

THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT AND HIS SCHOOL

A thesis written in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts

Stewart MacDonald,
St. Mary's University,
School of Education,
March 31, 1967.

© Copyright

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. DEFINING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY	4
II. EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM	7
III. THE HOMES	11
IV. JUVENILE DELINQUENTS AND INTELLIGENCE . . .	19
V. THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT AND HIS SCHOOL RECORD	31
VI. THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT AND HIS BEHAVIOUR AT SCHOOL	39
VII. THE SCHOOL AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY . . .	43
VIII. SUMMARY	58
APPENDIX	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY	70

INTRODUCTION

Among the social problems of our time juvenile delinquency has a prominent place. The problem became a serious one after World War I and increased further in seriousness after World War II. A great deal has been said and written on this problem. Its seriousness is no doubt sometimes exaggerated in newspaper and magazine articles. Nevertheless, no one would deny that the problem is real and that no solution is yet at hand.

The study reported in this paper was made in order to determine the extent and nature of the problem in one community and to make some comparisons with trends in the country generally. The study deals with the cases of one hundred youths who appeared in juvenile court in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, between October 26, 1961, and December 31, 1965. The cases are chosen at random. Approximately one hundred and forty cases were examined but a number were rejected due to unavailability of information pertinent to the study.

The question of juvenile delinquency is studied with particular relation to the educational factors involved. The relationship between delinquency and school progress is examined, the relationship between delinquency and intelligence, the relationship between delinquency and

behaviour in school are studied. The general relationship between juvenile delinquents and the school is also discussed and some recommendations are made with respect to improving the position of the school as an agency in combatting juvenile delinquency.

Although the emphasis is on educational factors, certain social and economic aspects of the problem are presented since it is not feasible to ignore some of these environmental factors which cannot be really separated from the whole question.

Some description of the local scene should be made. Dartmouth is an older community in relation to Canadian centres, having been established in 1750. By 1873 it had become an incorporated town. Between that year and 1954 its growth was slow. After 1954, when a suspension bridge connected it to the City of Halifax, its growth became quite rapid. By 1960 Dartmouth's population grew to approximately 25,000. On January 1, 1961, the town amalgamated with its suburban areas and became a city of about 47,000. Since 1961 its population increased rapidly so that by 1966 its population became approximately 56,000 and is increasing by about 2200 persons per year. Planners estimate that its population will reach 100,000 by 1985. This is a very rapid rate of growth, particularly in relation to other

communities in the Atlantic region.

Since Dartmouth is to a great extent a city of younger people, the ratio of school population to overall population is high, being almost twice that of many Nova Scotia communities.

Due to the nature of its expansion, the amount of "slum" area in the city is comparatively small. There are, of course, areas where housing is poor and incomes are low but these areas are generally being improved. Since town planning is becoming more highly developed, conditions should further improve.

This rapid expansion of a community from a small one to a comparatively large one has been accompanied by many problems.

Before attempting this study, the writer was under the impression that one of these problems was a considerable rise in the rate of juvenile delinquency. This "impression" was only an assumption based on general comment in the community and a knowledge of more frequent sittings of the juvenile court. In Chapter III the actual facts with regard to the increase are presented.

CHAPTER I

DEFINING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

It is difficult to give a satisfactory definition of a juvenile delinquent. A policeman, a parent involved, a social worker, a teacher may all have different views as to what a juvenile delinquent is. Many youngsters who are termed delinquent are not really delinquents since their offending acts may be only a part of a rather healthy defiance of authority and a natural aggressiveness of youth. This protest against adult society is as old as time. Almost any adult, in recalling the days of his youth, could turn up acts which today might be called acts of delinquency. Occasional misdemeanors, therefore, committed by youths would hardly indicate that these youths are really delinquents.

However, for the sake of consistency, we must accept some definition of a juvenile delinquent.

According to the Criminal Code of Canada under The Juvenile Delinquents Act, a juvenile delinquent is "any child who violates any provision of the Criminal Code or of any federal or provincial statute, or of any by-law or ordinance of any municipality, or is guilty of sexual immorality or any similar form of vice, or who is

liable by reason of any other act to be committed to an industrial school or juvenile reformatory under the provision of any federal or provincial statute. The commission by a child of any of these acts constitutes an offence known as a juvenile delinquency".¹

The upper age of children within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court varies from province to province. In the majority of Canadian provinces the upper age is sixteen years although it is fifteen in some provinces and as high as eighteen in others.

Discussing juvenile delinquents in terms of the definition as given in the Criminal Code results in a quite incomplete picture. There are committed many delinquencies which do not result in apprehension of the offenders. Some are simply not caught. Families of influence in middle and upper classes no doubt sometimes make "arrangements" which keep juvenile offenders out of court. So it is difficult to obtain information sufficiently accurate to show the true incidence of delinquency. These difficulties are summarized in a study of juvenile delinquency by Bloch and Flynn.²

¹Canada Year Book, 1963-64, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa.

²Herbert A. Bloch and Frank T. Flynn, The Juvenile Offender in America Today, New York: Random House, 1956.

1. lack of uniformity in reporting and no compulsory registration of youthful offenders;
2. differences in the way courts classify and handle delinquents;
3. variations in the way in which youngsters with problems are referred to community agencies for handling;
4. variations in the methods of reporting the reception of children in institutions;
5. differences in the way in which police handle and refer children for misbehaviour.

In spite of such difficulties some practical basis must be used in choosing cases for a study of the problem of delinquency. For this particular study the term juvenile delinquent refers to any youth under the age of sixteen who has appeared on a charge in the Juvenile Court in the City of Dartmouth.

CHAPTER II

EXTENT OF THE PROBLEM

An examination is made in this chapter of the number of cases brought before the juvenile courts in (1) Canada, (2) Nova Scotia, and (3) Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, from 1957 to 1966.

Since statistics for Canada are available only to 1961, the figures for Nova Scotia and Canada will first be compared. Information as obtained from Canadian Department of Justice¹ shows the following with regard to the number of cases in juvenile courts from 1957 to 1961, inclusive:

	<u>1957</u>	<u>1958</u>	<u>1959</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1961</u>
Canada	10,620	11,766	11,986	13,969	14,804
Nova Scotia	529	701	664	703	573

These figures show that the number of cases in Canada increased from 10,620 in 1957 to 14,804 in 1961. Since overall population increased as well during those years, a fairer comparison is made by showing that there were 371 court appearances per 100,000 population in 1957

¹Juvenile Delinquency in Canada, Report of the Department of Justice, Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1965.

while in 1961 there were 435 appearances per 100,000. This is an increase of 17 per cent. During those years the population of Canada increased by 9.5 per cent.

In Nova Scotia during those same years the number of cases brought before the juvenile courts increased from 529 to 573. However, the rate per 100,000 population actually decreased from 405 to 395.¹ As opposed to the 17 per cent rise in cases in Canada, in Nova Scotia there was a decrease of 2.5 per cent, both percentages being based on the rate of 100,000.

Figures for Canada beyond 1961 are not yet available. The Department of Public Welfare, Province of Nova Scotia, however, issues an annual report and these reports show the number of juvenile court cases up to 1966.²

The figures in these reports must be considered separately from those coming from the federal government since the Nova Scotia reports give the figure for the year ending as of March 31.

The reports show that for the year ending March 31, 1962, there were 805 cases before the juvenile

¹This means per 100,000 population of Canada, not of Nova Scotia.

²Reports: Province of Nova Scotia, Department of Public Welfare, Halifax, Nova Scotia, March 31, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965.

courts. For the year ending March 31, 1963, there were 1354 cases, for 1964 there were 1210 cases, for 1965 there were 1171 cases. Although the report for the year ending March 31, 1966, is not available at the time of writing, the Minister of Welfare reported in the Nova Scotia Legislature on February 18, 1967, that there were 1360 cases before the courts during the year ending March 31, 1966. This, the Minister stated, was an increase of 16 per cent over the previous year. Using the figure for 1962 and the figure for 1966 shows that the number of cases increased by 555 or by approximately 69 per cent.

