which boy was sentenced after first parole from institution for delinquents	Total boys	General adjustment at time of interview		
		Successful	Doubtful	Unsuccessful
Total.....	623	200	203	220
Convicted.....	363	38	126	199
Not convicted.....	258	162	76	20
Not reported whether convicted.....	2	-----	1	1
Sentenced to reformatory.....	125	-----	27	98
Not sentenced to reformatory.....	498	200	176	122
Sentenced to penitentiary.....	73	-----	11	62
Not sentenced to penitentiary.....	550	200	192	158

SUMMARY

1. After their release from the institution the sons of native and of foreign-born white parents had become adjusted to the general requirements of community life, or had failed of adjustment, in proportions so similar as to indicate that nativity of parents is not on the whole a determining factor. So few Negroes were among the boys studied that no statement can be made in regard to the significance of race as a determining factor, but the adjustment ratings for Negroes are very similar to those for the white boys. The boys who had come to the institution from broken homes constituted 49 percent of the total for whom information on this point was available; they constituted 46 percent of the boys who made successful adjustment and 50 percent of those whose adjustment was unsuccessful.

2. The group whose adjustment after release from the institution was not satisfactory contained a relatively large proportion of boys who prior to their commitment had lived in bad neighborhoods, in homes in which the physical conditions were poor, and in families whose standards were low. A similar relation appears to exist between the boys' general adjustment and their environment after release from the institution as observed at the time they were interviewed. This similarity would logically be expected. Further research on this matter is greatly to be desired in spite of the difficulties involved.

3. It had been noted that half the boys for whom data on precommitment recidivism were obtained had appeared in court twice or oftener before their commitment to the institution; these repeaters constituted 42 percent of the boys who made successful adjustment and 56 percent of those whose adjustment was unsuccessful. Though this disproportion may indicate some predisposition to later failure it would scarcely justify any great emphasis on precommitment recidivism in a prognosis of future adjustment.

4. Proportionately fewer of the boys who were successfully adjusted had been subjected to formal discipline while in the institution than of those in the doubtful and failure groups.

5. A study of the length of the boys' institutional training prior to their first parole in relation to their later adjustment yielded nothing of value. The percentages of boys successfully and unsuccessfully

adjusted whose stay had been less than a year, 1 year but less than than 2 years, and 2 years or more were very similar. This should not be interpreted to mean that the length of the training period has no effect on the probable outcome. Further study of the subject is necessary before definite conclusions may be drawn.

6. Correlation between parole officers' service to the boys and the boys' general adjustment, or any of the phases of adjustment on which a rating as to general adjustment was reached, was not possible; this service is too intangible to measure by mere number of visits, and the information available on the character of such service as was reported was too inadequate for statistical analysis.

7. A high proportion (85 percent) of the boys poorly adjusted in employment and a relatively low proportion of those who made excellent or good employment adjustment (35 and 33 percent, respectively) had been convicted of offenses after their release from the institution.

8. Boys whose records indicated that in the jobs they had held after release they had made no use of the training received in the institution were in about the same proportions in the groups which had made excellent, good, and poor adjustment in employment. The data do not reveal to what extent the general habits of work and attitudes acquired in the institution contributed to the employment adjustment of the large group who were successfully adjusted but who reported no use made of any particular skills acquired in the institutional assignments. In the groups making excellent and good adjustment in employment the percentages of boys who had made primary use of specific institutional training were about 6 and 4 times as high, respectively, as in the group poorly adjusted in employment. This points to the possibility that more attention to providing suitable training of desirable kinds might increase the proportion of successful adjustments to employment on return to community life.

9. In the group that had made successful adjustment, practically the same number were single and married. In the unsuccessful and doubtful groups a greater number were single.

10. Affiliation with organized bodies, such as churches, fraternal orders, trade unions, social and other clubs, seems to stand in some sort of favorable relation to successful adjustment. Cases in which such affiliation was reported constituted 59 percent of the instances of successful adjustment and only 17 percent of the unsuccessful ones.

Chapter IX.—POSSIBLE UTILIZATION OF FINDINGS

PREDICTING OUTCOMES

No attempt has been made to utilize the data obtained in the course of this study to construct a scoring system for predicting the outcome of institutional treatment. Because some attention has been given to the idea of devices to aid in prediction, however, it seems advisable to mention briefly some of the methods and arguments of their proponents. Prominent among the more recent discussions of this subject are the contributions of Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck in connection with their studies of juvenile and adult delinquents. In their report on a study of graduates of the Massachusetts Reformatory they devoted a chapter to the question of predictability, with the comment that the instrument there proposed "constitutes a step towards a scientific management of the problem of crime by courts and administrative agencies."¹ Utilizing certain factors found by statistical analysis to bear a relatively close relation to the subsequent conduct of these reformatory graduates, they constructed prognostic tables which, in their opinion, might be used to throw some light on the probabilities of later successful adjustment of persons brought before the criminal courts of Massachusetts.

In their next volume they offered similar prediction tables based on certain factors found to have close relation to recidivism among 1,000 boys whom they had studied. Their conclusion seemed to be that a juvenile-court judge using the tables they had devised could see that a young delinquent whose mathematical score was of a certain magnitude would have, for example, 1 chance in 10 for reformation; but if his score were of a certain other magnitude his chances might rise to 6 in 10. The list of factors they considered sufficiently significant to use as a basis in computing this prediction table was the following: Discipline by the father; discipline by the mother; school retardation (age-grade); misconduct in school; age at first known behavior disorder; and length of time between onset of delinquency and examination by the Judge Baker Foundation clinic.² These factors were weighted in accordance with the percentage of post-treatment recidivism for each of the subclasses under them.

These authors expressed a belief that specific prediction tables for outcomes of probation treatment, of correctional care, of foster-home placement, and of all the other types of disposition resorted to by a juvenile court could be built up on the basis of the materials contained in their study as well as on the basis of court-clinic treatment in general. It was their hope that they had demonstrated the possibilities of the method in such a way as "to stimulate actual experiments by courts and behavior clinics in its further utilization", and they further remarked, "There can be no doubt that any instrumentality which makes possible an objectified approach to the disposition

¹ 500 Criminal Careers, p. 296.

² *Ibid.*, p. 278; *One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents*, pp. 185, 186.

and treatment of cases of delinquency is an improvement over the much-vaunted but emotionalized approaches based on 'personal experience' and 'common sense'.³

To what extent a purely objective measurement of such factors as discipline of juvenile by father or by mother may be made seems rather problematic. Some one has to decide whether that discipline has been "sound", "false", or "unsound", and the decision has to be based on statements made by the juvenile, by the father or mother, or by other observers, of whom each is influenced by his or her own emotional reactions, colored to a large extent by his or her own personal experiences and attitudes. However, questions of that kind are not the ones that arouse the most serious doubts concerning the practicability of attempting to mechanize judgments as to the probability of successful social adjustment.