Figures for increase in population in Nova Scotia from 1962 to 1966 are not available but the overall population gain was not sufficiently great to have any significant effect on the percentage increase.

Caution must be exercised in interpreting these figures for the province of Nova Scotia.

In 1961 in Nova Scotia there were nine juvenile courts. By 1962 there were twenty-one such courts. This means that in 1962 the jurisdiction of the juvenile courts extended to every part of the province. The nine juvenile courts in 1961 did not have such wide jurisdiction and many juvenile court cases were dealt with in the regular magistrate's court. Therefore, a more realistic compar-

ison might be made by using the figures for the year ending March 31, 1963, (1354) and the year ending March 31, 1966 (1360). These figures, of course, show almost no change.

The first juvenile court sat in Dartmouth on October 26, 1961. Prior to that day, cases of juveniles were tried in magistrate's court. Between October 26, 1961, and March 31, 1962, there were 13 cases before the court. During the full year ending March 31, 1963, there were 95 cases in the court. For the year ending March 31, 1964, there were 74 cases, and for the year ending March 31, 1965, there were 66 cases. However, for the year ending March 31, 1966, the number had risen to 91.

The above figures show that while there has been a considerable increase in juvenile delinquency in recent years in Canada, there has been little change in Nova Scotia.

In Dartmouth there was a considerable decrease in the number of the cases from 1963 to 1965. This decrease is more marked in view of the fact that the population of the city increased by several thousand during those years. This encouraging downward trend, however, was greatly changed when 91 cases were reported for the year ending March 31, 1966.

CHAPTER III

THE HOMES

Although juvenile delinquents come from all strata of society, students of the problem have generally found that a great proportion of the delinquents come from families in the lower economic level.

In a detailed study of delinquents and non-delinquents in underprivileged areas, areas which were deteriorating, low rent urban neighbourhoods, or areas in a transitional stage from residential to industrial, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck¹ found that despite the fact that both delinquents and non-delinquents lived in poor environments, the delinquents were less favourably situated than the non-delinquents. The delinquents changed residence more often than the non-delinquents, the delinquents lived in less sanitary and more crowded conditions. A greater proportion of the delinquents came from families on welfare and from families with unskilled parents. The Gluecks found little difference between the two groups with relation to the number of children in the family. They found a greater proportion of delinquents came from

¹Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1964.

families in which the parents were separated, divorced, or not married.

In his study, Sir Cyril Burt¹ found in London that more than one-half of the delinquents came from poor homes. Burt's study concentrated on no geographical area of London. Since he had concluded that less than thirty per cent of the inhabitants of London lived in "poor" homes, Burt decided that a disproportionate number of delinquents did come from poor homes. Nevertheless, since about one-half of the delinquents came from homes whose economic status Burt classes as fair, good, or very good, he concluded that poverty was only one of many causes of delinquency.

Burt found a definite relationship between delinquency and over-crowded dwellings.

Sir Cyril Burt concluded that poverty was common among juvenile delinquents but he found poverty common among non-delinquents as well. He decided that it was not poverty itself which bred delinquency but rather poverty accompanied by defective family relationships, by vicious home environment, and particularly by home situations where defective discipline prevailed.

There is a commonly held belief that broken homes

¹Sir Cyril Burt, The Young Delinquent, London University Press, London. Fourth Edition, 1943.

are a major factor in causing delinquency among children.

Richard S. Sterne, in a study "Delinquent Conduct and Broken Homes"¹ questions this belief. Sterne points out that the influence of the broken home in bringing about delinquency was generally accepted in America until 1931 when Shaw and McKay² compared delinquents and non-delinquents in Cook County, Illinois, and concluded that broken homes were not a significant factor in causing juvenile delinquency. The results of this study surprised students of the problem of delinquency and caused some of them to re-examine the question. The common belief which followed was that the inadequate home rather than the broken home was a common cause of delinquency. In spite of the disruption in a broken home in which one parent is dead, or a father has deserted his family, or divorce has taken place, it was often noted that the remaining parent maintained a quite adequate environment for the bringing up of children.

On this point Teeters and Reinemann stated, "It is not that the home is broken, but rather that the home is inadequate that matters. Many mothers, and some

¹Richard S. Sterne, Delinquent Conduct and Broken Homes, College University Press, New Haven, 1964.

²Clifford R. Shaw, Henry D. McKay, Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency, National Committee on Law Observation, Report on Causes of Crime, Number 13, Washington, D.C., 1931.

fathers, who have lost their mates through separation, divorce, or death, are doing a splendid job of raising their children. It is not so much the physically broken home as the home that is confused and inadequate . . . that contributes to high delinquency rates."¹

It was in an attempt to shed further light on this question that Richard S. Sterne² undertook a study of delinquency and broken homes. Sterne published his findings in 1964.

In his study Sterne examined the cases of one thousand and fifty boys who had appeared in juvenile court in Trenton, New Jersey. It should be noted that Sterne considered only serious offences, excluding from his study such offences as truancy, trespassing, indecent language, false alarm, etc.

Sterne reported that 65.2 per cent of the serious delinquency acts were committed by youths who came from unbroken homes while 59.2 per cent of the serious acts were committed by youths from broken homes. The percentage of serious acts for the whole group was 65.3.

Sterne's findings would suggest that broken homes are not crucial factors in the causation of

¹Nigley K. Teeters and John Otto Reinemann, The Challenge of Delinquency, Prentice Hall Inc., New York.

²Richard S. Sterne, op. cit.

juvenile delinquency.

Another aspect of Sterne's study is of interest. He tested the rather common belief that the "working mother" has a deleterious effect on the family, an effect which often leads to juvenile delinquency.

Sterne reported that 62.1 per cent of the serious offences were committed by youths who came from homes in which the mother did not work, while 67.8 per cent of the serious offences were committed by youths from homes in which both parents worked. It is of interest that only 54.2 per cent of the serious crimes were committed by youths in whose homes not only did the mother work but she was, as well, the head of the home, no husband being in the home.

In an examination of this question Gerald Francis Hickey¹ studied fifty-eight families in the city of Halifax, the children of which had appeared in juvenile court. He found that in 75 per cent of the cases the parents were living together. Although this is a limited study, the results agree with others mentioned above and would suggest that difficulties within the home are of greater significance than an actual separation of the parents.

¹Gerald Francis Hickey, "Family Backgrounds and Family Patterns, Thesis, Maritime School of Social Work, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1961.

Although the emphasis on this study is on educational factors, some conclusions regarding home conditions of the one hundred youths are recorded.

It is not possible to place homes neatly in categories of very good, adequate, inadequate, etc.

However, in the case of each youth there was at least one report from a probation officer and these reports were sufficiently descriptive and detailed to provide general guidelines for categories.

Probation officers' reports would indicate that in 29 per cent of the youths the homes appeared to be good or very good. "Good" here may refer mainly to the physical surroundings of the home since one or two visits to a home on the part of a probation officer may not permit him to assess the relationships within a family. When probation officers' reports indicated good physical surroundings but indicated evidences of disharmony and discord within the home, the home was placed in an inadequate category.

In the cases of 12 per cent of the youths, the home would be termed adequate. Probation officers' reports would suggest that in these homes physical surroundings were acceptable and relationships within the family appeared to be reasonably good.

Of the homes, 31 per cent might be described as

fair. In these homes physical surroundings appeared to be barely acceptable and family relationships were not completely unharmonious.

Of the homes, 28 per cent might be described as inadequate. In these homes probation officers found alcoholism, dissensions, and an atmosphere generally detrimental to the bringing up of children.

Of the one hundred youths, 13 per cent came from homes in which the parents were separated, divorced, or in which one parent was dead.

Probation officers reported specifically that in 14 per cent of the homes the discipline appeared to be inadequate. These fourteen homes were not found exclusively in any one of the above categories. However, there was a concentration of these in the "inadequate" group although some of the homes so described were those of parents well situated financially.

These reports indicate that a large proportion (59 per cent) of the juvenile delinquents came from homes which are inadequate or barely adequate for the bringing up of children. On the other hand, it is of interest that 29 per cent of the homes appeared to be quite well suited for the raising of a family.

The fact that 13 per cent came from "broken" homes seems to support the theory of Sterne and others

that the absence of one parent from a home is not a major factor in the causation of juvenile delinquency.

CHAPTER IV

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS AND INTELLIGENCE

There is often in the mind of the public an assumption that juvenile delinquents are characterized by less than normal intelligence. Students of the problem have questioned this assumption and a number of studies have been made to determine what relationship, if any, exists between juvenile delinquency and intelligence.

In order to make comparisons with studies made elsewhere, the intelligence quotients are placed in groupings of ten. The framework is as follows:

<u>I.Q.</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Per Cent of General Population</u>
120 and above	superior	8.9%
110 - 119	bright-normal	16.1%
100 - 109)	average	50%
90 - 99)		
80 - 89	dull-normal	16.1%
70 - 79	borderline	6.7%
60 - 69)	defective	2.2%
50 - 59)		

The classifications of superior, bright-normal, etc., and the percentage of the general population in each group are presented by some psychologists as a general picture of intelligence distribution among a school population.

In a study of the relationship between juvenile delinquency and intelligence, Sir Cyril Burt¹ reached certain conclusions. Burt studied one hundred ninety-seven boys and girls who had appeared in juvenile court in London, England. The results of his study were first published in 1925 and his work was revised most recently in 1944.

Burt's analysis is most detailed and complete. The one hundred ninety-seven delinquents came from three main groups: first, children referred to him by magistrates, child care organizations, teachers, and parents, for the purpose of psychological examination; second, a somewhat smaller group encountered in an educational survey of a representative London borough; and third, a small selection from remand-homes or industrial schools.

Burt studied numerous aspects of the problem of delinquency. In this paper particular reference is

¹Sir Cyril Burt, The Young Delinquent, London: University of London Press Ltd., 1925.

made to the matter of home conditions of delinquents and the intelligence factor.

Although Burt's study was made some years ago, and under different social conditions, there may be some value in making comparisons between his findings and the findings in the Dartmouth study.

As a result of intelligence testing, using the Binet-Semon intelligence tests, Burt concluded that 2.2 per cent of the youths charged with delinquency were of superior intelligence, 2.0 per cent were in the bright-normal category, 43.7 per cent were of average intelligence. He found that 29.0 per cent were dull-normal, 15.7 per cent were of borderline intelligence, and 7.6 per cent were mentally defective. These categories are based on the general framework outlined above.

Probably the most exhaustive study of juvenile delinquency in the United States was made by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck.¹ The Gluecks studied five hundred inmates of the Lyman School for Boys in Westboro, Massachusetts. These boys came mostly from the Boston area. For the purposes of comparison, the Gluecks

¹Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1950.

studied, as well, five hundred non-delinquent boys from the Boston Public Schools.

It should be pointed out that in the Boston study the Gluecks examined only delinquents who had resided in underprivileged sections of the city before they were committed to the correctional school. By an underprivileged area was meant a neighbourhood which was deteriorating. In such a neighbourhood housing was substandard, incomes were below the city average, and conditions generally were not suited to the wholesome development of children.

For testing purposes, the Gluecks used the Wechsler-Bellevue tests.

Among the five hundred delinquents, the Gluecks found that 1.2 per cent were of superior intelligence, 8.2 per cent were bright-normal, and 47.8 per cent were of average intelligence. They found that 24.2 per cent were in the dull-normal category, 14.4 per cent were borderline, and 4.2 per cent were defective in intelligence.

The basis of selection in the Dartmouth study was different from the bases used by Burt and the Gluecks. In the Dartmouth study the selection of cases was a random one. The pupils whose cases were examined came from all sections of the community

extending from poorer neighbourhoods to the better residential areas of the city.

The tests used in Dartmouth were the Dominion Tests of Learning Capacity. These tests were first developed in 1934 by the Department of Educational Research, Ontario College of Education. The tests are widely used in Ontario and are the tests commonly used in Dartmouth schools for group testing.

In the Dartmouth study 2 per cent were found in the superior category, 8 per cent in the bright-normal, and 44 per cent in the average grouping. In the dull-normal group there were 26 per cent, 17 per cent in the borderline group, and 3 per cent in the defective group.

The summarized results of the London, Boston, and Dartmouth surveys may be found in Table 1, Page 30.

Despite certain disparities, there is a marked consistency in the findings of the three studies. The great variance is in the bright-normal group where Burt's finding is 2 per cent as opposed to 8.2 per cent in Boston and 8 per cent in Dartmouth.

As indicated earlier, Burt's study was first made in 1925. The Gluecks' was made twenty-five years later, and the Dartmouth study was made in 1966. The bases of selection were different in the three studies.

These factors, along with differences in social conditions at the time of the studies and differences in testing techniques, no doubt, cause disparate findings in various categories.

An examination of the findings leads to some interesting conclusions. The three studies show that more than two-fifths of the juvenile delinquents studied were of average intelligence. The Gluecks showed the highest percentage, 47.8 per cent, Dartmouth's 44 per cent and Burt's 43.7 per cent being almost equal. The studies indicate that youths of superior intelligence do commit delinquencies though the percentage is small. Boston and Dartmouth were in agreement that about 8 per cent of delinquencies were committed by youths of bright normal intelligence. All three studies agree in finding that youths in the dull normal group committed about one-fourth of the acts of delinquency. There is no great variance in the borderline group. Burt found a higher percentage in the defective group, while Dartmouth's 3 per cent was the lowest of the three.

In general, the results of the three studies would seem to refute any claim that a high per cent of juvenile delinquents are in the low intelligence group. In the Dartmouth study of one hundred youths, the number who were of superior intelligence was little different

from the number who were mentally defective. All studies indicate that the preponderance of acts of delinquency is found among youths of average intelligence. The general framework of intelligence distribution shows that 50 per cent of the population is in the average category and the three studies found that of the youths committing delinquencies, close to 50 per cent were in the same category.

Some observations based on the results of the Dartmouth survey might be made here.

Despite the statement made above that most delinquencies were committed by youths of average intelligence, the findings, nevertheless, do show another relationship between delinquency and intelligence. Of the school population generally, 8.9 per cent are of superior intelligence. Only 2 per cent of the delinquents were found to be in this category. Of the general population 16.1 per cent are of bright to normal intelligence but only 8 per cent of the delinquents were in this group. By combining these two groups one could conclude that although 25 per cent of the population are of more than average intelligence, only 10 per cent of the delinquents were of more than average intelligence. The conclusion might be stated more generally by saying that it is much less likely that youths of more than

average intelligence will commit acts of delinquency.

The other side of the picture is seen in the below average group. Disregarding the mentally defectives, about 23 per cent of the general population are of less than average intelligence. It is noteworthy, however, that 43 per cent of the delinquents were of less than average intelligence. The figures would indicate that the incidence of delinquency is likely to be almost twice as great among youths of less than average intelligence than among the general population for this intelligence group.

In the mentally defective group, the percentage who committed delinquencies was only slightly higher than the percentage found in the general population in this category.

A more detailed analysis of I. Q. information shows that the two persons in the highest bracket had I. Q.'s of 121 and 120. The delinquencies committed by these two youths were of a minor nature and there is no evidence of repetitions. At the time of writing, one of these was in his junior matriculation year but he had repeated two years in his high school career. The other completed his high school courses although his academic achievement was considerably below what might be expected of a youth of such ability.