One very serious objection to such a device lies in the probable effect of its routine or even fairly frequent use. It would seem inevitable that if judges, parole-board members, and others responsible for treatment methods should adopt such mechanical aids and rely on them, their attention would tend to be diverted from the more fundamental analysis of the problems of the individual children with whom they deal, and from an attempt to provide the kind of social treatment needed without ruling out any child on the basis of a set of factors which appear to make the prognosis unfavorable.

Prof. Henry C. Morrison, of the University of Chicago, discussing the prognostic use of intelligence tests, declares that such use may be disastrously misleading, for reasons which he states in the following words:

In the first place, it has a strong tendency to lead administrative officers and classroom teachers alike to attempt to fit the pupil to the school rather than to fit the school to the pupil, and little by little the school thus comes to be mistaken for education in the place of being viewed as an instrument of education. When a pupil is sent back from the administration of the intelligence test with the verdict "dull normal; will not go far"; the educational question is begged altogether. In that case, the testing was either a meaningless gesture, or else the pupil's program will be likely to be arranged so that he cannot go far.

In the second place, whatever the administration may understand to be the nature and limitations of the testing, the pupil is prone to think that the results place him in the scheme of things as being good, bad, or indifferent clay, and inescapably so. Of course his attitude is confirmed if the teachers think so too. Now if such a view were beyond all question the right one, then we should have to learn how to make the best of it; but, as we have abundantly seen, that view is not the right one. Even if there were a great deal better evidence for it than there is, it would still require a great deal of proving.⁴

As in educational establishments so in corrective agencies any prognostic instruments should be interpreted and used only in the most cautious manner and only by persons thoroughly familiar with all the dangers inherent in hasty or routine application of such measurements. This was recognized by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, who in their earlier work remarked that prognostic devices such as they presented should not be used blindly, continuing in these words:

It is not proposed thereby to convert judges completely into the rubber stamps they are sometimes partially compelled to be by detailed, legislative prescription of penalties to be imposed for various offenses. If a physician, utilizing a prognostic instrument for different combinations of symptoms as an aid to treatment,

³ One thousand Juvenile Delinquents, pp. 189, 190. See also *Five Hundred Delinquent Women*, p. 284.

⁴ Morrison, Henry C.: *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School* (revised edition), p. 604. University of Chicago Press, 1931.

were to follow such a table blindly, he would soon find himself in trouble. Such a device could only furnish support to his experience and reason; it would not be a substitute therefor. Similarly a prognostic instrument of the kind herein devised would only aid the judge in performing his sentencing task much more intelligently than he performs it today. It would not supersede the judge.⁵

Yet, human predilections being what they are, the very fact that a mathematical scoring system was in use would almost inevitably tend to give a false semblance of positiveness and infallibility to prognoses based on it. There is every likelihood that its introduction would have an effect markedly the opposite to some of those its advocates offer as arguments for its standardization and adoption. It is open to question how much a parole authority will be helped by knowing that a case has been calculated to have only 3 chances in 10 to succeed, if treatment such as has been customary in the past is accorded. Those responsible for parole need, of course, to know what unfavorable factors are present in a case. But a mathematical score will not tell them that. An intelligently prepared brief summary which sets forth not only the major liabilities but also the chief assets in the case would probably go much further toward setting in motion treatment procedures that would afford better protection to society by reason of their greater effectiveness in helping the individual toward a more successful social adjustment. If those in whose hands society places responsibility for determining what shall be done with its delinquents have not the time, nor the inclination, nor the ability to arrange to obtain and to make intelligent use of such case summaries, it seems highly unlikely that they would exercise the discretion needed in making use of a mathematical scoring system.

OVERHAULING PROGRAMS

Demonstration of need

The facts have already spoken for themselves. Records of convictions subsequent to first parole were found in 363 (58 percent) of 621 cases. Evaluating outcomes on a broader basis led to the conclusion that 220 (35 percent) of the 623 boys seemed to have failed entirely to make the hoped-for adjustment to community life. An additional 203 (33 percent) had achieved adjustment of such doubtful character as to make it very uncertain whether the community could count on having no further difficulty with them.

This is not a record with which any institution could be satisfied. It immediately suggests that a thorough examination of the treatment methods in vogue at the time these boys were in training might reveal where some of the weak spots were.

Academic problems

The heavy incidence of school retardation and of occasional or habitual truancy among these boys prior to commitment clearly indicates serious educational maladjustment. The institutions are confronted with problems in this field which the public schools in the boys' home communities apparently had been unable to solve. That being the case, it would be logical to conclude that academic courses modeled on the prevailing conventional school curricula and method, even though high standards were maintained, would be likely to fail in similar fashion. There seems to be evidence here of need for much experimentation with new curricula, new instructional media, and a

⁵ 500 Criminal Careers, p. 292.

variety of teaching methods. Most important of all perhaps is the necessity for studying individual cases by means of every available examinational device in order that each boy's particular problem may be thoroughly understood so that the best possible educational program may be worked out to meet his special needs.

This means a complete reversal of the policy that is still all too prevalent, namely, attempting to force all boys through the same educational process. Educational processes must be diversified and flexible and must be fitted to the boy rather than the boy to them, if education is to serve its true purpose. Nowhere is that need more insistent than in the treatment of socially maladjusted adolescents. Institutions need teachers who are not only well qualified with respect to acquaintance with modern trends in educational work but who also are especially fitted by temperament to deal with many kinds of difficult individuals.

Vocational problems

Employment adjustment was found to have a close relation to conduct problems, only 15 percent of the boys who were poorly adjusted in employment at the time of the study having escaped conviction subsequent to their first parole. It will be recalled that a very small percentage of the boys had been able to make primary use of such vocational training as had been given them while they were in the institution, but that a higher percentage in the successfully adjusted group than in the poorly adjusted or even the fairly well adjusted group had made primary use of such training. This points to the need for a thorough canvass of the whole vocational-training field in connection with institutional treatment. The findings indicate that at the time these boys were in the institutions the training planned for them was not at all related to the situations in which they would inevitably find themselves on release. The problems of the individual boys were seldom studied thoroughly, and assignments to training seemed determined to a very considerable extent by the needs in the various departments carrying on institutional maintenance work. Emphasis was still largely on learning by doing. The movement to develop well-rounded courses, in which even when maintenance work was done the emphasis should be placed on its training aspects, had not made much progress. Moreover, there was little evidence that when these boys were released any concerted effort was made to help them find employment in which such trade acquaintance as they had made in their institutional training could be used to advantage. Of course general work habits and attitudes could be carried over from whatever they had done in the institution to whatever they undertook after release, but apparently that was almost the only benefit the great majority of these boys derived from their vocational work in the institution.

Vocational education or trade training presents great difficulties for any group of young people. The basic problems in connection with such programs are the same, however, whether the young persons involved have a normal family background or come from an institution. The fundamental premise that vocational training is an educational activity and not a productive enterprise should never be disregarded. Activity in productive occupation can justify the designation of vocational training only when the activity is directed toward the development of the individual. Productive activity becomes work

just as soon as the interest in the results of the activity takes precedence over what may be happening mentally, emotionally, and physically to the person who engages in that activity. In any sound vocational-training program the training must be merged with vocational guidance. Training plus guidance prepares the youth for occupations suitable to his capacity and interests, develops skills and aptitudes which can be readily transferred to the technic of a given job, and establishes habits of neat and efficient work. The supervisor of vocational training should be a person who will keep his awareness of his responsibility as an educator uninfluenced by his interest in getting out production, whether that interest in production is from the point of view of its value to the training institution or is to measure his success as a teacher of vocational training.

Although some of the institutions studied had made some progress in developing training courses in which they attempted to give the boys at least a rudimentary knowledge of a trade, it is evident that—in most cases at least—such efforts fell far short of the standards of good vocational guidance and training. There is much to be done in this field; in fact it is one of the most challenging aspects of institutional work. In view of the present employment situation it is not easy to determine just what plan is the best to follow in attempting to fit these maladjusted boys for self-support and productive life after release, but it is a question to which all such institutions need to give their best thought. There is no doubt that changes are needed. What those changes should be must be determined by the institutional leaders with the advice and cooperation of the best authorities in the field of vocational training and guidance.

Disciplinary problems

The information the field agents were able to get concerning disciplinary treatment while the boys were in the institutions was so limited that not much can be learned as to ways in which institutional methods might be made more effective. Only one of these institutions maintained corporal punishment as an approved form of discipline. That this did not prove any more effective than milder methods of discipline is indicated by the fact that boys from the institution using corporal punishment showed the fewest successful adjustments and the greatest number of failures. Yet the differences were small, and so many other factors enter in that it is impossible to ascribe any very definite and specific weight or meaning to those facts. They merely are worthy of note in passing and suggest lines for further investigation.

A considerable enrichment of programs in the way of extracurricular and recreational activities that interest boys has strengthened the disciplinary systems of some of these institutions by providing a much greater range of privileges that may be withdrawn as the price of misconduct. An intensive study of these disciplinary features should be very much worth while.

When the boys included in this study were under institutional care the type of discipline apparently was still determined mainly by the type of offense that had been committed rather than by careful study to discover the reasons back of each individual offender's act. This too is being greatly changed in some of those institutions, attention now being centered not on what the boy did but on why he did it. Much yet remains to be done in this field, and it is one in which scientific experimentation accompanied by careful recording of all the facts

which will permit later analysis of treatment in relation to outcome is highly desirable.

Standards of living, recognition of social responsibilities, and use of leisure

There is enough evidence of low standards of living and of failure to recognize social responsibilities in the precommitment backgrounds and post-treatment situations of these boys to indicate that institutional administrators could well analyze their programs carefully to determine whether they are doing all that might be done for their boys. The manner in which the boys actually live while in the institution could greatly influence their later attitudes toward standards of living. If the institutional facilities permit boys to be housed in small enough cottage units, presided over by appropriately qualified personnel, so that a semblance of good, wholesome family life can be maintained, the boys probably derive lasting benefits from their life as a part of such a unit. All kinds of incidents in cottage life can be made to contribute to better standards of living, which the boys might come to appreciate and might carry over into life after release. This would mean that all the regular chores of daily life, involving problems of personal hygiene and family or group relationships, would have to be treated in such a way that the boys would accept and adopt as desirable for themselves certain habits, feelings, and attitudes. They would learn to do things because they thought them desirable, not just because they were the rule and because punishment would follow failure to do them.

In this connection there is no doubt that institutional programs need to be examined thoughtfully in relation to what they are doing to prepare a boy to make wise choice of ways to fill his leisure hours when he is released for life back in the community. This is an even more pressing problem when unemployment is prevalent and idle time bulks large in daily living. The whole recreational program of an institution should have for one of its primary objectives the training of boys to select their leisure activities intelligently. It should be designed to acquaint them with a great variety of possible developmental and recreational pursuits. It should be so diversified that boys of every type could find something in it which would hold their interest and in which they could attain a proficiency that would make it a permanent asset in later life. Institutional recreation is certainly not, as some people regard it, solely for the purpose of making the boys happy during their stay. Unless it has features that will carry over and be of service to each boy after he is released, it is missing its greatest opportunity.

The information that could be obtained for the boys included in this study was too incomplete on this matter to allow many conclusions. However, the number of boys who seemed to have very few wholesome recreational interests was considerable, and in general their lives seemed very dull. The fact that boys having social affiliations were found in a larger proportion of the group successfully adjusted to community life than in the group not successfully adjusted adds evidence that institutions should take an active interest in the development of this important field.

Individualization of treatment

The foregoing paragraphs have made it apparent that what needs to be done cannot be done by mass treatment. They indicate the

necessity to individualize treatment plans and to adapt them to the requirements of each boy as discovered by thorough study by properly qualified persons. Though this had been begun in a very limited way in California and in New Jersey at the time the boys included in the study were interviewed, and though clinical procedures have been developed quite extensively in these States and in New York, even in these institutions only the first steps have been taken toward perfecting such an approach to the problems of treatment of maladjusted boys committed to institutions. This seems to be the direction in which most hope lies for bringing about real improvement in their treatment.

Placement and supervision after release

Perhaps the most striking findings of this study have been those relating to the plans for placement and for supervision of the boys during the difficult period immediately following their return to community life. Home conditions, family standards, and character of the neighborhood were found closely related to behavior. This would suggest that the most effective approach to a boy's rehabilitation would be to study him and his home situation very carefully and to undertake to improve, if possible, the family situation while he is being treated in the institution. There was almost no evidence that anything of this kind was being undertaken at the time the boys included in this study were under care; yet on release a considerable proportion of them were returned to the same homes and neighborhoods from which they had come. When their homes were so bad that placement elsewhere was attempted, there was little evidence that it was done in accordance with acceptable standards for investigation and study of the foster home in relation to the individual boy's needs. Such supervision as was exercised seems to have been so superficial that it had little relation to the boy's later success or failure. There were, of course, exceptions; but for the group as a whole that conclusion was inescapable.