Among the one hundred delinquents studied, eight showed I. Q.'s from 110 to 119, and eighteen showed I. Q.'s from 100 to 109. In the I. Q. range of 90 to 99 there were twenty-six youths. A large number of youths, twenty-six, were found in the 80 to 89 range. Seventeen were found in the seventies. One youth showed an I. Q. of 68, one showed 64, and the lowest I. Q. found was 56.

The youth with the I. Q. of 68 had an extremely difficult home situation to contend with and made repeated appearances in juvenile court on such charges as break and entry, property damage, indecent assault. The youth with the I. Q. of 64 came from a home in which the parents were divorced and probation officers report that the mother was unstable and unfit to bring up a child. His appearances in court resulted mainly from theft and truancy. The youth with the I. Q. of 56 came from a home where probation officers report that the father was an alcoholic, the mother well-meaning but ineffectual. This youth's main offence was car theft and he had made two appearances in juvenile court. At the time of writing he was employed. He had made no recent appearances in court.

Although the low I. Q. no doubt played a part in bringing on delinquencies among youths such as the

three noted above, it is obvious that many other factors were exerting their influence in the lives of such youths.

The Dartmouth Schools operate a quite extensive program of "auxiliary" classes. These classes are designed to meet the educational needs of youths in the fifty to seventy-five I. Q. range, that is, pupils who are mentally defective but nevertheless educable. The writer hoped that the attention given to these in small classes and the nature of their educational program would help to deter these pupils from committing acts of delinquency. Six of the delinquents did come from such auxiliary classes. This number is not unexpected since in the cases of four of these six pupils any progress made by the school in developing good citizenship was largely offset by unsatisfactory home situations.

A Nova Scotia study of juvenile delinquency was made in 1962 by Kathleen Judith Moore.¹ This study examined the results of intelligence testing among one hundred sixty-three juvenile delinquents who had been committed to the Nova Scotia School for

¹Kathleen Judith Moore, *Juvenile Delinquency and Mental Retardation*, Halifax: Thesis at Maritime School of Social Work, 1962.

Boys, a correctional school at Shelburne, Nova Scotia. The study concluded that there were almost five times as many retarded youths (I. Q. below 80) among the delinquents than are found in the population generally. The Dartmouth study found about two and one-half times as many.

Miss Moore found that the average I. Q. among the delinquents was 83. The Dartmouth study found the average I. Q. to be 90.

The differences in the results of the Shelburne and Dartmouth studies are, however, not surprising. The one hundred sixty-three youths at Shelburne could truly be termed juvenile delinquents since no youth is committed to that institution unless his offence has been a serious one or he has been found guilty of repeated offences and has violated his parole. In the case of the Dartmouth youths the offences were often of a minor nature and often there was no repetition. One would expect a generally higher average I. Q. among these Dartmouth youths who found themselves in juvenile court and of whom only a small per cent were sentenced to the Shelburne School.

TABLE 1

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND INTELLIGENCE

I. Q.	Category	General Population	Sir Cyril Burt ¹	Eleanor and Sheldon Glueck ²	Dartmouth
120 +	Superior	8.9%	2.2%	1.2%	2.0%
110-119	Bright-Normal	16.1%	2.0%	8.2%	8.0%
100-109	Average	50%	(13.7)	(18.6)	(18)
90-99			43.7%	47.8%	44.0%
80-89	Dull-Normal	16.1%	29.0%	24.2%	26.0%
70-79	Borderline	6.7%	15.7%	14.4%	17.0%
69 and below	Defective	2.2%	7.6%	4.2%	3.0%

¹Sir Cyril Burt, The Young Delinquent, London: University of London Press, 1924.

²Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1950.

CHAPTER V

THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT AND HIS SCHOOL RECORD

In this survey no attempt was made to study the actual marks or grades attained by the delinquents. To record the marks made by the youths as they progressed through school would have been a difficult and in some cases an impossible task.

As an alternative the school history of each youth was examined and the grade or grades repeated by each was recorded. This information was available through current and retired files in the school administration office.

The results of this investigation are revealing.

Of the one hundred youths, only ten had not repeated a grade in school. Thirty-six youths repeated one grade, twenty-eight repeated two grades, and eighteen repeated three grades or three times. Two of the youths repeated four times. This accounts for ninety-four of the cases. Six of the delinquents were in auxiliary classes where the grade structure is not clearly defined and pupils progress at a rate suited to their abilities. In this situation no pupil is considered a repeater.

Further examination of this aspect of the school history of the delinquents shows that fourteen repeated one elementary grade, and twenty-two repeated one junior high school grade.¹ However, in the elementary school, twenty-six youths repeated more than one grade whereas in junior high school only six repeated more than once. Of the twenty-six who repeated more than once in elementary school, seven repeated three times and two repeated four times. In junior high school, four repeated twice and two repeated three times. In addition to these there were sixteen pupils who repeated two or three times with the repetition of grades being in both elementary and junior high school and senior high school.

Summarizing this story of repetition of grades shows that ten youths had no repetitions, thirty-six youths repeated once in school. Forty-eight repeated two, three, or four times.

The concentration of repetitions in the elementary school is partly explained by the fact that a number of the youths had not progressed into junior high school and others were still in the elementary school at the time of the writing of this report.

¹The Dartmouth School System has seven grades in Elementary School; Primary to Six, three in Junior High School, 7, 8, 9, and three in Senior High School, 10, 11, 12.

In general, the youths who did not repeat at all had better than average I.Q.'s, being in the 110 - 120 range. There were two exceptions to this. One non-repeater shows an I.Q. of 96 while another showed 100. It is of interest to note that the youths with the second highest I.Q. (120) repeated grades nine and eleven.

The pupils who repeated three times were generally in the below average category with regard to I.Q. ratings. There were three exceptions to this. These three showed I.Q.'s which were slightly above or below 100.

The two youths who had four repetitions in elementary school had I.Q.'s of 79 and 56.

It is difficult to draw conclusions from the data on school grades repeated which is presented here. One could speculate that for these youths school must have been an unhappy place indeed, a place where frustrations were built up and compounded. A pupil can likely survive one grade repetition without too much damage to his morale and general feeling of well-being but what effects two or three repetitions can have on the pupil's feeling toward school and toward society itself can only be left to the imagination. And forty-eight of these youths repeated two or more times in their school careers.

This finding that almost one-half of the delinquents repeated two or more grades is a cause for concern. The fact that these youths were required to go through such experiences at school would appear to be an indictment of the school organization.

In the background of these youths there were many factors which led them along the road to delinquency. A perusal of probation officers' reports showed that in many cases the youths lived in homes in which there was quarrelling, dissensions, and a general absence of harmony. For these youths to have had to face such conditions at home and to have met with repeated failures at school was scarcely conducive to good behaviour in school and in the community.

This matter of repeated failures in school may even suggest that the school can even serve as a contributing factor in juvenile delinquency. This is a harsh accusation and if the accusation has some justification, the onus of guilt is really upon the educational system rather than on the members of the school staffs, although the teachers are not always blameless. In many cases, however, the teachers are not aware of the problems which these pupils carry to school with them. Certain standards of work may be expected by the school authority and the standards may become more important

to the teachers than the mental health and outlook of those pupils who find it difficult to keep up.

During the past six years the local school system has been attempting to diversify the school program so as to provide programs more suited to the needs of various ability groups. The pupils of borderline intelligence are placed in auxiliary classes. Those with little aptitude for the regular academic program are placed in classes with a modified school curriculum and are given an opportunity to participate in on-the-job work experience program. This is a program terminal at grade ten. A follow-up of the pupils who completed this program shows that almost all are either pursuing some trade training or are employed. Without such a program these youths would almost certainly have left school at grade eight or so and some would likely have been problems to society or potential problems.

This is, of course, only a beginning of an attempt to meet the individual needs of pupils in the schools. With the expansion of vocational school facilities, the setting up of junior vocational schools, and a further diversification of the regular school program surely will come a diminution of this appalling story of repetitions of grades in our schools.

On this question of juvenile delinquents and

school progress, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck¹ reported that a high proportion of juvenile delinquents repeated grades in school. They found that 15.6 per cent of the youths studied had not repeated. The corresponding figure in Dartmouth was 10.6 per cent. Among the Boston group 37.9 per cent repeated one grade whereas in Dartmouth 38.3 per cent repeated once. In Boston 25.7 per cent repeated two grades while in Dartmouth 29.8 per cent repeated two grades. The Gluecks found that 20.8 per cent of the youths repeated three or more times while in Dartmouth the figure was 21.3 per cent.

In obtaining these percentage figures, a total of ninety-four was used, thus excluding the six auxiliary class pupils.

Although there is a considerable variance in the percentage who did not repeat at all, the results, in general, of the Boston and Dartmouth surveys are remarkably similar. Both surveys show a high rate of repetition and the Boston survey would seem to suggest that educational authorities in that city were no more successful than the Dartmouth authorities in meeting this problem. In fairness it should be pointed

¹Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1950.

out, however, that the Boston report was published in 1950.

This matter of grade repetition will be referred to again in Chapter VII.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF YOUTHS WHO REPEATED GRADES
IN BOSTON AND DARTMOUTH SURVEYS

	Boston	Dartmouth
Did not repeat	15.6%	10.6%
Repeated one grade	37.9%	38.3%
Repeated two grades	25.7%	29.8%
Repeated three or more grades	20.8%	21.3%

CHAPTER VI

THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT AND HIS BEHAVIOUR AT SCHOOL

An attempt was made to find out if any correlation existed between juvenile delinquency and problems of behaviour on the part of delinquents while they were in their schools. School principals and teachers were questioned on this aspect of the problem. Since all the one hundred delinquents were in the Dartmouth schools within five years of the time of the writing of this report, it was possible to get some information on the manner in which most of these reacted to the school environment.

Some of these delinquents were serious behaviour problems, and as such stood out in the mind of Principal and Staff, so there was some temptation to single out these young people for special attention. Given such attention, the records of these youths could have led to invalid generalization and, to avoid this, detailed information was sought on the school behaviour of all the youths concerned in this study. Interviews with school personnel and an examination of cumulative records of these youths did yield information sufficient to attempt conclusions. The schools

reported that of the one hundred youths, forty-eight presented no problems in discipline while in school. These forty-eight were just normal youths with regard to school behaviour and appeared to be no different from their fellows. Thirteen of the youths were the cause of problems in discipline in school upon occasion but the problems caused were not serious and offences against school regulations occurred at irregular intervals and were not of sufficient magnitude to cause serious disruption of classroom programs.

Seventeen of the youths were definitely discipline problems in school. The degree of seriousness of the problem varied, of course, but in all cases the breaches of school regulations were major ones. Among the last group, in general, there was a resentment or open defiance of authority. In only one or two cases was there any physical display of violence although two or three had threatened physical violence. Most of the seventeen found themselves suspended from school temporarily on occasions but only two were actually expelled from school. Expulsion, however, might have occurred in the case of some of those who were committed to Shelburne had they remained in the school environment.

With all these seventeen, truancy was common and in some cases truancy was used as a charge in

bringing the youths to juvenile court while the persistent breaches of school regulations were the actual reason for school authorities' recommendation that the youths be charged. Accusations on the latter are more difficult to prove in court. This accounts for only seventy-eight of the one hundred youths. Six of the youths were in auxiliary classes where numbers are very small and the discipline is of a different type from that in ordinary classes and teachers would hesitate to classify any member as a discipline problem. They recognize that the problems are of many facets. It was difficult to obtain sufficient reliable information on the remaining sixteen to place them in any of the three groups.

From these investigations one would conclude that in the cases of the youths studied, about three-fourths of them ($\frac{61}{78}$) were not disciplinary problems in the schools. About 22 per cent of the youths were major problems in school and, in general, these were the delinquents whose charges in court were more serious and more numerous.

A rather small proportion (13) were the cause of discipline problems upon occasion but this could be said of perhaps a similar proportion of pupils who were never in difficulty with juvenile courts.

One cannot disregard the seventeen who were real problems. In each case there were many background factors such as broken homes, chaotic home conditions, emotional disturbances, and other factors the interpretation of which is beyond the terms of this study. One might say only in general that these youths rebelled against society and the school was just a part of that society.

With regard to school behaviour there is another aspect of the problem which deserves comment. The reaction of the pupil to the school authority is to a degree influenced by the manner in which that authority is exercised. The type of discipline exacted varied from rigid and unquestioned to a certain permissiveness. Pupils with rebellious tendencies react in different ways to these disciplinary methods. This aspect of the question, then, is another variable which makes firm conclusions regarding the relationship between delinquency and school behaviour difficult to form.

CHAPTER VII

THE SCHOOL AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

In the prevention of juvenile delinquency and in the attempt to solve this serious social problem, the school occupies an important and strategic position. The importance of the place of the school increases as the family abdicates to other agencies its responsibility for the bringing up of children.

In promoting a school climate which may help the delinquent or potential delinquent to function satisfactorily in the classroom, the chief requisite would seem to be the establishment of an educational program suited to the needs of the individual pupils. This tenet has been stated by many of the students of juvenile delinquency.

Speaking to a group of Toronto teachers, Ralph S. Boot, Inspector, Youth Bureau, Metropolitan Toronto Police, put it this way:

The school's main responsibility toward the delinquent or potentially delinquent child is the same as its responsibility for all children. The school, therefore, should provide an educational programme that meets the needs of different children. If the school can provide in its programme for the needs of every child, then it will be making its greatest contribution on the positive side of delinquency prevention. If the school fails to bring the child along

successfully in accordance with his abilities, this may directly contribute to the development of undesirable behaviour, through school rejection, failure of grades, which result in the child becoming frustrated.

Robert C. Taber, writing on this aspect of the school's responsibility, states: "Our schools can be a major factor in turning the tide of juvenile delinquency if we are willing to spend the time, effort, and money to organize a screening program and to provide the special services required to meet individual needs."²

A social worker who had many years' experience in Chicago made this statement:

The sad fact is that some of our juvenile court judges and many educators agree . . . that the only solution to juvenile delinquency is work for our children.

It does not seem to occur to these that we owe our children an education - which is all too little now - and that we must adapt our curriculum to the needs of children - so that they will want to remain in school at least until they are sixteen years of age . . .

Samuel Miller Brownell, writing in *School Life*, presents a similar argument when he points out that schools prevent delinquency when their aim is to educate

¹The Bulletin, Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, December, 1964.

²Robert C. Taber, "Before It's Too Late", NEA Journal, December, 1953.

³Jessie C. Birford, A Letter to the Tenth Annual Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Chicago, 1955.

all children by teaching each child according to his abilities.¹

Again, in reference to the role of the school in combatting delinquency, Dr. William C. Kvaraceus, Director of the Juvenile Delinquency Project of the National Education Association, in addressing a committee of the United States Senate, states:

There must be greater differentiation of instruction . . . In differentiating the curriculum, attention must be given to current monolithic structure of the upper class curriculum. Attention needs to be given to a meaningful curriculum for the lower class youngster for whom middle class goals do not represent reasonable and realistic goals. The core of this revision should centre around the communication skills, leisure time use, and occupational competencies.²

There seems to be, then, a general agreement that one of the most valuable contributions in combatting delinquency that the school can make is the development of a program which will meet individual needs.

Although there is agreement that individual needs should be met in the schools, there is no simple formula for organizing programs to bring this about.

Establishing such programs is a difficult task. Often the youths are approaching or are in their "teens"

¹Samuel Miller Brownell, School Life Magazine, April, 1957, p. 13.