Attempts to improve parole service are now being made in some places. Personnel standards are being raised, through requirement of better education, special training and experience in social service, and suitable personal qualifications. The number of parole officers is being increased, so that territory to be covered and case loads to be carried need not be so great as to render effective work impossible. Preparation for parole is being closely associated with the clinical study of the boys immediately after admission to the institution, so that work with reference to the home situation may be inaugurated and carried on during each boy's absence. These activities are bringing the institution into the greatly to be desired closer contact with the boys' homes and communities.

These are significant movements which may demonstrate in a practical way methods of successful work with maladjusted boys.

Integration with community agencies

At the time these boys were under care there was little evidence of any close working relation between the institutions and the juvenile court or other social agencies in the communities from which the boys were committed. Just as the boy's life is continuous, his treatment must be one continuous process if it is to be effective. The institution cannot function as a thing apart from all the rest of a boy's experi-

ences and still achieve its objectives. Its work must have close connection with that of the other community agencies which have had something to do with the boy or with his family. This is undoubtedly one of the most important next steps in the development of intelligent social treatment of delinquency problems. There are observable trends in that direction at the present time. Institutions which attack these problems with thought and vigor and which work out helpful relations with other social agencies will probably make the greatest change in their ratio between successful and unsuccessful adjustments.

Appendix A.—FACTORS AFFECTING SELECTION OF THE CASES

The factors taken into consideration in the selection of cases, and the problems encountered in the effort to obtain analogous cases from five institutions with varying policies and subject to different legal provisions, are outlined in the following sections:

WHITTIER STATE SCHOOL (CALIFORNIA)

Legal jurisdiction over boys at the Whittier State School (Whittier, Calif.) was authorized until they reached 21 years of age unless discharged earlier.¹ It was within the power of the school to discharge boys from parole (termed by this institution "placement"), in accordance with certain requirements, on approval of the State department of institutions. Placement periods were indeterminate, the length depending on the individual case; the average period when the boys studied were under supervision was 1 to 2 years if the boy's record was satisfactory. Boys were discharged automatically, regardless of the time on placement, if committed to another correctional institution or enlisted in military service. Occasionally a boy was discharged if his record was not satisfactory and he was considered too old or of too low mentality for return to the institution. Boys seldom remained under supervision until 21 years of age.

Field work was begun in California in September 1929 and was continued to the middle of May 1930; the cases were selected from the list of boys discharged during the calendar years of 1923 and 1924 and during the early months of 1925. It was necessary to include a period of slightly over 2 years to obtain the necessary number of cases.

BOYS' VOCATIONAL SCHOOL (MICHIGAN)

Legal provisions and policies relating to parole and discharge from the Boys' Vocational School (Lansing, Mich.) differed considerably from those of the other institutions studied. Commitments were for a definite period—until the boy should become 17 years of age, if he had been under 16 when committed, or until 18 years, if he had been 16 at commitment. If commitment was to 18 years it was so specified by the court. Not all the courts, however, used the provision regarding commitment to 18 years. Authority to parole boys before they reached the age for discharge was vested in the superintendent, with approval of the State corrections commission; but final discharge, whether the boy was on parole or in the institution, took place automatically at the age specified in the commitment.² A number of boys 16 years of age at commitment and committed only until 17 were discharged directly from the institution with no period under parole supervision. Boys returned for violation of parole frequently reached discharge age before earning another parole and hence were discharged direct from the institution. A few were discharged on special order of the institution before reaching the age specified, usually under extraordinary circumstances, such, for example, as that the boy's family was moving from the State and requested permission to take the boy. Boys committed to other correctional institutions while on parole were usually continued as active cases until they became 17 or 18, the fact of subsequent commitment frequently not being reported or known to the Boys' Vocational School.

Field work was begun in Michigan in March 1930 and was completed in November of that year; the cases were selected from the list of boys discharged between November 1, 1924, and June 15, 1925. Cases in which the boy had been discharged directly from the institution without having been placed on parole were excluded because there were almost no such cases at the other institutions. Those returned for violation of parole and discharged before earning another parole were included.

¹ California, Deering's Gen. Laws 1931, act 9255, sec. 18.

² Michigan, Comp. Laws 1929, sec. 17802.

STATE HOME FOR BOYS (NEW JERSEY)

Jurisdiction of the State Home for Boys (Jamesburg, N. J.) was authorized until the boy reached majority unless earlier discharged.³ Boys were not officially discharged from parole until they became 21. Boys committed to other correctional institutions were listed as "delinquent parolees", as also were boys who were "missing" but not discharged until they became 21. Active supervision was discontinued in cases in which the boy enlisted in military service, but he was not officially discharged.

Field work was begun late in September 1930 and was completed in the latter part of May 1931; the cases were selected from the lists of boys whose last placement on parole occurred between August 1, 1922, and August 1, 1923. Selection on the basis of discharge from parole for 5 or more years would have given a group of cases in which the boys had been away as long as 8 or 10 years, mostly the latter period; and nearly all the boys would have been about 26 years of age at the time of the study—3 or 4 years older than most of those selected from the other institutions. For this reason the time between last placement on parole and the date of study was used for selecting the cases in New Jersey. In order that some time might have elapsed since final official discharge, no cases were included that did not show at least 2 years between discharge from parole and the time of study.

As in New Jersey a relatively large number of boys were committed under 12 years of age, the cases were chosen from the consecutive lists in such a way as to obtain a group representative of the typical institution population in the matter of age distribution. The selections fell into the following subgroups by age at commitment: 25 boys under 12 years of age; 115 boys 12 to 15 years of age; 10 boys 16 years of age and over. The group under 12 years of age was found to contain a number of boys returned to the institution several times "for adjustment." They were illustrative of the long periods of institutional care which were found to be not unusual at this institution.

STATE AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL (NEW YORK)

The State Agricultural and Industrial School (Industry, N. Y.) had jurisdiction to 21 years of age,⁴ but the boys seldom remained under active supervision throughout minority. Before 1929 the general policy had been to "discontinue" cases from parole supervision at the end of 3 years. This amounted in effect to discharge, but legal jurisdiction did not cease, and legal return without court action was possible until the boy became 21. This 3-year policy was not carried out with any degree of consistency, however, and considerable variation in the periods of active parole supervision was found. Boys were automatically "discontinued" on enlistment in military service, on commitment to other correctional institutions, or on marriage. Usually they were "discontinued" when their whereabouts remained unknown for a period of a few months; if they were located before the expiration of 3 years they might be returned to supervision.

Field work was begun in New York in September 1931 and was completed in May 1932; the cases were selected as in New Jersey, on the basis of length of time from last placement on parole to the period of field work and discontinuance from active parole supervision for at least 2 years, selection being made from the list of boys placed on parole—and not subsequently returned to the institution—between August 1, 1924, and March 1, 1925. This was found to include boys returned for violation of parole and boys discharged for various other reasons previously noted, such as enlistment in military service.

BOYS' INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL (OHIO)

At the Boys' Industrial School (Lancaster, Ohio) the policy was that of discharge from parole following a 1-year parole period, although the law authorized jurisdiction to the age of 21 years.⁵ Every 3 months a discharge list was made of the names of boys whose year had expired during the preceding quarter and of boys whose commitment to some other institution or enlistment in military service was reported. Formal approval of the superintendent and of the State department of public welfare was required, but these discharges were practically

³ New Jersey, Cum. Supp. 1924, secs. 34-141, 34-146.

⁴ New York, Cahill's Consolidated laws 1930, State Charities Law, sec. 196 (1).

⁵ Ohio, Code 1932, secs. 2083, 2084.

automatic. Formal recommitment was necessary for boys returned to the institution after discharge from parole. This parole policy in Ohio made it possible for cases at this institution to be selected from the lists of boys discharged from parole beginning with 5 years prior to the field work, with the period from placement on parole the last time corresponding to that from the other institutions (6 to 9 years).

Field work was begun in Ohio in April 1931 and continued to November of the same year; cases were selected from lists of boys discharged in October and December 1925 and February 1926, excluding boys discharged in those months who later were recommitted.

Appendix B.—CASES IN WHICH NO INTERVIEW WAS OBTAINED

In spite of persistent efforts the field agents were unable to discover the whereabouts of 98 of the boys selected for study. In the cases of 30 others, their whereabouts were discovered but interviews were impossible owing to their location at points too distant from any of the places visited during the subsequent field work or in one case because of the critical illness of the boy. A few special trips to secure interviews were made into States other than those visited in the regular course of the study, but in these 30 cases the time and expense which would have been involved did not seem justified. Ten of the boys not seen because of distance were in active military service (5 in the Army at far-away posts, 4 in the Navy on board ship or at a distant port, and 1 in the Coast Guard); 9 others were in correctional institutions (5 in State prisons, 2 in Federal prisons, 1 in a reformatory, and 1 in jail); the other 10 were employed in distant States. For these 128 cases the same preliminary work was done as was done for all the other cases—that is, the precommitment, institutional, and parole histories were assembled from the records and from interviews with other persons than the boy himself—and certain details are presented here.

Approximately the same number of boys not interviewed came from each of the five States. The figures given in the lists which follow indicate that there were no striking differences between the two groups—interviewed and not interviewed—in relation to age at commitment, character of the neighborhood, reason for commitment, time in the institution, intelligence quotients of the boys to whom psychological tests had been given, record of conduct in the institution, amount of supervision given during parole, number of times returned for violation of parole, and age at discharge. Proportionately more of the boys not interviewed than of those interviewed came from rural communities and from families with poor standards and poor home conditions.

<i>Age at commitment (noninterviewed boys)</i>	<i>Home conditions at commitment (non-interviewed boys)</i>
Total ----- 128	Total ----- 128
9 years ----- 3	Excellent ----- 2
10 years ----- 1	Good ----- 13
11 years ----- 2	Fair ----- 29
12 years ----- 18	Poor ----- 48
13 years ----- 27	Not reported ----- 36
14 years ----- 24	
15 years ----- 37	
16 years ----- 12	
17 years ----- 4	
<i>Character of neighborhood at commitment (noninterviewed boys)</i>	<i>Family standards at commitment (non-interviewed boys)</i>
Total ----- 128	Total ----- 128
Good ----- 22	Good ----- 11
Medioere ----- 35	Medioere ----- 26
Bad ----- 47	Poor ----- 73
Not reported ----- 24	Not reported ----- 18

Reason for commitment (noninterviewed boys)

Total	128
Automobile stealing	7
Burglary or unlawful entry	29
Other stealing	51
Ungovernable	17
Truancy	9
Running away	9
Act of carelessness or mischief	1
Injury to person	2
Other reason	2
Not reported	1

Intelligence quotients (noninterviewed boys)

Total	128
Less than 60	5
60, less than 70	7
70, less than 80	19
80, less than 90	15
90, less than 100	9
100, less than 110	5
110 or more	2
Not reported	19
No examination	45
No report as to examination	2

Type of misconduct in institution (noninterviewed boys)

Total	128
Insubordination	16
Escape	18
Insubordination and stealing	7
Stealing	4
Escape and insubordination	4
Sex offense	4
Insubordination and sex offense	2
Escape and stealing	1
Escape, sex offense, and stealing	1
Insubordination, sex offense, and stealing	2
Sex offense and stealing	1
Escape, insubordination, and stealing	1
Misconduct of other type	14
No misconduct	11
No report as to misconduct	42

Total time spent in the institution (noninterviewed boys)

Total	128
Less than 1 year	28
1 year, less than 2	52
2 years, less than 3	36
3 years or more	12

Number of visits made by parole officer during parole period (noninterviewed boys)

Total	128
None	17
1	14
2 to 5	41
6 to 10	16
11 or more	18
No report as to visits	21
Boy paroled out of country	1

Type of service rendered by parole officer during parole period (noninterviewed boys)

Total	128
None	66
Home placement only	2
Employment only	6
Home placement and employment (with or without other service)	25
Home placement and other than employment	2
Other than home placement or employment	5
Not reported	21
Boy paroled out of country	1

Returns for violation of parole (noninterviewed boys)

Total	128
Not returned for parole violation	95
Returned once	27
Returned twice	1
Returned 3 or more times	5

Age at discharge from parole (noninterviewed boys)

Total	128
Under 16 years	10
16 years	12
17 years	41
18 years	25
19 years	12
20 years	3
21 years	22
22 years	2
Not reported	1