²Quoted from Juvenile Delinquency in Canada, Report of Department of Justice, Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, Ottawa, 1965.

when they come to the attention of the school authorities. By that time unhealthy attitudes towards school have been built up and these are hard to change. Often, too, undesirable home situations militate against corrective measures. Teachers may be sincere in their efforts to fill the needs of these pupils but in some cases the problems may be so deep that the classroom teacher cannot cope with them. Repeated failures on the part of the teacher to deal successfully with "difficult" pupils may lead to disillusionment and despair.

This is not to suggest that the school cannot be a helpful agency in dealing with delinquency. Certain conditions, however, are required.

Proper attitudes on the part of teachers are most important. Since the place of the teacher is discussed later in this chapter, this aspect of the school program will not be examined at this point.

If the school is to achieve any degree of success in meeting the individual needs of pupils, the teacher must have a group or class which is small enough to permit him to know what these needs are, and to teach the pupils as individuals.

There will be problems of delinquency which the teacher cannot deal with effectively, problems with which,

in some cases, the teacher should not even attempt to cope. Therefore, the teacher must have help from such specialists as psychologists, social workers, psychiatrists.

Co-operation on the part of the parent is needed. In some cases this is not easy to obtain. If the home refuses to co-operate, or due to conditions is unable to co-operate, the help of community services should be sought.

There have been experiments in which people interested in the problem of juvenile delinquency have attempted to prove that delinquents will respond favourably to the school program if the conditions are right.

Harrison E. Salisbury¹ describes such a school in Brooklyn, New York. In that city a member of the Board of Education maintained that pupils who were behaviour problems in school would succeed if the school were given sufficient money to provide good guidance programs, psychiatric aid, and after-school programs. These services were provided to a school in Brooklyn. Boys who would leave the school normally at three o'clock were kept until five o'clock in the afternoon. Activities were carried on which were of interest to

¹Harrison E. Salisbury, The Shook-Up Generation, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1958.

these boys who had been behaviour problems in the school and outside it. The principal of the school maintained that ninety per cent of these boys became useful citizens.

In discussing these all-day schools Bertram M. Beck¹ states that such schools are extremely important to the social delinquent since the schools provide a needed "protective" environment. He points out, as well, that the school must be willing to accept disruption, property damage at times, and "different" behaviour.

Another school which tackled the problem is the M. Gertrude Godwin School in Boston. Mary Handy² states that over the past twenty years some six thousand boys who had been habitual truants, or who had been considered unmanageable, were enrolled in that school. She maintained that eighty-four per cent of these became responsible citizens. In this school discipline was firm and consistent. The rules of the school were enlightened but when these rules were broken repeatedly the offenders and their parents were

¹Bertram M. Beck, "The School and Delinquency Control", Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science, November, 1955.

²Mary Handy, "Willingly - To School", NEA Journal, December, 1955.

brought before the juvenile court.

In this school the curriculum was no ordinary one. Boys made their own clothes and learned to cook. In academic subjects special assistance was given in an attempt to bring the boys up to their grade level. Every effort was made to hold the interest of the boys by curriculum adjustment.

The success of such schools as these would suggest that the school can go a long way in the struggle to reduce juvenile delinquency if the school has sufficient resources and teachers who have an understanding of and a determined desire to meet and solve this problem.

The problem of repetition of grades among delinquents has been discussed briefly in Chapter V. However, in view of the importance of this factor in the overall relationship between the school and delinquency, the question will be examined further here.

William B. Kvaraceus¹ states that the one great difference between the general youth population in school and the delinquent is the "rejection and condemnation" of the delinquent because he so often fails to be promoted from grade to grade. Kvaraceus states

¹William C. Kvaraceus, Juvenile Delinquency and the School, New York, World Book Company, 1945.

that habits of failure and feelings of inferiority are characteristic of delinquency and that rebellion and flight from the classroom are not surprising results. He believes that the truancy and vandalism that are often characteristic of delinquents are protests against frustrating and defeating experiences in school.

Although the problem of grade repetition is being treated separately here, it is very closely related to the problem of developing in the school program suited to the needs and abilities of the pupils. If all pupils are poured into one academic mold, repetition of grades will result. If the school program is sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of the academically and non-academically inclined, this frustrating and demoralizing picture of repetition in which pupils fall farther and farther behind their fellows can be changed. No one can seriously question the effects on personality that repetition has. The gain made in various academic subject areas by repeating a grade is, as well, open to question.

Besides the matter of providing a school program suited to the needs of juvenile delinquents and the problem of grade repetition, there is another area in which the school plays an important part. This is the role which the teacher plays.

No matter how excellent the program of the school may be, if the teachers administering it are poorly prepared, or have improper attitudes, the program is likely to fail.

The role of the teacher in the problem of delinquency is then a vital one.

Most of the juvenile delinquents in our communities are enrolled in the schools. In Nova Scotia, for example, upon reaching the age of sixteen the youth who is accused of breaking the law is no longer termed "juvenile". Since youths normally are required to remain in school until they have reached an age of sixteen, it follows that the great percentage of juvenile delinquents are in school. The small percentage who are not in school have either been excluded from school or are in a corrective institution. So with the exception of the home there is no organization of society closer to the delinquent than the school.

The school, then, should be in a position to combat some of the influences outside which are leading youths toward delinquency. Unfortunately, this is often not what the school really does. As stated earlier, the school may find itself acting as a contributor to delinquency.

Brownell cites certain factors which may cause

the school to contribute to delinquency. Among these are: poor preparation of teachers in detection of special needs of children; lack of time for teachers to really know the children they teach; the failure of the school to provide teachers with the special assistance they need to deal with behaviour problems.¹

William C. Kvaraceus², in discussing favourable school conditions, makes a number of suggestions aimed at correcting conditions that foster undesirable behaviour. Some of these apply particularly to the classroom teachers.

1. Knowing and accepting the student delinquent as a person. The teacher must know the student delinquent not only through records but as a human being no matter how objectionable his behaviour may at times be.
2. Locating the juvenile delinquent. Dr. Kvaraceus lists eighteen factors which may help teachers to identify potential delinquents. These are listed in Appendix F.
3. Preserving an impersonal and objective point of view. The teacher should view unpleasant episodes in the classroom as aggressiveness against authority in general rather than toward the teacher.
4. Taking a diagnostic look. The teacher should be more concerned with "Why did he do it?" rather than "What did he do?"

¹Brownell, op. cit., p. 53.

²William C. Kvaraceus, Pamphlet, What Research Says to the Teacher - Juvenile Delinquency, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1958.

The importance of the place the teacher can play in meeting the delinquency problem is clear. For the teacher, however, the task is difficult, often frustrating and discouraging. Although the school may be a headache for the delinquent child, the delinquent child may be a headache to the teacher, no matter how sincere the latter may be in his efforts to meet the problem fairly.

In relation to the factors cited by Brownell and the suggestions made by Kvaraceus with regard to classroom teachers and delinquents in the school, certain observations might be made.

Both writers stress the importance of detection. Early detection and referral are important. Teachers, however, vary greatly in their skill in identifying pupils with tendencies towards delinquency. Many teachers have little interest in even attempting to identify them. It might be argued that it is unfair and unrealistic to expect classroom teachers to be sufficiently competent to become involved in what can be a problem for personnel trained in such matters.

Brownell speaks of the poor preparation of teachers in detection of delinquency. This poor preparation, or even complete lack of preparation of

evident in most schools. It is likely teachers are generally aware of this inadequacy on their part and it is also likely that they are unsure as to the extent of their responsibility in the whole question.

Even when teachers do detect symptoms of delinquency, they often become discouraged in dealing with the matter of referrals. In many school systems, time and time again, they may make referrals. Some diagnosis of the problem may follow but often there is no corrective treatment. This lack of follow-up is usually not the fault of any individual, or individuals, but rather the fault of the community and society. The help of psychologists is often not available; psychiatrists are few in number and overworked. Mental health clinics for children across the country have long lists of those awaiting treatment.