Appendix C.—SAMPLE CASE RATINGS

FIFTY RATINGS FROM SUMMARY SHEETS USED IN DETERMINING GENERAL ADJUSTMENT

Case number	Employment status at time of interview	Employment adjustment	Economic adjustment	Conduct at time of interview	Conduct since release	Social adjustment	General adjustment
1	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Satisfactory	Excellent	Excellent	Successful
2	do	do	do	do	Good	do	Do
3	Good	Good	Good	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Poor	Unsuccessful
4	Inapplicable ¹	Very poor	Very poor	do	do	do	Do
5	Good	Good	Excellent	Satisfactory	Good	Good	Successful
6	do	Fair	Good	do	do	do	Do
7	Inapplicable ¹	Poor	Very poor	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Poor	Unsuccessful
8	do ²	do	Poor	do	do	do	Do
9	Good	Good	Good	Satisfactory	Excellent	Excellent	Successful
10	Inapplicable ³	Poor	Very poor	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Poor	Unsuccessful
11	Good	Good	Fair	Satisfactory	Good	Good	Successful
12	Excellent	do	Excellent	do	Excellent	Excellent	Do
13	Good	Excellent	Good	do	Good	Good	Do
14	Inapplicable ³	Poor	Very poor	Unsatisfactory	Very poor	Very poor	Unsuccessful
15	Good	Fair	Excellent	Satisfactory	Excellent	Good	Successful
16	Fair	do	do	do	do	do	Do
17	Inapplicable ¹	do	Fair	do	Poor	Fair	Doubtful
18	do ¹	Poor	Poor	Doubtful	Very poor	Poor	Unsuccessful
19	Fair	Good	Excellent	Satisfactory	Excellent	Good	Successful
20	Good	Fair	Good	Doubtful	Very poor	Fair	Doubtful
21	do	Good	Good	Satisfactory	Fair	do	Do
22	Poor	Poor	Poor	do	Poor	Poor	Do
23	do	do	do	Doubtful	do	do	Do
24	Inapplicable ³	do	Very poor	Unsatisfactory	Very poor	Very poor	Unsuccessful
25	do ³	do	do	do	do	do	Do
26	Fair	do	Fair	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor	Doubtful
27	Excellent	Excellent	Good	do	Excellent	Good	Successful
28	Inapplicable ¹	Good	do	do	Good	do	Do
29	Fair	Poor	do	do	Poor	Fair	Doubtful
30	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	do	Excellent	Excellent	Successful
31	Inapplicable ³	Poor	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Poor	Unsuccessful
32	do ³	do	do	do	do	Very poor	Do
33	do ³	do	do	do	do	Poor	Do
34	Inapplicable ¹	do	Very poor	do	do	do	Do
35	Good	Good	Good	Satisfactory	Good	Good	Successful
36	Inapplicable ³	Poor	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Poor	Unsuccessful
37	Good	Good	Good	Satisfactory	Good	Good	Successful
38	do	do	do	do	do	do	Do
39	do	do	Fair	do	Excellent	Excellent	Do
40	Excellent	do	Excellent	do	Good	Good	Do
41	Fair	Fair	Good	Satisfactory	Excellent	do	Do
42	Excellent	Good	Excellent	do	do	do	Do
43	Good	Fair	do	do	do	Excellent	Do
44	Excellent	Good	Fair	do	Fair	Good	Doubtful
45	Inapplicable ³	Fair	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Poor	Unsuccessful
46	Fair	Poor	do	do	do	Very poor	Do
47	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Successful
48	Inapplicable ¹	Poor	Fair	do	do	Fair	Doubtful
49	do ³	do	Very poor	Unsatisfactory	Very poor	Very poor	Unsuccessful
50	do ¹	do	do	Satisfactory	Poor	do	Do

¹ Unemployed.

² In jail.

³ In prison.

Appendix D.—SCHEDULES AND STATISTICAL CARD USED IN THE STUDY

[Original size of each page 8 x 10½ inches. The back of each page is left blank to give room for additional information and comment]

FORM 1

INSTITUTION:

PRECOMMITMENT HISTORY

Agent:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Name: | 2. Inst. No.: |
| 3. Date received: Y M D | 4. Where committed: |
| 5. Date born: Y M D | 6. Age received: Y M D |
| 7. a. Where living at commit.: | b. Length of time: |
| 8. Fa.: a. W. B. O. N. F. (spec.): | b. Yrs. U. S.: c. Mar. Con. |
| 9. Mo.: a. W. B. O. N. F. (spec.): | b. Yrs. U. S. c. Mar. Con.: |

10. Family at time of commitment:

Name of parent or siblings	Age	Sch. work completed	Occupation	Whereabouts
F.				
M.				
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				

11. Family standards

- a. Relations within the family (give sig. dates):
- b. Reputation of family:
- c. Delinquency records of parents or siblings (date, character, treatment):
- d. Other abnormality in family (intoxication, mental defect, or disease):
- e. Language spoken: f: Religion:
- g. Agent's estimate:

Inst. No.:

12. Home conditions

Address:

- a. No. persons per room:
- b. Care given to house:
- c. Equipment (necessities, luxuries, provision for recreation):
- d. Agent's estimate:

13. Neighborhood conditions

- a. Character of neighborhood (degree of congestion, relation to business district):
- b. Character of neighboring homes:
- c. Play facilities:
- d. Presence of demoralizing agencies:
- e. Length of time in neighborhood described:
- f. Agent's estimate:

14. Bad habits of boy**15. Use of leisure**

=====

Inst. No.:

Form 1, p. 3

16. School training

- a. Age began:
- b. Age left:
- c. Grade completed:
- d. Grades repeated:
- e. Yrs. retarded:
- f. Reason retarded:
- g. Attendance (grade truancy began, general record):
- h. Conduct in school:
- i. Special school work:

17. Employment history

- a. After-school work (kind, duration, age began):
- b. Age began regular work:
- c. Nature and conditions of work:

Kind of work	Date began	Dur.	Wage	Reasons left

- d. Use made of earnings (contrib. to family, own support, recreation, savings):

Inst. No.:

18. Offense for which committed

- a. Court:
- b. Date referred to court:
- c. Charge:
- d. Date committed:
- e. Actual offense:
- f. Commit. on suspended sentence: Y. N.
- g. Place of detention:
- h. Length of detention:
- i. Offense committed alone or with group:
- j. Conditions of offense:
- k. Psychological exam.:

Date	M. A.	I. Q.	Classification	Test used or examiner

19. Previous court record

- a. Date and nature of first known delinquency (source):

b. Date	c. Court	d. Charge	e. Offic.	f. Disposition
Y M D			Y. N.	
Y M D			Y. N.	
Y M D			Y. N.	

20. Institutional and foster-home experience

- a. Institutions (name, type, date entering, duration):
- b. Foster homes (agency, date placement, duration):

21. Probation history (date of beginning and end, reason for termination):

--	--	--

INSTITUTION:

INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

Agent:

1. Name: 2. Inst. No.:

3. Age when received:

4. Time in institutiona. Date received: Y M D c. Time out on escape:b. Date paroled: Y M D d. Time in institution:e. Ret'd parole: Y M D g. Addn. time in inst.:f. Date reparaled: Y M D h. Total in inst.:**5. Psychological exam.**

a. Date	b. M. A.	c. I. Q.	d. Classification	e. Test used or examiner

f. Special abilities (mechanical aptitude, mathematics, etc.):

6. **Psychiatric exam.** a. Date b. Examiner:

c. Diag.:

7. Dominating personality traits**8. Physical disabilities**a. Nature of disabilities: b. Extent corrected in inst.:

Active disease: _____

Deformities: _____

Sense defects: _____

Nutrition: _____

Inst. No.:

9. Conduct

- a. Length of time lessened for good conduct:
 b. Length of time kept in inst. above minimum for misconduct:
 c. Nature of misconduct:

Escape; Insubordination; Sex; Smoking; Fighting

- d. Discipline record:

Date	Method dealt with	Number of days	Offense

Inst. No.:

10. Academic training

- a. Total number days in attendance while in institution:
 b. Grades completed:
 c. Quality of work (include application and interest):

Excellent; Good; Fair; Poor

- d. Special problems:

11. Vocational training

a. Type and character	b. Time spent	c. Success

- 12. Estimate of institution** at time of parole as to probable success outside of the institution (special problems):

ADDRESS SHEET

Name of boy:

Inst. No.:

General addresses

Date	Name	Relat. to boy	Town	State	No.	Street

Boy's addresses

Date	With whom living	Town	State	No.	Street

INSTITUTION: _____

PAROLE HISTORY

Agent: _____

1. Name: _____ 2. Inst. No.: _____
3. Age placed on parole: (1) _____ (2) _____
4. Where placed: (1) _____ (2) _____
5. **Time on parole**
- (1) a. Date placed on parole: Y M D c. Time on parole: _____
 b. Date discharged or ret.: Y M D d. Reason: _____
-
- (2) a. Date replaced on parole: Y M D d. Time on parole: _____
 b. Date discharged or ret.: Y M D e. Total time: _____
 c. Reason: _____
6. **Supervision**
- a. No of written reports: _____ b. Dates of reports: _____
- c. No. of personal reports: _____
- d. Dates of visits: _____
- e. No. of visits boy seen: _____ f. No. of visits boy not seen: _____
- g. Services rendered by P. O. (recreation, employment, family adjmt.): _____
- h. Names of parole officers: _____
7. **Affiliation with constructive organizations**
8. **School**
- a. Grade entered: _____ b. Grade completed: _____
- c. Age left school: _____
- d. Special school work: _____

Inst. No.:

9. Employment

a. After-school work (kind, duration):

b. Nature and conditions of work:

Kind of work	Date begun	Dur.	Wage	Reasons left

c. Use made of earnings (contrib. to family, own support, recreation, savings):

d. Amount saved at termination of parole:

10. Conduct

a. General character of conduct:

b. Specific offenses committed (nature of offense, date, treatment):

11. Parole officer's estimate of probable success (spec. problems):

INSTITUTION:

PRESENT SITUATION

Date: Agent:

1. Name: 2. Inst. no.:
3. Address: Town State
4. Marital con.: *a.* S.; M.; Wid.; Div.; Des.; Sep. *b.* Date Mar. *c.* No. ch.
5. Place lived in: Par. ho.; Own home; Boarding; Lodging; Other (spec.)
6. Time lived in: *a.* Ho. *b.* Neighborhood *c.* Town
7. **Description of home** (persons per room, care given, equipment)
8. **Description of neighborhood** (character of homes; degree of congestion; relation to business areas; deteriorating or improving; transient population; demoralizing agencies)

Form 4, p. 2

Inst. No.:

9. **Economic status** (sources)
- a.* Support: Sup. self; Sup. family; Contr. to family; Assist. occas.; Assist. freq.
- b.* Wife working: *c.* Reason for:
- d.* Weekly earnings: *e.* Savings or debts:
- f.* Home: Rented; Owned; Buying:
- g.* Time covered by information:
- h.* Agent's estimate of econ. resp.:
10. **Position in present community** (Sources)
- a.* Constructive affiliations or activities (lodges, unions, clubs, Y. M. C. A., church, classes, etc.):
- b.* Destructive affiliations or activities:
- c.* General reputation (reliability, industry, habits):
- d.* Family relationships:
- e.* Social agencies known to (date, name, service):
- f.* Agent's estimate of present social adjustment:
11. **Mobility:** Enter all places lived in since discharge.

Inst. No.:

12. History of the first work after leaving institution

- a.* How was job obtained:
- b.* Type of work: *c.* Wage:
- d.* Date began: *e.* Duration:
- f.* Success:

13. Present employment

- a.* Date began: *b.* Name of employer:
- c.* Type of work (industry, occupation):
- d.* Wage: *e.* Success (promotions, satisfaction in):
- f.* Names of two previous employers:

14. Work history

- a.* Number of jobs since leaving institution:
- b.* Longest time in any one job:
- c.* Kind of work:

Nature of job	Promotions or success	Reason for leaving

Inst. No.:

14. Work history—Continued.

- d.* Use made of training given in institution:
e. Extent of unemployment and reasons:
f. Agent's estimate of industrial adjustment:

15. Conduct history (to date including precommitment period)

<i>a.</i> Character of difficulties	<i>b.</i> Approximate time	<i>c.</i> Outcome

Form 4, p. 5

Inst. No.:

16. Recorded delinquency (since release)

a. Court record:

Date	Place	Court	Charge	Official	Disposition

b. Institutional record:

Date committed	Date discharged	Name of institution	Charge

INSTITUTION:

BOY'S STORY

Agent:

1. Name:

2. Inst. No.:

3. **Personality** (brief description of appearance with reference to apparent health, personal habits as indicated by dress, etc., frankness, reserve, poise)

4. **Present attitude towards precommitment delinquencies** (causes of, persons influencing, treatment by courts, probation officers, desirability of commitment)

Form 5, p. 2

Inst. No.:

5. Attitude towards State School

a. Staff:

1. Supt.

2. House officers

3. Teachers

4. Special activity directors (recreational, religious, military leaders)

5. Others

b. Associates:

c. Value of training offered (school, vocational, recreational, physical)

d. Discipline:

Form 5, p. 3

Inst. No.:

6. Attitude towards parole experiences

a. Parole officers:

b. Services given:

Job placement

Recreation tie-ups

c. Frequency and quality of contacts:

Form 5, p. 4

Inst. No.:

7. Extent to which contact has been kept with State-school boys

a. Favorable:

b. Unfavorable:

8. **Discrimination experienced because of institutional commitment** (give specific instances in employment and in social life)

9. **Present plans for further advancement** (include attitude toward family and community life)