So, in many cases, the teacher simply passes the child in trouble along to the next teacher.

Both Brownell and Kvaraceus speak of the importance of really knowing the delinquent as a person. Although teachers generally are aware that this "knowing" the child is important, they often become so involved in the routine of the school that the subject matter becomes more important than the child. As schools become larger and departmentalization becomes more

specialized, the importance of the individual pupil may become less. In this case of largeness, a partial answer may be found in the establishment of special departments whose function is to seek out the potential and actual delinquents, to have competent and understanding guidance teachers who attempt to work out the problems of these youths, to have social workers who can involve the parents, and to have professional help available for those whose problems are beyond the competency of the above three groups.

The suggestions of Kvaraceus that the teacher preserve an objective point of view and that he should try to understand why the difficult pupil acted as he did are worthy of note indeed. This ability of the teacher to accept that the pupil who is a recurrent behaviour problem is rebelling against the school and society and not against the teacher is necessary if that teacher is to have any success in dealing with the delinquent. If the teacher takes the rebellion as a personal attack, only a running battle can follow. There are rather few teachers who have this valuable quality of such objectivity. The scarcity of such teachers would suggest that delinquents who are behaviour problems in school should not be placed indiscriminately in the care of teachers. Teachers with

understanding and sympathy may be able to forestall the outbursts while teachers of different temperament and attitude may bring on the flare-ups. In a departmentalized school the placing of the behaviour problems in the hands of a few trusted teachers, rather than exposing them to the staff generally, may go a long way in dealing with the problems of the school as well.

Basically, then, the main factors which can enable the school to take some effective measures to help delinquents with their adjustment to school life and society are the existence of a diversified school program and the presence in the school of teachers who have some understanding of the problems facing these youths and who have a desire to help them solve the problems. Understanding such youths is not easy, nor is objectivity on the part of the teacher with them easily achieved. Nevertheless, until a good measure of these two qualities exist among the teachers who see the behaviour-problem delinquents from day to day, the behaviour problems are likely to continue and the school program, in general, is likely to suffer.

A third factor is the availability of professional people to whom the school may turn when problems

arise which are beyond the competence of the teachers.

All of this does not suggest that the school should be expected to serve as the major treatment centre for the problem of delinquency. Nevertheless, the school may expect some measure of success or may be confident that if it is not being effective in meeting delinquency problems, at least it is not aggravating the problem of those youths who come to it.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY

The preceding pages have given a general picture of juvenile delinquency in an expanding community. The story is not really a discouraging one. Although the year ending March 31, 1966, shows a marked increase in the incidence of juvenile delinquency in the city of Dartmouth, the total number of cases relative to total population was less in 1966 than in 1963. The trend from 1963 to 1965 was definitely downward. Whether or not 1966 was a portent for years to come or only an unfortunate year will be decided when further reports become available.

The reports given in Chapter III on the homes of delinquents would indicate a relationship between the home conditions and the delinquency. Almost sixty per cent of the youths came from homes which appeared to be ill-suited for the bringing up of children. This percentage is very high in relationship to rather small portion of the city which has really poor housing conditions. This is not to suggest that no delinquents came from "better" neighbourhoods for almost thirty per cent did come from good residential areas.

The "broken" home did not appear to be of great importance in the causation of juvenile delinquency.

Regarding the intelligence factor in relation to delinquency, the three communities compared (London, Boston, Dartmouth) show a rather similar pattern despite the differences in the manner in which the delinquents were chosen for study. The greatest segment of the delinquents were in the average intelligence grouping. However, both the London and Dartmouth study found that about one-half of the delinquents were of dull-normal intelligence or less than dull-normal. The Boston study showed a somewhat smaller percentage in this group. It is not possible to do anything to raise native intelligence of such youths but it is possible to improve the community and school environment in which these youths live and develop, and thereby encourage them to conform to the mores of the community.

The story of the common repetition of grades by the youths in the survey is revealing and uncovers a situation in the schools which requires attention. Repetition of one, two, three or more grades surely must aggravate the already existing problems of these youths.

It should be reported here that the local school authorities are aware of, and concerned about, this

problem of grade repetition in the schools. The school administration sought to reduce the amount of grade repetition during the past few years and is studying plans to replace the rigid grade system which exists by a more enlightened plan of continuous progress on the part of the pupils and based on their ability to learn.

Of the one hundred delinquents, only seventeen presented any serious discipline problem while in the schools. The majority of the delinquents were able to conform to school situations and regulations. The seventeen who were problems were often the cause of disruption of the school routine and program and a number of these were suspended from the schools. Some, too, were removed from the public schools by their being committed to a corrective institution.

The general relationship between the school and the delinquent was examined. The school does have an important place in facing the problem of juvenile delinquency. The school's role is important but it is also a difficult role. Teachers are often poorly prepared to deal with youths who do not, or cannot, fit into the daily routine of the school. Despite their desire to "understand" the difficult pupils, they may become disheartened and disillusioned in their efforts to see the problems with some objectivity.

In order to improve its position as an agency in combatting juvenile delinquency, it was suggested that a greater understanding of the problem of delinquency be encouraged among teachers. Some of these youths appear at school in the morning after having spent the night at a home where turmoil and confusion reigned. Some understanding of the home conditions of a number of their pupils would cause the teachers not to question why the pupils were late or were in a non-receptive mood, but rather to marvel that they managed to get to school at all.

It was suggested that the development and implementation of a school program suited to the abilities, interests, and needs of these youths would help to make the school a happier and more profitable place for them.

Professionally trained people, it was suggested, are a pressing need in the schools. The problems are often too great and too many for the classroom teachers. Counsellors, psychologists, mental health clinics, social workers are all required to make the school program a complete one.

That there is a problem of juvenile delinquency is clear. In Nova Scotia and in the City of Dartmouth it has not yet reached major proportions. However, social problems such as delinquency have a way of

spreading from major centres of population in a country to the relatively smaller communities. Therefore, unless some effective measures are found to deal with the problem, it is likely to become more serious. Since the problem of delinquency has its basis in the whole society, the home, the school, the community, solutions are not easy to find.

A consideration of the changes which have taken place in our society during the last decade or so might give some understanding of the greater prevalence of juvenile delinquency. Youths are growing up in a world in which change is the pattern, in which traditional values are being challenged, in which a "new morality" is being promoted. Perhaps our society is fortunate in that the problem is not more serious and more widespread than it actually is.

APPENDIX A

DARTMOUTH CITY - CASES BEFORE JUVENILE COURT 1962 - 1966 - AGES^a

Year Ending	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Unknown	Total
(Oct. 26, 1961, to)												
March 31, 1962	2	..	1	1	3	4	2	13
March 31, 1963	..	1	1	4	4	13	17	20	35	95
March 31, 1964	2	6	6	29	28	3 ^b	..	74
March 31, 1965	1	1	5	10	11	7	29	1 ^b	1	66
March 31, 1966	Age distribution not available											91

^a Reports of Department of Public Welfare - Province of Nova Scotia

^b Normally youths of sixteen years of age do not appear in Juvenile Court. However, under the Education Act a youth is required to remain in school until the end of the school term during which he became sixteen and is thus subject to charges in Juvenile Court.

APPENDIX B

THE GRADE IN SCHOOL AT THE TIME
OF THE COURT APPEARANCE

	Number of cases
Grade 2	1
Grade 3	1
Grade 4	4
Grade 5	10
Grade 6	14
Grade 7	32
Grade 8	23
Grade 9	7
Grade 10	2
Auxiliary	6
	<hr/> 100

The great proportion of the juvenile delinquents were in grades 6, 7, and 8 when they appeared in court. Of the one hundred youths, sixty-nine were in these three grades. One pupil was in grade 2 and one in grade 3. Seven of the offenders were in grade 9 and only two were in grade 10. The probable explanation for the few delinquents found in senior high school is that the large number of delinquents found in the grades below grade 9 do not reach high school. The story of grade repetition as told in Chapter VI would support this statement.

APPENDIX C

THE AGES OF THE DELINQUENTS AT THE TIME OF
THEIR COURT APPEARANCES

Age	Number of Youths
9	3
10	1
11	4
12	6
13	17
14	34
15	35
	<hr/>
	100

As Appendix B shows, the great proportion of the youths were in grades 6, 7, and 8 at the time of their court appearances. Most of the youths are found correspondingly in the 13, 14, 15 age group. Only 14 per cent of the youths were below the age of thirteen.

APPENDIX D

THE CHARGES

Break - Entry and Theft	35
Theft	36
Car Theft	8
Property Damage	10
Truancy	8
Indecent Assault	1
Assault	1
Public Mischief	1
	<hr/>
	100

As shown above, Break-Entry accompanied by Theft and Theft made up the greater proportion of the charges. Car theft is recorded separately since this charge was generally more serious than the usual theft charges. There were rather few truancy charges. The Public Mischief charge was a charge of "bomb scare" at a school.

Most of the youths had only one charge against them. However, some of the youths faced several charges, the largest number of charges against a youth being eight.

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP

It is not possible to determine accurately the number of the one hundred youths who have criminal records in the adult court. Many of the youths whose cases were reported are still in public school and a number of those who have, at the time of writing, become adults have left the city. However, local police records do show that a considerable percentage of the youths have, as adults, appeared in Magistrate's court.

Police records show that sixteen of the youths, at the time of this writing, have had criminal charges against them in adult court. Five of the sixteen were found guilty of charges sufficiently grave to have them sentenced to penitentiary. The charges against the other eleven were mainly theft, and assault and battery and all had received fines or jail sentences.

Considering the facts that many of the youths studied are still under sixteen years of age, that a number are no longer resident in Dartmouth, and that the offences committed by some of the juveniles were

of a minor nature and not repeated, sixteen per cent is a significant figure. It would suggest that appearances in juvenile court does not augur well for those involved.

In the cases of the five who were sentenced to a federal penitentiary there was a pattern in the offences as juveniles and as adults.

Number one was charged with theft in juvenile court and is in prison on a theft charge.

Number two was charged with car theft in juvenile court and repeated charges on this count sent him to prison.

Number three was charged with Break-Entry and Theft in juvenile court and is in prison on similar charges.

Number four was in juvenile court charged with Break-Entry and with car theft. Similar charges sent him to prison.

Number five was in juvenile court on charges of Break-Entry. He is in prison on an assault and battery charge.

APPENDIX F

IDENTIFYING JUVENILE DELINQUENTS

Mr. Kvaraceus¹ compiled this list from various research studies made on identifying potential delinquents. He suggests that a few of the factors are not really indicative of trouble but rather "a saturation of these characteristics".

1. Shows marked dislike for school.
2. Resents school routine and restriction.
3. Disinterested in school program.
4. Is failing in a number of subjects.
5. Has repeated one or more grades.
6. Attends special class for retarded pupils.
7. Has attended many different schools.
8. Intends to leave school as soon as the law allows.
9. Has only vague academic or vocational plans.
10. Has limited academic ability.
11. Is a child who seriously or persistently misbehaves.
12. Destroys school materials or property.
13. Is cruel and bullying on the playground.
14. Has temper tantrums in the classroom.
15. Wants to stop schooling at once.
16. Truants from school.
17. Does not participate in organized extra-curricular programs.
18. Feels he does not "belong" in the classroom.

¹William C. Kvaraceus, Juvenile Delinquency, What Research Says to the Teacher, National Education Association, Washington, August, 1958.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aichhorn, August. Wayward Youth. New York: Viking Press, 1925.
- Applegate, Melbourne S. Helping Boys in Trouble. New York: Associated Press, 1950.
- Bennett, Ivy. Delinquency and Neurotic Children. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Bernstein, Saul. Youth on the Streets. New York: Associated Press, 1964.
- Bloch, Herbert A.; and Flynn, Frank T. Delinquency - The Juvenile Offender in America Today. New York: Random House, 1956.
- Burt, Sir Cyril. The Young Delinquent. London: University of London Press, Revised, 1944.
- Cavan, Ruth Shanke. Juvenile Delinquency. New York: J. B. Lipencott Company, 1963.
- . Readings in Juvenile Delinquency. New York: J.B. Lipencott Company, 1963.
- Cloward, Richard; and Ohlin, Lloyd E. Delinquency and Opportunity. Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.
- Cooley, E.J. Probation and Delinquency. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons. 1927.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Delinquents in the Making. New York: Harper Brothers, 1952.
- . The Problem of Delinquency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1959.
- . Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959.

- _____. Predicting Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1960.
- _____. Family Environment and Juvenile Delinquency. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Goldberg, Harriet L. Child Offenders. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1948.
- Gran, John M. Why Children Become Delinquent. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1961.
- Kohen, Albert K. Delinquent Boys. New York: Free Press, 1955.
- Kvaraceus, William C. The Community and the Delinquent. New York: World Book Company, 1954.
- _____; and Miller, W.B. Delinquent Behaviour. Washington: National Education Association, 1959.
- Londer, Bernard. Towards an Understanding of Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.
- Martin, John M.; and Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. Delinquent Behaviour. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Matza, David. Delinquency and Drift. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Mays, John Barron. On The Treshold of Delinquency. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1959.
- McClellan, Grant C. Juvenile Delinquency. New York: H. H. Wilson Company (The Reference Library), 1956.

- McGrath, W.T. Youth and the Law. Toronto:
W.J. Gage and Co., 1964.
- Merrill, Maud A. Problems of Child Delinquency.
New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947.
- Mihanovich, Clement S. Principles of Juvenile
Delinquency. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing
Company, 1950.
- Miller, Haskell M. Understanding and Preventing
Juvenile Delinquency. New York:
Abingdon Press, 1958.
- Neumeier, Martin H. Juvenile Delinquency in Modern
Society. New York: D. Van Nostrand Com-
pany, 1949.
- Reckless, Walter C.; and Smith, Marpheus. Juvenile
Delinquency. New York: McGraw-Hill Book
Company, 1932.
- Roul, Tenley. Kids, Crime, and Chaos. New York:
Harper and Row Co., 1962.
- Rubin, Sol. Crime and Juvenile Delinquency. New
York: Oceana Publications Incorporated,
1961.
- Scudder, Kenyon J.; and Beam, Kenneth S. The Twenty
Billion Dollar Challenge. New York: G. P.
Putnam and Sons, 1961.
- Shaw, Clifford R.; and McKay, Henry D. Juvenile
Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- Shulman, Harry Manuel. Juvenile Delinquency in
America Today. New York: Harper and
Brothers, 1961.
- Slawson, S.R. Re-Educating the Delinquent. New
York: Collier Books, 1961.

- Spiegel, Irving. Racketville, Slumtown, Haulburg.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Steiner, Leck. Understanding Juvenile Delinquency.
New York: Chilton Company, 1960.
- Sterne, Richard S. Delinquent Conduct and Broken Homes. New Haven: College and University Press, 1964.
- Tappan, Paul W. Crime, Justice, and Correction.
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- _____. Juvenile Delinquency. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1949.
- Teeters, Negley K.; and Rheinemann, John Otto. The Challenge of Delinquency. New York: Prentice-Hall Incorporated, 1950.
- Wilson, Harriet. Delinquency and Child Neglect.
London: George Allen and Unwin Limited, 1962.
- Vedder, Clyde B. The Juvenile Offender. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1954.
- Young, Pauline V. Social Treatment in Probation and Delinquency. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1952.