STATISTICAL CARD

INSTITUTIONAL CARE OF DELINQUENT BOYS

No. -----

State: -----

PRECOMMITMENT HISTORY

1. Name: 2. City Town Rural 3. Inst. No.
 4. Age at commit.: Y M D 5. Where: Par. Mo. Fa. Rel. Fos. ho. Inst. Other
 6. Fa.: a. W. B. O. N. F. b. Yrs. U. S. c. Mar. Remar. Dead. Div. Wid. Sep. Des.
 7. Mo.: a. W. B. O. N. F. b. Yrs. U. S. c. Mar. Remar. Dead. Div. Wid. Sep. Des.
 8. Sib.: a. No. older: M. F. b. No. younger: M. F.
 9. Family stand.: a. G. M. B. b. Del. N. c. Abn. N. 10. Home cond.: Ex. G. F. P.
 11. Neighborhood cond.: G. M. B.
 12. School: a. Gr. com.: b. Age left: Y M D c. Yrs. ret. d. Truancy: Occas. Habit. None
 13. Psycho. exam.: N. a. I. Q. b. M. A.
 14. Employment: a. After school N. b. Reg. work N.
 15. Why commit.: 16. Nat. of offense: a. Hab. N. b. Indiv. One other Group
 17. Court: a. Age first appear: Y M D b. Tot. no. del. cases c. Tot. no. dep. cases
 d. Sus. sentence N. 18. Dur. of probation:
 19. Det. ho.: N. a. Times b. Dur. 20. Jail: N. a. Times b. Dur.
 21. Inst. for del.: N. a. Times b. Dur. 22. Other inst.: N. a. Type: Dep. F. M. Other
 b. Dur. 23. Foster ho.: N. Dur.

INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

24. Time in inst.: Y M D 25. Times returned: Viol. par. Other
 26. Psycho. exam.: N. a. I. Q. b. M. A. 27. Psychiatric exam.: N.
 28. Physical disab.: N. a. Active dis. N. Cor. N. b. Deform N. Cor. N.
 c. Sense def. N. Cor. N. d. Nutrition N. Cor. N.
 29. Trade exper.: a. Longest time in any trade b. Trade: 30. Att. sch.: Full Part None
 31. Misconduct in inst.: a. Type: Escape Insub. Sex Fighting Smoking Other
 Tot. days penal. c. Times penal. 32. Conduct: G, F, P.

PAROLE HISTORY

33. Time on parole: Y M D 34. Times paroled: a. No b. Par. to ho. Other
 35. Age at release: Y M D 36. No. reports: 37. No. visits:
 38. Service of P. O.: Ho. placement N.; Employ. N.; Fam. rel. N.; Rec. N.; Organ. N.
 39. Attend school: N. 40. After school work: N. 41. Conduct: Ex. G. F. P.
 42. Employment: a. No. jobs tr. in inst. b. No jobs no tr. in inst.

PRESENT SITUATION

43. Age at visit: Y M D 44. Time since com.: Y M D 45. Time since dis.: Y M D
 46. Mar. cond.: Mar. S. Wid. Div. Sep. Des. (spec.) 47. Time mar. 48. No. ch.
 49. Place living: Par. ho. Own ho. Boarding Lodging Other
 50. Home cond.: Ex. G. F. P. 51. Neighborhood cond.: G. M. B. 52. Self. sup.: Comp. Part. Dep.
 53. Sup. of fam.: a. Own Par. b. Sup. fam. Contr. to fam. c. Assist. occas. Assist. freq.
 54. Wife working: N. 55. Wk. earn.: 56. Econ. adj.: Ex. G. F. P. V. P.
 57. Soc. adj.: Ex. G. F. P. V. P.
 58. First empl.: a. Obtained by—P. O. Self. Fam. Agency Other b. Tr. in inst. N.
 c. Wage d. Time bet. parole and begin. work e. Dur.
 59. Pres. empl.: a. Ind. b. Occup. c. Dur.
 d. Tr. in inst.: N. e. Success. Ex. G. F. P. 60. Use made of major tr.: Prim. Sec. None
 61. Empl. hist.: a. No. jobs b. Longest time on job c. No jobs tr. in inst.
 62. Empl. adj.: Ex. G. F. P. 63. Approximate length of period of adjustment:
 64. Time between parole and first misconduct: 65. Assoc. with other school boys: N.
 66. Present conduct: a. Satis. Unsatis. b. Dur.
 67. First ct. record: N. a. Period since first parole b. Charge
 68. Tot. no. arrests: 69. No. times re'eased: 70. Discrim. against: N.
 71. No. times convict.: a. Tot. b. Minor offense c. Major offense
 72. No. of offenses sim. to commit. offense: 73. Times on probation: N.
 74. Jail: N. a. Times b. Dur. 75. Reform.: N. a. Times b. Dur.
 76. Pen.: N. a. Times b. Dur. 77. Other inst.: N. Dur.
 78. Boy seen: N. 79. Gen. adjustment: Success: Doubt. Unsuccess.

[Reverse of Statistical Card]

No.

State:.....

PRECOMMITMENT HISTORY

80. Name
 82. Fa: a. Employed: Y N b. Occup:
 83. Mo: a. Employed: Y N b. Occup:
 84. Family known to agencies: N No. agencies: c. Home Away
 85. Psycho. exam: Source record—Inst. Other
 86. Times on prob. 87. Inst. for del. Same Other

INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

88. Time before 1st parole: Y M D
 89. Trade and work exper. cont.: a. No. trade assign.
 b. No. work assign. c. Longest time in any work
 d. Type of work

PAROLE HISTORY

90. a. Tot. time inst. and par. Y M D b. Age disch. par. Y M D
 c. Reason disch. par.
 91. Ret. viol. par: a. Reason 1st ret. b. Time on par. Y M D
 c. Time ret. to 2d par. Y M D d. Where placed
 e. Reason 2d ret. f. Time on 2d par. Y M D
 g. Time ret. to 3d par. Y M D h. Where placed
 92. Visits: a. Boy seen b. Boy not seen
 93. School attendance: a. Grade entered b. Grade left school
 94. a. No. offenses while on parole b. Type

POSTPAROLE AND PRESENT SITUATION

95. Time last par. and interview Y M D
 96. Residence: Same city N Same co. N Same State N For. country
 97. a. Tot. no. jobs since disch. b. Tot. time unempl.
 98. Subseq. record: Type of offenses
 99. Jail: Age
 100. Reform: a. Ret. viol. parole N b. No. times. c. Age
 101. Pen.: a. Ret. viol. parole N b. No. times. c. Age
 102. Other inst.: a. Ret. viol. parole N b. No. times. c. Age
 103. Tot. time under restraint: Y M D
 104. Special classes or courses taken:
 105. Service enlistments: a. No. b. Type
 c. Length of time release inst. to enlist.
 d. Length of time in service
 e. Record: Disch. N a. Honor. b. Dishonor. c. Desertion
 106. Social status: a. Boy settled. b. Fairly stable c. Nomadic
 d. Associations—Church: Reg. Irreg. Clubs, union, fraternal order: Other:
 e. Where leisure time spent:

