

Abstracts

TRAITS, FACTORS AND DELINQUENCY

by

Joseph Edward Kiley

This study investigates the influence on behavior of a specific personality trait and two family environmental factors. The personality trait and environmental factors studied were hostility, discipline and rearing by parent substitutes. In this study the trait hostility was combined with each factor separately. The influence on behavior of that particular trait-factor relationship was then determined.

The data source was the records of 223 delinquent boys who were on probation to the Department of Public Welfare, Halifax. By the use of a random sample, 49 cases were the actual data source. The data gathered included whether the child was reared by his own parents or parent substitutes, the quality of discipline received by the delinquent and whether the boy exhibited evidence of hostility. The test applied to the data gathered was Chi Square.

It was found that non-recidivist delinquents had a higher frequency of suitable discipline and exhibited less hostility than their recidivist counterparts. The study indicated that certain traits and factors do influence behavior in such a manner as to render it criminogenic. It was concluded that prediction tables could be developed utilizing the traits and factors that most influence behavior.

For the second hypothesis no significant difference was found in the incidence of hostility among delinquents reared by their own parents and those reared by parent substitutes. However, it is interesting to note that out of the sample of 49, thirteen delinquents were reared by parent substitutes.

Saint Mary's University Library

Degree of Master of Social Work

Maritime School of Social Work

St. Mary's University

Halifax, 1967

TRAITS, FACTORS AND DELINQUENCY

A Study of Personality Traits and Environmental
Factors Influencing Behavior of Delinquent
Boys Residing in the Halifax-Dartmouth
Area, N. S.

A Thesis

Submitted to the

MARITIME SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

and

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements of a
Master's Degree in Social Work

by

Joseph Edward Kiley

Halifax, Nova Scotia

May, 1967

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere thanks to Professor L. T. Hancock, Director of the Maritime School of Social Work for permission to write this thesis; to Mr. Daniel O'Brien, Thesis Adviser for his assistance during the writing and revising of the thesis; and to Professor A. C. Ashby, Director of Research for his direction and encouragement throughout the project.

Appreciation is also extended to Mr. Dick, Director of the Department of Public Welfare, Halifax, for making the records of his agency available for study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THEORIES, HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY	7
III. TRAITS AND FACTORS	36
IV. STUDY FINDINGS	53
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	69
 APPENDIX	 78
BIBLIOGRAPHY	85

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
<p>I. Distribution of 49 Delinquent Boys taken from Department of Public Welfare Files, active as of November, 1965, by hostility, lack of hostility, and recidivism - non-recidivism</p>	61
<p>II. Distribution of 49 Delinquent Boys taken from Department of Public Welfare Files, active as of November, 1965, according to quality of family discipline</p>	62
<p>III. Distribution of 49 Male Delinquents taken from Department of Public Welfare Files, active as of November, 1965, by rearing by natural parents and by parent substitutes.. . . .</p>	63
<p>IV. Distribution of 49 Delinquent Boys taken from Department of Public Welfare Files, active as of November, 1965, in four combinations of quality of discipline and presence of hostility . . .</p>	64
<p>V. Distribution of 49 Delinquent Boys taken from Department of Public Welfare Files, active as of November, 1965, in four combinations of rearing by parent substitutes and presence of hostility</p>	66

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many forms of illegal behavior represent serious threats to the individual and the community. As society is concerned with crime, it is constantly seeking an explanation of the causative factors which produce the divergent behavior.

Theorists over the past two hundred years have made many diversified attempts to explain the phenomenon of delinquency. Each theorist reflects his cultural epoch and perhaps even his particular personality. However, the focus has gradually shifted from an early explanation that crime was due to innate depravity and the instigation of the devil, to the more contemporary approach which attempts to explain criminality in terms of causative factors related to the personality and the environment.

It is the purpose of this study to deal with certain aspects of the theoretical explanation for the occurrence of delinquency.

In any research endeavour in the field of juvenile delinquency, one of the first problems which must be dealt with is to decide upon an exact definition of the term "juvenile delinquency".

As the data for the research came from the files of the Probation Department of the Department of Public Welfare, the same criterion of delinquency was used as was used by the court to adjudicate the offenders. In the Province of Nova Scotia the Statutes of Canada are used for this purpose.

Delinquency is defined in the Statutes as follows:

2. (1) In this Act
 - (a) child means any boy or girl apparently or actually under the age of sixteen years, or such other age as may be directed in any province pursuant to sub-section (2); 1/
 - (h) "juvenile delinquent" means any child who violates any provisions of the Criminal Code of any Dominion or provincial statute, or of any by-law or ordinance of any municipality, or who 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 provisions of any Dominion or provincial statute; 2/
3. (1) The commission by a child of any of the acts enumerated in paragraph (h) of sub-section (1) of section 2, constitutes an offence to be known as a delinquency. 3/

As has been already stated there are many explanations of crime and delinquency. Research which utilizes the multi-factor approach has been gaining considerable attention. This type of examination is eclectic and considers various causal factors. The Gluecks typify and are among the most published proponents of this school or approach. Their research was used as a theoretical

1/ "Juvenile Delinquent Act", THE REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA: 1952 Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1952; Vol. III, C. 160; p. 3507

2/ Ibid.; section 2 (1) (h); p. 3508

3/ Ibid.; section 3 (1); p. 3509

base for this study. A multi-factor approach considers personality traits and attributes, specific environmental factors, and combinations of such traits and factors.

It was believed in this study that an eclectic, multi-causal approach, would offer the best understanding and produce the most significant results. The implications of the Gluecks' investigations ^{1/} were used as the theoretical base for this study. The Gluecks have proposed certain empirical generalizations: that certain psychological traits and specific factors in the environment occur more frequently among delinquents than non-delinquents, that the traits and factors work in various combinations to influence behavior in such a manner that it becomes deviant.

If the relationship between trait, factor, and delinquency, can be more clearly elucidated, then more realistic efforts can be made in regard to prevention.

This particular study was undertaken for the purposes of increasing the writer's understanding of research and statistical procedures. The project was also seen as a means of helping the student gain knowledge in the field of juvenile delinquency.

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1950, and

Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1962

The problem of delinquency has gained a great deal of prominence. The writer's interest in investigating this topic could result in information which might be of use to those practitioners who deal with the delinquent.

The study was also undertaken as an individual thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a Master's Degree in Social Work. The investigator is a second year student at the Maritime School of Social Work for the school year 1965-1966.

The trait selected for study in this research was hostility. The two factors chosen were "quality of discipline" and "rearing by parent substitutes". It was believed that the above mentioned trait and factors would be representative of the total number of traits and factors enumerated by the Gluecks. Two hypotheses were derived incorporating the above trait and two factors. The two hypotheses were: (1) if the quality of parental discipline and the presence of hostility in a child are related to the incidence of juvenile delinquency, then unsuitable discipline and hostility will be more frequent in recidivists than non-recidivists; and (2) if rearing by a parent substitute contributes to the presence of hostility in a child which operates to render behavior criminogenic, then there should be a higher incidence of hostility in delinquents reared by parent substitutes than in delinquents reared by their natural parents.

As no control group was used, the sample of 49 cases used to test the hypotheses was broken down into recidivist and non-recidivist for purposes of comparison and statistical analysis.

The study was carried out in conjunction with seven other second year students at the Maritime School of Social Work. The seven other students were investigating various aspects of juvenile delinquency.

The data for the study were collected at the Department of Public Welfare in Halifax on schedules drawn up by the group for the purposes of their studies.

Appendix A shows the schedule used in the collection of data. Questions, 15, 21, and 43, on the schedule are pertinent to this particular study.

The data were collected from 49 cases randomly chosen from a total sample of 223. The cases were all active at the time the data were collected.

The statistical test used to analyse the data and test the hypothesis was chi square. Chi square was applied to the first hypothesis and the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of significance. The procedures followed in statistical testing of the hypotheses are outlined in detail in the text.

The findings and conclusions of this study are not presented as final and conclusive regarding the relationship to

delinquency of the trait and factors under examination. However, the findings do indicate that there is a significant difference, in one instance, between the two groups under study in relation to the trait and two factors considered.

CHAPTER II

THEORIES, HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY

Practically all societies look upon crime as a critical phenomenon no matter how infrequently by definition it occurs. It usually involves some harm or injury to others and threatens to interrupt the smooth operation of the social and political order. It is not surprising then that from many viewpoints crime is considered a major social problem.

As Walter C. Reckless writes in *THE CRIME PROBLEM*:

... Crime, or violation of Code, is one of the oldest problems of society. Society's concern about crime, which in a very real sense makes crime a social problem, is likewise among its oldest and most persistent concerns. ^{1/}

When society's codes are broken, whether they be legal or normative codes, it signifies disorganization and threatens the social order. If society cannot exercise a control over crime, disorganization is likely to appear and chaos ensues. Society then, has valid reason to be concerned with crime. ^{1/}

Our present day society is so constructed that its

^{1/} Walter C. Reckless, *THE CRIME PROBLEM*; Appleton-Century, Crofts, Inc., New York, 1950; p. 1

members have become ever more interdependent and, therefore, conforming behavior is a necessary and integral part of living. Because of society's interdependency an individual functions on the supposition that his fellow man will carry out his activities within a common sanctioned set of norms and expectations. When individuals no longer conform to norms and sanctions and, operate in a deviant manner, the behavior is dysfunctional and becomes a serious threat to societal living.

When reference is made to crime and criminals, the connotation usually suggests that the violating act was executed by an adult. However, children too, infringe upon society's legal codes. Behavior by children which violates legal codes is called delinquency and in many ways is similar to adult forms of crime. ^{1/}

The juvenile delinquent is considered by some to be a "junior criminal", by others something other than criminal. However, the important thing is that it is generally agreed that the crucial factor is that delinquency constitutes deviance from the norm and is thus a threat to the social order.

One might assume that the increasing concern about juvenile delinquency is a result of the high valuation Western

^{1/} Walter C. Reckless, op.cit.; p. 191

Society has placed on youth in the 20th century. However, as the following quotation (attributed to Socrates in the fifth century) will attest, the problems of youth have been a concern to society throughout all ages.

The children now love luxury. They have bad manners, contempt for authority, they show disrespect for elders, love chatter in place of exercise. They no longer rise when their elders enter the room. They contradict their parents, chatter before company, gobble up dainties at the table, cross their legs, and tyrannize their teachers. ^{1/}

It would seem that delinquent behavior is not characteristic of a specific age span. Rather this problem becomes identified with whatever preparatory age level a given society conceives as transitional to adulthood. Thus, as Ruth Benedict writes, "the problems of adolescence are fundamentally problems of a sociological rather than a physiological character". ^{2/} With the advent of modern industrialism and the growth of urbanism, the social problems of adolescence have merged with the tensions induced by physiological growth.

In the relevant literature, various theoretical explanations are suggested to explain delinquency. A few of the more

^{1/} (as quoted by) Herbert A. Bloch & Gilbert Geis, *MAN, CRIME, AND SOCIETY*: Random House, New York, 1965; p. 407

^{2/} Ruth Benedict, *PATTERNS OF CULTURE*: p. 23, as quoted by Bloch & Geis, *op.cit.*; p. 408

important contributors to the theoretical knowledge are Cohen 1/ Sutherland, 2/ Glueck, 3/ Reckless, 4/ Nye, 5/ and Eysenck. 6/

The writings of these authors, as well as others, will be examined in the light of their contributions to an understanding of delinquency later in this chapter.

Before dealing with the works of the above named authors the "Cambridge-Somerville project" will be examined. This well known study was more of a test of an empirical generalization rather than a theoretical explanation of deviant behavior. In 1935, the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study 7/ began. Authorities

-
- 1/ Albert Cohen, DELINQUENT BOYS: THE CULTURE OF THE GANG; The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill. 1955
 - 2/ Edwin Sutherland, PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINOLOGY; J. B. Lippincott, Philidelphia, 1960; (Rev. ed.)
 - 3/ Sheldon Glueck & Eleanor Glueck, UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1950
 - 4/ Walter C. Reckless, op.cit.
 - 5/ F. Ivan Nye, FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR; John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1958
 - 6/ H. J. Eysenck, CRIME AND PERSONALITY, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1964
 - 7/ William & Joan McCord and Irving Zola, ORIGINS OF CRIME; Columbia University Press, New York, 1959; p.1

in the field of delinquency thought that it would prove to be the most progressive experiment in many years. The study involved a comprehensive experimental attempt to determine if a certain form of treatment such as friendship and understanding would deter delinquency. This kind of approach was based on the opinion that the development of delinquency could be prevented early in life if only the potentially maladjusted child had an opportunity to form a friendly, understanding relationship with another person.

The treatment fell short of validating the original hypothesis that a sustained, friendly relationship would prevent delinquency. A close relationship depended on frequent contact, but worker turnover and heavy caseloads prevented the establishment of close bonds. The out-break of the Second World War decimated the staff and a large number of boys under study joined the armed forces and these factors combined to bring about an early conclusion to the study. The results of this approach, therefore, were unclear and inconclusive.

In the thirties, the Gluecks ^{1/} began publishing the results of their research into the causes of delinquency. Their

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, 500 CRIMINAL CAREERS;
Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1950

early work centered around the effectiveness of various types of peno-correctional treatments. The Gluecks have continued to study and write in the field of delinquency; one of their latest publications appeared in 1964. ^{1/} Interestingly, their study emphasis has shifted to a study of causation with a view to formulating an effective preventive program.

^{1/} Neumeyer believes that although juvenile delinquency is not a new nor recent problem, it has in recent years received increasing attention. ^{2/} As crime trends show, it has become a serious social problem. ^{3/} It is a complex, many sided subject with diverse causes and far-reaching consequences. Juvenile delinquency does not exist alone as a problem, but appears related to personality maladjustments, environmental factors and various aspects of disorganization in society. /

Before this study proceeds further it would seem appropriate to define the term "delinquency". The term "juvenile delinquent" appears to be an ambiguous one as indicated by the variety of definitions which exist. Literally, any child who violates the law regardless of how minor the act may be, can be a delinquent child.

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, VENTURES IN CRIMINOLOGY; Rutledge & Kegan Paul, London; 1964

^{2/} Martin H. Neumeyer, JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN MODERN SOCIETY; Van Nostrand Co., Inc. New York, 1949

^{3/} Ibid.; p. 3

Kvaraceus offers this description of the delinquent:
"... he is a youngster who habitually resolves his personal-social problems through overt behavior this delinquency-aggression is purposive and adjustive; from the point of view of society, it constitutes an irritating mal-adaptation." ^{1/} Neumeyer believes that, "in a broad sense, juvenile delinquency has reference to anti-social acts of children and young people under adult age." ^{2/} These definitions may well serve a useful purpose for the social worker or therapist involved with delinquents. However, they are not usually the definitions used by the courts or ascribed to the phenomenon of delinquency by the community as a whole. These are, in fact, not legal definitions.

The Gluecks state that delinquency refers to behavior which, if resorted to by persons beyond the juvenile court age, would be punishable as crime. ^{3/}

This definition of delinquency is more legally orientated. For the purpose of this study a legal definition

^{1/} William C. Kvaraceus, THE COMMUNITY AND THE DELINQUENT; World Book Co., New York, 1954; p. 57

^{2/} Neumeyer, op.cit.; p. 16

^{3/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; op.cit., p. 13

of delinquency was used. 1/

There have been many explanations of delinquency which attempt to specify why the individual deviates from society's norms and resorts to acting-out behavior. Dale S. Hardman 2/ has classified the different causational theories under three general groupings: biological; psychological; and sociological.

The biological school believed that the offender is born as such and that characteristics, genetically determined, predispose him to criminal behavior. The most widely known exponent of this group was Lombroso who believed that the criminal represented retrogression to a more primitive type of creature and could be identified by certain physical characteristics. Lombroso's theory was tested by Charles Goring who reached the conclusion that there was no such thing as a physical criminal type. 3/

A later exponent of the constitutional or biological approach was Kretschmer. 4/ As a result of his investigation

1/ c.f.; p. 2 above

2/ Dale S. Hardman, "The Case For Eclecticism", in CRIME AND DELINQUENCY; National Council on Crime and Delinquency; vol. 10. n.3 pp. 202-211

3/ W.C. Reckless, op.cit.; p. 235

4/ E. Kretschmer, PHYSIQUE AND CHARACTER, trans. W.S.H. Sprott; Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1925; p. 21

impoc

he was impressed by the fact that certain persons who tended toward deviant behavior displayed particular types of body build.

The basic types of body build in the Kretschmerian scheme are: the asthenic, a classification of long slender body structure; athletic, body structure in which there is well balanced proportion between limb and trunk; pyknic, a classification characterized by large body cavities, considerable subcutaneous fat and general roundness of contour; and certain mixed and unclassifiable types.

As Reckless writes, the effort to associate body types with deviant behavior and unreformability of the offender, (as Kretschmer tried to do,) could not stand the test of objective measurement. ^{1/}

Sheldon ^{2/} expanded the concept of body build as related to behavior by linking physique with physical disease, temperament, psychopathy and delinquency. Sheldon's classification of physical constitution or physique is made up of three components possessed by every individual in various combinations. The three components are endomorphy, mesomorphy, and ectomorphy.

^{1/} W. C. Reckless, op. cit., p. 25

^{2/} William H. Sheldon, VARIETIES OF DELINQUENT YOUTH: AN INTRODUCTION TO CONSTITUTIONAL PSYCHIATRY: Harper Bros., New York, 1949

Mesomorphy means relative predominance of muscle, bone, and connective tissue; whereas endomorphy indicates relative predominance of soft roundness throughout the various regions of the body; and, ectomorphy is defined as relative predominance of linearity and fragility. ^{1/} Sheldon found that the delinquent's parents exhibited much the same patterns of deviant behavior as was shown by their delinquent children. ^{2/}

The constitutional approach, however, can be criticized because it does not explain why so many conventional children with similar physiques and temperament do not become delinquent. It is also conceivable that what this approach imputes to constitutional factors may be the result of environmental stimulus or expectations.

The Gluecks, in their early investigations of delinquent and non-delinquent boys, found that mesomorphs "apparently have a higher delinquency potential than other body types". ^{3/} However, the Gluecks attempted to associate psychological traits and environmental factors with specific types of body builds rather than associating delinquency with only body build without considering traits and environmental factors.

The psychological or psychogenic theorists believe

^{1/} William H. Sheldon, THE VARIETIES OF HUMAN PHYSIQUE, Harper Bros., New York, 1940; pp. 5-6

^{2/} William H. Sheldon, op. cit.; p. 771

^{3/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, PHYSIQUE AND DELINQUENCY; Harper Bros., New York, 1956, p. 219

that the inner tensions and emotions, unresolved conflicts, and unsatisfied needs of the individual underlie anti-social behavior. A central figure in this group was W.F. Healy. ^{1/} He believed that delinquency stems from emotional deprivation in childhood. However, Healy's methods of testing were somewhat subjective and errors were detected. ^{2/}

One Neo-Freudian who studied delinquency and should be considered, was August Aichhorn. ^{3/} Aichhorn's application of Freudian theory to delinquent behavior was made during the post World War I era. In WAYWARD YOUTH, Aichhorn states that delinquency is more than anti-social behavior and has characteristics of a neurotic symptom. ^{4/} Aichhorn subscribes to the Freudian concept of the "pleasure principle" and likens the delinquent to a child who is unable to forego immediate pleasure for later satisfaction. ^{5/} He identifies three types of parental up-bringing which can cause delinquency:

^{1/} William Healy & Augusta F. Bronner, NEW LIGHT ON DELINQUENCY AND ITS TREATMENT; Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1936

^{2/} Dale S. Hardman, op. cit.; p. 205

^{3/} August Aichhorn, WAYWARD YOUTH; The Viking Press, Inc., New York, 1936

^{4/} August Aichhorn, op. cit.; p. 35

^{5/} Ibid.; p. 190

excess of love; excess of severity; and an alternation of the two. 1/

Two later followers of Aichhorn who used psycho-analytical concepts to explain delinquency were Kate Friedlander 2/ and Fritz Redl. 3/ Friedlander basically believed that it was character formation which determines whether a person reacts with delinquent behavior to inner or outer stress. 4/ Redl believes that the delinquent suffers from ego disturbance that is developed in childhood and results in a "delinquent ego", which leaves the delinquent guilt-free and anxiety-free to follow his delinquent impulses. 5/

Another theoretical approach has been that based on sociological thinking. An important contributor in relating delinquency to gangs was Frederic M. Thrasher. 6/ He pioneered

1/ August Aichhorn, op. cit.; p. 35

2/ Kate Friedlander, THE PSYCHO-ANALYTICAL APPROACH TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; International Universities Press, Inc., New York 1947

3/ Fritz Redl and David Wineman, CHILDREN WHO HATE; The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1951

4/ Kate Friedlander, op. cit.; p. 205

5/ Fritz Redl and David Wineman, op. cit.; pp. 142-144

6/ Frederic M. Thrasher, THE GANG: A STUDY OF 1,313 GANGS IN CHICAGO; The University of Chic. Press, Chicago, Ill., 1927 abridged vol. 1963

in applying a scientific approach to the examination of various aspects of the delinquent gang in the interstitial or transitional neighbourhoods of the large city. His work examined the gang from the view point of the needs it met for its members. Thrasher believed that the particular needs of the gang members were created by the deteriorating neighbourhoods and immigrant families. ^{1/}

Shaw and McKay ^{2/} utilized an ecological approach in studying the problem of delinquency. They used findings gathered through twenty years study to show a relationship between the prevalence of delinquency and slum areas of large cities. They point out the relatively low incidence of delinquency in residential communities of higher economic status. As a result of their findings, they attempted to relate the incidence of juvenile delinquency to the pattern of the physical structure and the social organisation of the American city. ^{3/}

Whyte ^{4/} published his work about the same time as

^{1/} Frederic M. Thrasher, op. cit.; Chapter XII, pp. 179-182

^{2/} Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay, JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND URBAN AREAS; The Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1942

^{3/} Ibid.; p. 134

^{4/} William F. Whyte, STREET CORNER SOCIETY; University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1943

Shaw and McKay. His study was carried out in a particular slum area of Chicago. The delinquents in the slum were predominantly of Italian ethnic origin. Whyte formulated hypotheses about the subcultural mores of the slum and how these subcultural influences contributed to the occurrence of delinquency. ^{1/} Whyte's work, while coming more than a decade later, was essentially in agreement with Thrasher's pioneering work.

Another important contributor to the scientific knowledge about delinquent subcultures was Albert K. Cohen. ^{2/} Cohen's theory blends psychogenic factors with the subcultures to produce a single causal process. Essentially Cohen's contribution was his explanation of how the individual's psychogenic needs are met through the function of the subcultural gang. ^{3/}

A notable individual of the sociological group is Edwin Sutherland. ^{4/} His work is referred to in most elementary texts on delinquency. Sutherland's theory is generally referred to as the "theory of differential association" and leads to

^{1/} William F. Whyte, op. cit.; pp. 255-276

^{2/} Albert K. Cohen, DELINQUENT BOYS: THE CULTURE OF THE GANG; The Free Press of Glencoe, Chicago, Ill., 1955

^{3/} Ibid.; p. 17

^{4/} Edwin H. Sutherland, PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINOLOGY; J.B. Lippincott Co., New York, sixth ed., 1955

nine hypotheses. Because of the prominence attached to Sutherland's theory the major hypotheses are quoted below:

- (1) Criminal behavior is learned;
- (2) in interacting with other persons;
- (3) especially in intimate personal groups;
- (4) the learning consists of techniques of committing crimes as well as attitudes, rationalizations, motives and drives;
- (5) the favorable or unfavorable direction of motives or drives is learned from the way surrounding persons (probably key persons in one's world) define the importance or unimportance of obeying legal norms;
- (6) "a person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definition favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law" (this is a statement of differential association);
- (7) associations with criminal or with anti-criminal behavior vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity of contacts;
- (8) learning criminal behavior in association is the same as learning any other kind of behavior;
- (9) criminal behavior is not explainable by general needs and values, because noncriminal behavior is also an expression of the same general needs and values. 1/

Sutherland's theory has been criticized by Glueck 2/ and Reckless, 3/ as well as by others. 4/ The principle difficulty with Sutherland's theory is that it is extremely difficult to

1/ Edwin H. Sutherland, op. cit.; pp. 77-79

2/ Sheldon Glueck, "Theory and Fact in Criminology", THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF DELINQUENCY; Bailcare Tendall & Cox Ltd., Act 1956, V. VII, No. 2; pp. 92-109

3/ Walter C. Reckless, op. cit.; p. 311

4/ James F. Short, Jr., "Differential Association with Delinquent Friends and Delinquent Behavior", PACIFIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW; V. 1, No. 1; 1958; pp. 21-32

test, does not explain the origin of crime, nor does it explain crime by offenders who have had no previous contacts with criminals or delinquents.

Kvaraceus ^{1/} views delinquency as mainly a lower class phenomenon. According to Kvaraceus, the lower class culture contributes to delinquency of lower class youngsters. He maintains that certain cultural practices, which comprise essential elements of the total life pattern of lower class culture, automatically violate certain legal norms.

Cloward and Ohlin ^{2/} generally agree with Kvaraceus that lower class youngsters are unable to identify with middle class values and cannot achieve desired goals. Faced with limitations on accepted means of achieving goals, they choose non-conforming alternatives.

While there is merit in class determination of delinquency, it does not explain delinquency in rural areas or middle classes. This approach suggests that what is needed is a strong middle class as a reference group, or model for the lower class youngsters, and a doing away with the lower class.

^{1/} M.C. Kvaraceus, THE COMMUNITY AND THE DELINQUENT; World Book Co., New York, 1954

^{2/} R.A. Cloward & L.E. Ohlin, DELINQUENCY AND OPPORTUNITY; A THEORY OF DELINQUENT GANGS; The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1963

"An important result of modern empirical research has been the growth from single and simple to multiple causational theories". ^{1/} The multicausal approach has led to the search for, and the discovery of, new and additional relevant factors. The search has led to an awareness of the necessity of viewing the various factors in different ways. It vividly illustrates the complexity of the causative nature of delinquency and the interrelatedness of the numerous factors. ^{2/}

From the etiological point of view, delinquency is normal and is to be expected, in the sense that like all human behavior, it is purposive. The offender's behavior is the natural and inevitable result of all the factors that have influenced his growth. He reacts to stimuli in a way which he believes or feels, to be satisfactory in relation to his own needs.

Behavior is always an affair of stimulus and response between a human individual and some features of his environment: the form of misconduct we call delinquency is no exception. ^{3/}

As delinquent behavior is viewed as a reaction of the

^{1/} Paul W. Tappan, JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1949; p. 75

^{2/} Ibid.; pp. 74-77

^{3/} The White House Conference, op. cit.; p. 57

individual to his environment, the study of delinquency must lead to the environment in which the offender was reared. The concept of environment could include all the factors, real or potential, that influence an individual's behavior. However, the number of variables involved would be so many and their interaction so complex as to call for techniques which, if they have been developed, are beyond the level of functioning at which this study is being attempted. The more immediate environment of an individual would include the family, peer group, and subculture. Of these three, the family unit appears to be the most important environmental influence. ^{1/} It is within the family that the child's primary development takes place. It is there that the child's personality is most influenced. In the family he has developed, tested, and accepted what he feels to be appropriate responses to the various environmental stimuli.

The importance of other influences on a child's life cannot be discounted completely. But the family is an important and effective influence in formulating a child's attitudes, values and norms. It is extremely influential in developing his personality and all that this entails, including his perspective of

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; op. cit.,; p. 158

life around him. ^{1/}

F. Ivan Nye, ^{2/} who essentially writes about the family and its influence on the child, contends that the family is the unit which exercises the most important control over adolescents. ^{3/} In his investigations he found also that a high incidence of delinquent boys come from broken or unhappy homes and that the quality of discipline administered in the home often bears directly on the commission of a delinquency by a child. ^{4/}

This approach to delinquency assumes that any child placed in a given situation might become delinquent. Of course, it does not mean that every child placed in a particular environment would become delinquent. Such a statement discounts the importance of the psychological constellation of the individual who reacts with the environment.

Psychological theorists hold that the personality of the individual must also be considered as an important determinant of behavior. ^{5/} The individual's behavior, then, delinquent or

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

^{2/} F. Ivan Nye, op. cit.

^{3/} Ibid.; p. 51

^{4/} Ibid.; p. 90

^{5/} The White House Conference, op. cit.; p. 80

otherwise, may be the result of the way he, with his personality in relation to the environment, has had to act in order to satisfy his needs. ^{1/}

The underlying contention of the preceding paragraphs is that deviant behavior is the result of personality and socio-cultural or environmental factors. This study is based on the premise that sociologists and psychologists are both correct in believing that environment, and inner workings of the personality, are significant in deviant behavior.

A study of juvenile delinquency based on the premise as outlined above requires an approach which is more integrative than particularistic in view of the multiple causational principle believed to operate in delinquency. A causal approach is needed which considers both psychological traits in the individual and various factors in the environment. That is: "to ascertain the specific psychologic . . . traits and the specific factors in the environment which occur more among delinquents than non-delinquents". ^{2/}

It is necessary to determine the force of socio-cultural influences on the basic environmental circle (family) on the

^{1/} Hardman, op. cit.; pp. 202-211

^{2/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY: op. cit.; p. 3

development or stimulation of traits which are related to delinquency. The Gluecks in UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY have taken an integrative view of delinquency. They give consideration in their research to both psychological traits in the individual and social factors in his environment. This formulation was based on the Gluecks' hypothetical framework and considered both psychological traits in conjunction with environmental factors as determinants of deviant behavior. That is, that factors reflecting family environment and psychological traits in the personality, in combination, bear on delinquency.

The above statement does not discount the relevance of the sociological or psychological theories mentioned earlier. However, it is believed, that the best approach to determining the causes of deviant behavior is one which considers sociological factors and psychological traits in interaction.

At this point it would be pertinent to discuss some of the criticism that has been directed at the Gluecks. The Gluecks have been criticized on the grounds that their research is strictly empirical, carried out in a "shot gun" manner, and does not have any theoretical direction. What the critics fail to consider is the etiology of delinquency is multiple and varied, and that numerous "causes" participate to bring

about the end result of the variety of acts legally comprised under "delinquency". Delinquency should be examined in a manner which is not only adequate to explain it, but with a view to accumulating knowledge that can be utilized in treatment and prevention. The approach which considers both personality traits and environmental factors appears to be well suited to the above mentioned objectives.

The Gluecks maintain that their research is guided by a theoretical framework.

To say that this research was not guided by any theories simply because its directors did not include in the printed report a sentence or two spelling out such theories when they were perfectly obvious, is to indulge in a fallacy. ^{1/}

As this study is based on a psychological-sociological theoretical framework which utilizes the concepts of traits and factors, an explanation of these terms is warranted. The psychological part of the theory will be tested in terms of traits and the sociological in terms of factors.

English and English states that, "trait tends to be used only for differentiating characteristics. When broadly defined it includes many kinds of specific patterns - attitudes, virtues,

^{1/} Sheldon Glueck, THE PROBLEM OF DELINQUENCY; Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1959; p. 20

and even abilities and habits". 1/

The Gluecks in their writings say that the concept of traits is a general one and refers to psychological categories of personality such as qualities, drives, feelings, attitudes, and personality tendencies. They write that they have not attempted to be strictly technical in the use of the term and have employed trait in a general sense. 2/

For the purpose of this study traits refer to the elements of personality which motivate or influence the behavior of the individual. The Gluecks define the term trait as follows: "Traits referred to, are those which might be expected in common experience to facilitate or hamper the kinds of behavior subsumed under the legal term delinquency". 3/ Some general headings under which traits are grouped by the Gluecks are: attitudes to authority; feelings of insecurity and anxiety; hostility; and other personality qualities. 4/

The traits are not in themselves criminal, but unless

1/ Horace B. & Ava C. English, A COMPREHENSIVE DICTIONARY OF PSYCHOLOGICAL & PSYCHOANALYTICAL TERMS; David McKay Co., Inc., New York, 1958; p. 560

2/ Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; p. 9

3/ Ibid.; p. 14

4/ Ibid.; pp. 207-211

they find acceptable outlets, may in combination with an environmental stimulus (factor) lead to delinquent behavior. That is: it cannot be said that because an individual has feelings of hostility, he must in turn be criminal. But if these feelings of hostility cannot find a suitable outlet, such as through recreation, then in conjunction with a social factor, such as lax discipline, the need for suitable expression of this trait may lead to deviant behavior. Whereas the healthy personality may make use of coping behavior such as sublimation ^{1/} for handling hostility, and do this when the environment frowns on the overt expression of this trait. When discipline is lax (weak social control) the environmental controls are weakened and this allows for more overt and unacceptable expression of the trait.

The Gluecks' findings indicate that a preponderance of some traits, more than others, point to delinquency. However, this does not mean that there is no evidence of these traits in a healthy child. If a child has only one or two of these traits and there is parental affection and understanding he may never stray from accepted behavior. But if he has a combination

^{1/} Horace B. & Ava C. English, op. cit.; p. 533

of them together with neglectful, hostile or unconcerned parents, the total effect may well be that which would lead to delinquency.

The environmental factors referred to are those which are present in the immediate environment, the family. Factor, in this context, denotes a prevailing environmental condition or stimulus. There are other environmental factors which would probably be found to have an influence on behavior. For example, the attitudes of peer groups may be of significance as a factor in a child's behavior. However, it is the contention of this study that the factors located in the family unit are of the most importance.

Reckless and Dinitz ^{1/} in their investigations support the value of a "good home" in relation to preventing delinquency. They found a higher incidence of delinquency among boys who were reared in broken homes or homes which would not be considered cohesive or stable. There was a low incidence of delinquency among boys who were reared in homes where there appeared to be parental supervision, and parental interest in the welfare of the child. ^{2/}

^{1/} Walter C. Reckless & Simon Dinitz, "Self-Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency"; AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW; Vol. 21, No. 6, 1956

^{2/} Walter C. Reckless & Simon Dinitz; op. cit.; pp. 754-755

There are various types of relationships which are possible between social factors and personality traits. It is often difficult to discern whether the relationship is direct or indirect. ^{1/}

The Gluecks offer three possible paterings of interaction between factor and trait, any one of which is possible in a particular instance. The first reflects the more or less direct influence of the factor upon the trait. That is: the trait would not exist or would exist in a different form if the associated factor were not present. Hostility might not be present in a child if it were not for the presence of over-strict discipline by his parents (factor), or if it were present, but the factor was absent, it might remain suppressed or else find a suitable outlet.

The second pattern suggests that the trait and environmental factor are reciprocal in their influence. Given the trait of destructiveness, the factor of strict discipline will probably follow which in turn will enhance the trait.

A third pattern is that a pre-existent trait in a child serves as a stimulus to produce a more or less specific response

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; pp. 18-19

from the environment. The factor is associated with the trait because of the frequency with which the trait attracts the factor. ^{1/}

In the present study the purpose is to illustrate how a child's family environment and his personality traits may both be involved in contributing to his delinquency. An attempt was made to show that some socio-cultural factors contribute to the formation or enhancement of traits which are significantly associated with anti-social behavior tendencies in children. The attempt was also made to show that some social influences (factors) render criminogenic some traits which are normally neutral.

It is believed that some children who are characterized by certain traits, such as hostility, are particularly vulnerable to delinquent behavior. When these children are exposed to the influence of a particular environment, that environment in combination with the trait leads to criminal activity.

The contamination of the child depends not only on what he is exposed to, but how susceptible he is. "It is the concatenation in the particular individual of factor-trait and the interpenetration of these influences from divergent sources

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; pp. 18-20

that determines whether, at a certain point of pressure, resistance to anti-social expression will break down." 1/

For the purpose of this study it was necessary to conceptually divide the personality into some of its components or traits and to describe the influence of the family in terms of separate factors. This was done, however, only to facilitate the research. It is the whole personality of the child which reacts with the total influence of the family or home. There exists an inter-relatedness between all factors and traits which are present. In order to approach the causation of delinquency in a systematic manner, however, it is necessary to selectively isolate certain personality traits and environmental factors. There are factors outside the family which contribute to pressure on the child. This study, however, is concerned with the basic and most important influencing agent, the family. This is not to say for example, that a broken home leads directly to delinquency. But, because of a broken home, the situation may present difficulties which affect crucial inter-familial relationships and other important aspects of family life. "The family greatly affects the chances a child will have in satisfying his needs [It] is considered

1/ Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; p. 155

to be the single factor most important in exercising social control [over children]. 1/

1/ F. Ivan Nye, op. cit.; p. 9

CHAPTER III

TRAITS AND FACTORS

In the previous chapter it was stated that the theoretical base of this thesis was that which has been derived from the Gluecks' studies. To recapitulate briefly, it was the contention of this study that factors in the family environment in combination with traits in the child's personality operate together to contribute to the child's delinquency. It is believed that some influences (factors) in the home such as poor discipline contribute to the formation or enhancement of traits such as hostility, which are significantly associated with anti-social behavior tendencies.

The traits in themselves are not necessarily criminogenic; the traits may be found in non-delinquents as well as delinquents. But these traits, once formed, may react with environmental factors to produce deviant behavior. It was the purpose of this study to investigate whether particular personality traits and environmental factors in combination do contribute to delinquency.

The question may be asked whether the trait would be present or exist in a different form if the factor were absent; or whether the factor(s) which combines with a particular trait

to produce deviant behavior is the same factor which influenced the formation of the trait in the beginning. However, as explained in the previous chapter, the investigator cannot always be sure of the exact relationship between factor and trait. For example, it is questioned whether the trait is of such a nature as to evoke a certain response from the environment.

For the purposes of this study, it was contended that it is not a question of how the traits are formulated, but whether in fact, they do operate in conjunction with environmental factors to produce delinquent behavior. It was expected that the significance of the trait-factor combination would depend not on the source, but on their combined effect.

There are social factors outside the family environment which undoubtedly influence the individual's personality. Sutherland ^{1/} for example, emphasized the importance of gangs or peer groups. The family, however, is a primary group which has an early and important effect on the child. Burgess and Locke ^{2/} believe that family experience is the source of many

^{1/} Edwin H. Sutherland, op. cit.; pp. 78-79

^{2/} Ernest W. Burgess, et.al.; THE FAMILY; American Book Co., New York, 1945; pp. 213-225

basic human motivations, and therefore, must be considered of particular importance in the development of the personality traits. If the family is fundamental in the conditioning of the child, it would influence and guide the child's earliest behavior patterns.

The Gluecks ^{1/}state that the importance of the influence of family environmental factors, in conditioning personality traits, is evident. They believe that even certain personality characteristics which are regarded as essentially hereditary are conditioned and enhanced in the emotional area of the home. The present study, in recognition of this distinction, maintains that although environmental involvement is not always clear, it plays a dominant role in the shaping of personality.

In another study by the same authors ^{2/}, it was found that when the backgrounds of delinquents and non-delinquents were compared, certain characteristics and circumstances in the make-up and family environment of the juvenile offender bore a significant relationship to the variations in his behavior. It appears probable that the family can be considered the most

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; pp. 154-156

^{2/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, PREDICTING DELINQUENCY AND CRIME; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1960; p. 19

important influence on the individual in the formation of his personality traits.

It would also appear that the child needs an adequate and wholesome outlet for his drives. It is within the family constellation that these drives are first expressed. If there are factors in the family environment that frustrate the personality drives, it seems likely that the individual's behavior will tend toward rebellion rather than conformity.

The investigator, in attempting to penetrate the phenomenon of human behavior, must determine the combination of personality traits and environmental influences that play a significant role in producing deviant behavior. In FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY ^{1/} it was found that most of the 67 personality traits studied were more characteristic of delinquents than non-delinquents. It was also found that certain social factors act as a catalyst in rendering traits criminogenic. The above statements indicate that factors such as unsuitable discipline or rearing by parent substitutes must be considered when assessing formative influences on traits that become anti-social in expression.

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; pp. 225-258, 281-300

The Gluecks in UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, ^{1/} enumerated 67 personality traits which they believed might, in common experience, facilitate or hamper unacceptable behavior in boys. They also isolated 44 factors reflecting family environment which they believed might, in combination with these traits, produce delinquent behavior. In formulating the hypotheses for this study, the trait "hostility" was chosen to represent the traits. The social factors, "unsuitable discipline" and "rearing by parent substitutes" were chosen to represent the factors.

This was not to suggest that the single trait and two factors mentioned operate in combination to produce all deviant behavior. It was accepted in this study that a large number of traits and factors enumerated by the Gluecks do influence behavior in such a manner as to produce delinquent behavior. Certain combinations of traits and factors were assumed to produce delinquent behavior more often than others. It was decided, due to the limited time available for this study, to investigate two combinations of traits and factors. For the purpose of this study, if these two trait-factor combinations prove statistically significant in rendering behavior criminogenic, this will be taken as an acceptable test of the Gluecks' formulations.

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; op. cit.

A further explanation follows as to why hostility, discipline and rearing by parent substitutes were chosen to represent the various traits and factors listed by the Gluecks. In order to illustrate the importance of these particular factors and trait, a brief description of each is given below.

The "need for discipline extends all the way back to infancy and all the way forward to adulthood. There is no period within the formative years of a person's life when discipline is unnecessary". ^{1/} It is obvious that discipline is needed to channel behavior and point it in the right direction, to limit behavior and to bring it in line with the requirements of society.

The demands and requirements of society make discipline necessary. If the child does not learn to control his feelings and emotions he may grow up emotionally immature and behave in a manner contrary to that which is expected by society. More important than discipline per se is the quality of discipline received by the child. Although the purpose of discipline is, or should be, to enable the child to control his feelings, emotions, and to channel his behavior into an acceptable direction,

^{1/} Alex H. Schneiders, PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT AND ADJUSTMENT IN ADOLESCENCE; The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1960; p. 230

the end result may differ from what was intended. This can frequently be attributed to the particular quality of discipline received by the child in his home development.

In relation to discipline, the reaction of the child to the patterning of parental control and to the feeling implicit in that control is most important, as is the content of the discipline itself. ^{1/}

It is the contention of this study that authoritarian, inflexible, impersonal, lax or erratic disciplinary attitudes encourage rebellion and generate hostility in the individual; whereas firm but kindly discipline should better provide the child with the self-control necessary to avoid deviant behavior.

Farnsworth describes discipline in the following manner:

A permissive attitude balanced with firm discipline is the quickest route to responsibility and self-control, especially when discipline is applied with consistency, kindness and thoughtfulness. Authoritarian, inflexible, and impersonal attitudes perpetuate rebellion and hostility. ^{2/}

Rearing of a child by parent substitutes also appears to be an important factor in deviant behavior. In UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY ^{3/} it was found that 88% of the five hundred non-delinquents

^{1/} Paul W. Tappan, op. cit.; p. 137

^{2/} D. L. Farnsworth, MENTAL HEALTH IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY; Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press 1957; p. 207

^{3/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; pp. 124 ff..

tested had the normal experience of being reared continuously by both or one of their parents. By contrast, only 54% of the five hundred delinquents had the normal experience of being reared continuously by both or one of their parents. This demonstrates the greater emotional handicap that the delinquent must contend with in his growing years. The Gluecks found this reflected in the greater emotional immaturity of the delinquent in contrast to the maturity of the non-delinquent.

A warm relationship between child and parents would seem to be of significance in helping a boy develop a wholesome emotional attitude toward life and society. ^{1/} The fact that a child is reared by a parent substitute might indicate he comes from an unsuitable home and lacks the benefit of an adequate parent-child relationship, although this is not necessarily so.

Rearing by parent substitutes would seem to indicate that in many cases the child would grow up in a family atmosphere not conducive to the development of a socially well-adjusted personality.

The Gluecks' studies suggested that these crucial factors and trait operated in combination to generate certain

^{1/} Irene M. Josselyn, "The Family As a Psychological Unit", in SOCIAL CASEWORK IN THE FIFTIES; Family Service Association of America, New York, 1962; pp. 106-118

delinquent behavior.

A description of the two factors under study and an explanation of their importance in the development and behavior of a boy has been presented above. However, as already mentioned it is the contention of this study that factors operate in combination with a trait to render behavior deviant. The trait and its importance in delinquent behavior is outlined below.

The personality trait of hostility also seems to play an important part in delinquency. According to the Gluecks, hostility "refers to conscious or unconscious unfriendly impulses against others without good reason". ^{1/} The Gluecks' definition of hostility is essentially in agreement with the definitions of hostility found in English and English which are quoted in part below:

Hostility is a condition of enmity, more or less enduring, marked by angry feeling ... ^{2/}

Tendency to feel anger toward, and seek to inflict harm upon, a person or group ^{3/}

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; p. 46

^{2/} Horace B. and Ava C. English, op. cit.; p. 31

^{3/} Ibid.; p. 243

As stated by Schneiders, hostility indicates anger which arises out of frustration of needs and particularly fundamental needs, such as the need for an adequate emotional relationship with parents or the need for guidance and control. ^{1/}

"Hostility is expressed in aggression and this is the behavior we witness in various delinquent acts." ^{2/}

In UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, ^{3/} it was found that there was a greater proportion of hostility among delinquents than non-delinquents. It appears that certain environmental factors contribute to the development of hostility in a boy, which in turn, increases his potential for anti-social behavior. It was believed that some types of discipline and rearing by parent substitutes might be two factors that would generate or enhance hostility in a child and this combination would in turn, contribute to delinquency.

In order to test the above mentioned proposition two methods were considered. One test would be to compare the quality of discipline or rearing by parent substitutes and the presence of hostility in children who were delinquent with the quality of discipline or rearing by parent substitutes and the presence of hostility in children who were not delinquent. However, the

^{1/} Alexander H. Schneiders, PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT AND ADJUSTMENT IN ADOLESCENCE; Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1960; pp. 204-207

^{2/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; p. 209

^{3/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; p. 231

measure of data in this exact manner was not possible due to a self-imposed limit on the study. That is, the decision not to use a non-delinquent control group.

A second method of testing the propositions would be to examine quality of discipline, rearing by parent substitutes and hostility in a child in terms of recidivist and non-recidivist groups. This method is the one which was utilized in this thesis.

Essentially, a distinction can be made between recidivism and non-recidivism as being a difference in the severity of the delinquent's attitudes. This is because, generally, the recidivist group have committed a greater number of delinquent acts than have the non-recidivist group. This probably indicates a higher degree of consolidation of delinquent conduct. This rationale is consistent with what is predicated in the hypotheses of this study which are stated below.

Two hypotheses were formulated which incorporated the trait hostility and the two factors mentioned previously, that is, the quality of discipline, and rearing by parent substitutes.

If the quality of parental discipline and the presence of hostility in a child are related to the incidence of juvenile delinquency, then unsuitable discipline and hostility will be more frequent in recidivists than non-recidivists; and, (2) if rearing by a parent substitute contributes to the presence of hostility in a child which operates to render behavior criminogenic, then

there should be a higher incidence of hostility in delinquents reared by parent substitutes than in delinquents reared by their natural parents.

In order to test the hypotheses, specific data were examined. The data were gathered from 49 files which represented a random sample taken from a total of 243 active cases at the Regional Office of the Department of Public Welfare in Halifax. In drawing the random sample a table of random numbers was used to prevent any bias in the selection of files. The data were collected from the files by means of a schedule. The schedule was developed by eight students at the Maritime School of Social Work who were studying various aspects of juvenile delinquency. The general areas of juvenile delinquency that the other students were studying included:

- (1) parental deprivation
- (2) maternal deprivation
- (3) anomie
- (4) social disorganization
- (5) family cohesiveness
- (6) criminal pattern in the family
- (7) "containment" theory

The questions on the schedule which pertain to this study

were numbers 15, 21, and 43. 1/ The purpose of question 21 was to determine the quality of the discipline administered the child. This data could be compiled under four categories of discipline which were as follows:

- (a) If parents were negligent, indifferent, or allowed child to do as he liked, this type of discipline was considered "lax".
- (b) If parents were harsh, unreasoning, demanding obedience through fear, this type of discipline was considered "overstrict".
- (c) If parents vacillated between strictness and laxity, and were not consistent in control, this type of discipline was considered "erratic".
- (d) If discipline was based on sound reason which the child understood and accepted as fair, this type of discipline was considered "firm but kindly".

The above criteria which were used to determine the level or type of discipline received by the child were adapted from the Gluecks' criteria for assessing parental discipline. 2/

1/ Appendix A., p. 78

2/ Eleanor T. Glueck, "Toward Improving the Identification of Delinquents"; JOURNAL OF CRIME, DELINQUENCY, AND POLICE SCIENCE; Vol. 52, 1962, pp. 164-170

Data pertinent to question 15 were collected to determine if the child was reared by parent substitutes. If the child was reared by step-parent, foster parent or relative, but not a person with whom child spends only brief periods away from his own parents (parent), the child was considered "reared by parent substitutes." The criteria for determining if a child was reared by parent substitutes were also adopted from the Gluecks' criteria for determining this factor. ^{1/}

Question 43 pertains to the presence of hostility in a child. If a child exhibited conscious or unconscious impulses against others without good reason, or showed a tendency to hurt, he was considered to be "hostile". The criteria for determining the presence of hostility in a child were adopted from the Gluecks' description of that personality trait. ^{2/}

Two of the questions, 21 and 43, involve analysis by value judgements. However, to mitigate against unwarranted value judgements, the file analysts were instructed as to the specific criteria as outlined by the Gluecks for determining the quality of discipline and presence of hostility. ^{3/} Additionally, it was decided to cross check almost one third of the files

^{1/} Eleanor T. Glueck, op. cit.; pp. 164-170

^{2/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; p. 209

^{3/} Eleanor T. Glueck, op. cit.; pp. 164-170

for consistency of the analysts' judgements in using the Gluecks' criteria. The method of cross checking was to have several judges repeat the process of collecting data from fifteen files and comparing the data collected with the data gathered in the first examination.

Cross checking indicated that the subjective judgements were valid in almost ninety percent of the cases. Therefore, it was believed that the differences encountered in the value judgements would have little effect on the validity of the data gathered.

As is indicated above, in any research undertaking there are certain limitations and biases which are inherent in the study itself; in addition there are the self-imposed limits.

The records which were used in this study were drawn up primarily for clinical purposes, not strictly for research purposes. It is not intended to suggest that the records were not useful and adequate for research purposes. However, due to this fact, data was occasionally available only implicitly rather than explicitly. There was also the question of the more subtle and difficult to discern implications raised by the fact that probation workers recorded their subjective analysis of the delinquent and his situation. This is something that most clinicians may be guilty

of due to the fact that social work involves value judgements. However, it is a matter of degree, and does not operate to such an extent as to mitigate seriously against the validity of the research. It does, however, introduce a bias which should be noted.

Only records of delinquent boys in the Halifax-Dartmouth Metropolitan area were used for this study and this can be considered a limit placed on the study as it does not include boys from the rural areas. The random sample used was small and this, understandably, further limits the study's reliability.

Some boys who come before the courts are reprimanded while others are placed on probation by the juvenile court judge. The disposition of the judge may reflect a bias which would be a limitation of this study. The effects of this possible bias are speculative, but it should be acknowledged.

As mentioned previously, this study considers two factors and one trait, while the Gluecks enumerated 44 factors and 67 traits. The choice of one trait and two factors was a self-imposed limit which was related to the time limitation. To study and statistically analyse 67 traits and 44 factors would not only be time consuming, but involve research techniques which would be beyond the scope of this investigation.

The study itself considered only male delinquents.

The theory upon which this study is based did not consider female offenders. Offences committed by females are usually of a different nature than those committed by male delinquents. The type of offence committed by female delinquents is often more against themselves than society. It was concluded that the theory upon which this study is based would not adequately explain female behavior. An investigation of causes of female delinquency would be another research undertaking that would perhaps be worth doing, but is not within the scope of the present investigation.

The restrictive selection of two social factors and one personality trait was made largely on the basis that these were believed to be representative of a large number of the total aggregation of factors and traits. Moreover, it was discovered that there was considerable reference made in the literature to the importance of these in determining a differential type of social behavior. However, in the same way, the other traits and factors listed by the Gluecks would be the subject of parallel investigations. Others might also wish to study the relationship between traits, factors and deviant behavior.

To test the hypotheses under study, appropriate statistical tests were used. The results will be outlined in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV.

STUDY FINDINGS

The population study for this thesis consisted of 223 active delinquent files of the Halifax Regional Office, Department of Public Welfare as of November 10, 1965. From this population a random sample of 49 cases were selected for study. The random sample was determined by assigning each of the 223 cases in the population with a number. A random table of numbers was then used to select the 49 cases in the sample. The 49 cases considered were all male delinquents from the Halifax-Dartmouth metropolitan area. In order to obtain the information necessary for this study schedules were devised to gather the data from the files. ^{1/}

For the purpose of comparison and statistical testing of the hypotheses the 49 cases were divided into two groups. The cases were divided into recidivist and non-recidivist groups. This distinction was made in order to determine the effect of the trait and factors under examination on two different groups. It was assumed that if factors in the environment and personality traits bear a relationship to the amount of delinquency committed, then the recidivist group should show more signs indicative of

^{1/} Appendix A

poorer quality of discipline or rearing by parent substitutes, and hostility, than the non-recidivist group.

Group I contained all the delinquents who were termed recidivist, that is had more than one court appearance. There were 26 delinquents in Group I. Group II contained all the delinquents who were termed non-recidivist, that is had made only one court appearance. There were 23 delinquents in this group.

Questions 15, 21 and 43 on the schedule apply to this study. Tables I, II and III illustrate the data obtained from each question. Question 21 which deals with the quality of discipline received by the delinquent offers several choices. Ferguson ^{1/} says that with certain types of data it is permissible and common practice to combine frequencies. In order to apply the Chi Square 2 x 2 test to the data, this became necessary. Category I was considered, therefore, to be suitable discipline and included the data which indicated that discipline was firm, or kindly or consistent. All other indicators were interpreted to indicate that the discipline was unsuitable.

As can be readily observed, the schedule provided

^{1/} George A. Ferguson, STATISTICAL ANALYSIS IN PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION; McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., New York 1959

for both explicit and implicit answers to the questions. An original intention was, that in order to get a more precise testing of the hypotheses, only explicit answers would be used. However, due to the limited number of explicit answers obtained, explicit and implicit answers were combined. This was believed to be permissible since the cross-references showed that the value judgements were valid in nearly ninety percent of the cases.

Question 43 on the schedule asked if the delinquent exhibited hostility. As the schedule indicates there were five possible answers. For reason cited above the references "very frequently" and "frequently" were grouped together as "yes". The other three references, "sometimes", "rarely" and "very rarely" were grouped together as "no".

Question 15 asked if the delinquent had or was living with his natural parents. This would indicate with whom the delinquent lived and whether he was reared by parent substitutes. A delinquent was not considered to be living with parent substitutes unless he had been with them at least six months at the time of the delinquency.

In order to analyze statistically the trait and two factors hypothesized to be of significance in delinquency, a particular statistical methodology was followed. The procedure

used in this study is that outlined by Siegel ^{1/} with some clarification by English and English. ^{2/} An hypothesis that is to be tested with the results evaluated statistically is in its best form if stated negatively. "This helps to reduce the bias of a researcher who is ego involved in his attempt to prove his hypothesis." ^{3/} This is referred to as a "null" hypothesis.

English and English ^{4/} state that the null hypothesis is the logical contradictory of the hypothesis one wishes to test. They go on to state:

If the null hypothesis can be proved false, its contradictory is thereby proved true. Since one exception can overthrow a generalization, it is usually easier to disprove the null hypothesis than to prove the original hypothesis directly. Hence a common research design calls for a testing to see whether the null hypothesis can be denied or disproved. ... In a typical experimental design, the hypothesis is that two variables show a greater-than-chance difference. The null hypothesis is that there is no difference greater than could be expected by chance; this is tested by appropriate examination of obtained differences. ^{5/}

^{1/} Sidney Siegel, NON-PARAMETRIC STATISTICS FOR THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES; McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York 1956, p. 6 et. seg.

^{2/} English and English, op. cit.; p. 350

^{3/} John C. Townsend, INTRODUCTION TO EXPERIMENTAL METHOD; McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1963; p. 47

^{4/} English and English; op. cit.; p. 350

^{5/} English and English; op. cit.; p. 350

Applying the procedures for the null hypothesis to the first hypothesis, it would read as follows: there is no significant difference between recidivists and non-recidivists in quality of discipline received and the presence of hostility.

To test the null hypothesis the data contained in Table I and Table II had to be matched for each individual case. Table IV illustrates the matched data from Table I and II. As the hypothesis considers both discipline and hostility there were four possible categories into which a recidivist or non-recidivist could fall. Category I includes those delinquents who received suitable discipline and did not exhibit hostility. Category II, those delinquents who received suitable discipline but exhibited hostility. Category III, those delinquents who did not receive suitable discipline and did not exhibit hostility. Category IV, those delinquents who did not receive suitable discipline, but did exhibit hostility. As can be observed from Table IV, the number of cases used in testing the hypothesis statistically will be 40 rather than 49. Nine cases were deleted from the sample as there was either no clear indication of whether hostility was present or else the judge was uncertain as to the kind of discipline received by the delinquent.

The statistical test used to test the hypothesis is

known as chi square or χ^2 . The type of table used in this study to calculate χ^2 is the 2 x 2 contingency table. This type of an χ^2 test will illustrate whether or not the observed frequencies in the table could have occurred under the null hypothesis.

The level of significance chosen for this study is .05. The procedure followed is to reject the null hypothesis and accept the hypothesis if the statistical test chi square yields a value whose associated probability is equal to or less than the level of significance. Using the .05 level of significance means that once in every twenty times or five times in 100 the null hypothesis will be rejected when in fact it should be accepted. However, there are 19 correct rejections of the null hypothesis for every one that is incorrect.

Before applying the chi square test to the data it is first necessary to calculate the degrees of freedom (df.). Since the data was cast in a 2 x 2 contingency table the number of degrees of freedom was one.

Since the number of degrees of freedom was calculated to be one, the critical value of chi square is 3.84. This numerical value for chi square was obtained from a statistical table. ^{1/}

^{1/} Sidney Stigel, NON PARAMETRIC STATISTICS: FOR THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES; McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1956; p. 249

In effect, this is, the level of confidence at which the researcher states the null hypothesis can be rejected and the hypothesis accepted. That is, the region of rejection of the null hypothesis in this case is all values of χ^2 that are equal to or greater than 3.84 at the .05 level of significance with one degree of freedom.

The data contained in Table IV is cast in the 2 x 2 contingency table below. As stated earlier in the text, in order to test the hypothesis it was necessary to match the data from Tables I and II. This was necessary as the hypothesis considered both the personality trait, hostility, and the environmental factor, discipline. From the 2 x 2 contingency table it can be seen that the data contained in Category I in Table IV is compared to the data in Categories II, III, and IV in Table IV. That is, the best combination of trait and factor is compared with the other three combinations.

2 x 2 Contingency Table

	<u>Category I^{a/}</u>	<u>Category II^{b/}</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	7	33	40
Recidivist	2	22	24
Non-Recidivist	5	11	16

a/ Category I refers to Category I in Table IV

b/ Category II refers to Categories II, III, and IV
in Table IV

The formula for χ^2 is as follows ^{1/} and this formula is applied to the observed frequencies of the data in the contingency table.

$$\chi^2 = \frac{B(1AB - BC1 - \frac{N}{2})^2}{(A + B)(C + D)(A + C)(B + D)}$$

The computations are as follows:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{40 \left((22 - 110) - 20 \right)^2}{(24)(16)(7)(33)}$$

$$\chi^2 = 5.8$$

It was also decided to test the two extremes in Table IV.

The results: $\chi^2 = 20.0$

^{1/} Sidney Siegal, op. cit.; p. 107

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF 49 DELINQUENT BOYS TAKEN FROM DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC WELFARE FILES, ACTIVE AS OF NOVEMBER, 1965,
BY HOSTILITY, LACK OF HOSTILITY AND
RECIDIVISM - NON-RECIDIVISM

	<u>Category I^{a/}</u>	<u>Category II^{b/}</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
TOTAL	19	24	6	49
Recidivist	14	10	2	26
Non- Recidivist	5	14	4	23

a/ Category I refers to delinquents who exhibited hostility.

b/ Category II refers to delinquents who did not exhibit hostility.

JK/sjs

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF 49 DELINQUENT BOYS TAKEN FROM DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC WELFARE FILES, ACTIVE AS OF NOVEMBER, 1965,
ACCORDING TO QUALITY OF FAMILY DISCIPLINE

	<u>Category I^{a/}</u>	<u>Category II^{b/}</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
TOTAL	13	31	5	49
Recidivist	6	18	2	26
Non- Recidivist	7	13	3	23

a/ Category I refers to delinquents receiving suitable discipline.

b/ Category II refers to delinquents receiving unsuitable discipline.

JK/sjs

TABLE III

DISTRIBUTION OF 49 MALE DELINQUENTS TAKEN FROM
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE FILES, ACTIVE
AS OF NOVEMBER, 1965, BY HEARING BY
NATURAL PARENTS AND BY
PARENT SUBSTITUTES

TOTAL	49
Parent Substitutes	13
Natural Parents	36

JH/sjs

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF 49 DELINQUENT BOYS TAKEN FROM DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE FILES, ACTIVE AS OF NOVEMBER, 1965, IN FOUR COMBINATIONS OF QUALITY OF DISCIPLINE AND PRESENCE OF HOSTILITY

	<u>Category I^{a/}</u>	<u>Category II^{b/}</u>	<u>Category III^{c/}</u>	<u>Category IV^{d/}</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
TOTAL:	7	6	14	13	9	49
Recidivist	2	4	8	10	2	26
Non-Recidivist	5	2	6	3	7	23

a/ Category I refers to suitable discipline and no hostility exhibited.

b/ Category II refers to suitable discipline and hostility exhibited.

c/ Category III refers to unsuitable discipline and no hostility exhibited.

d/ Category IV refers to unsuitable discipline and hostility exhibited.

JK/sjs

For one degree of freedom, a chi square equal to 5.8 is significant at the .05 level. That is, the first null hypothesis can be rejected. This indicates that the quality of parental discipline and the presence of hostility in a child are related to the incidence of juvenile delinquency; and unsuitable discipline and hostility are more frequent in recidivists than non-recidivists. Although comparing the extreme combinations of the trait and factor was not necessary, it does indicate that the undesirable trait-factor combination is significantly more common among recidivists than non-recidivists.

This finding can be partially supported by what psychological theorists write on the type of discipline delinquents typically receive. The study arrived at a conclusion similar to that stated in a recent text-book:

Parents of delinquents are typically lax or erratic in disciplining their children, swinging from overstrictness to over permissiveness without any consistency. ^{1/}

The same procedure outlined above was followed to formulate the second null hypothesis. Therefore, the second hypothesis stated in Chapter II becomes: there is no significant difference between delinquents who have been reared by parent substitutes and delinquents who have been reared by their natural

^{1/} Paul H. Mussen, THE PSYCHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHILD; Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1963; p. 99

TABLE V

DISTRIBUTION OF 49 DELINQUENT BOYS TAKEN
FROM DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE FILES
ACTIVE AS OF NOVEMBER, 1965, IN FOUR
COMBINATIONS OF REARING BY
PARENT SUBSTITUTES AND
PRESENCE OF
HOSTILITY

	<u>Category I^{a/}</u>	<u>Category II^{b/}</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
TOTAL	13	36	49
Exhibits Hostility	5	17	22
Does not Exhibit Hostility	6	18	24
Uncertain	2	1	3

a/ Refers to delinquents reared by parent substitutes

b/ Refers to delinquents reared by their natural
parents.

JK/sjs

parents in regard to the presence of the personality trait, hostility.

The total sample comprised 49 cases, thirteen of which were reared by a parent substitute as illustrated in Table III. As can be observed from Table V, however, the number of cases used in testing the hypothesis was 46 rather than 49. Three cases were deleted from the sample as there was no clear indication of whether hostility was present or not. Of the 46 cases tested eleven were reared by parent substitutes.

Table V shows the frequency of incidence of hostility among two groups of delinquents. Of the first, group of eleven delinquents reared by parent substitutes, six were judged to exhibit hostility and the other five lacked this characteristic. In the group of 35 delinquents reared by their natural parents the division was as follows: seventeen exhibited hostility and the other eighteen did not show this trait.

When the hypothesis was put to the test, the results were much greater than the critical value at the .05 level; therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected at the chosen level of significance. Therefore, the converse of the null hypothesis must be rejected. This means that the difference between delinquents who have been reared by parent substitutes and delinquents who have been reared by their natural parents, in regard to the presence of the

personality trait hostility, is not significant. That is, the second hypothesis of this study was not substantiated.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the findings presented in this chapter will be discussed in the following chapter. The reasons why the second hypothesis of this study failed to be significant will also be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study substantiated one hypothesis at a significant level. The second hypothesis, however, was not substantiated at an acceptable level of significance. The second hypothesis considered the rearing of a boy by parent substitutes and it was believed that this environmental factor would generate hostility in a child. It was also believed that the hostility generated would in turn increase the child's potential in resorting to deviant behavior. It was hypothesized that if the above statement were valid, there would be a higher incidence of hostility present in delinquents reared by parent substitutes than in delinquents reared by their natural parents.

The reason for this hypothesis not being substantiated lies in either the theory, the methodology devised to test the theory, or in a combination of both. The theory itself may be inadequate and, therefore, subsequent hypotheses derived from the theory would not be valid. The methodology employed in the statistical testing of the hypothesis may not have been appropriate in terms of providing an accurate test of the hypothesis.

Regarding the theoretical section a limit was accepted in the selection of one trait and two factors as representative

of the 67 traits and 44 factors. This admittedly had a restricting influence on the study as a whole. Such a selection of trait and factors can probably be justified, as both trait and factors were considered representative of the group of factors and traits enumerated by the Gluecks. Furthermore, in isolating the trait and factor for theoretical representation, both were found to have causative significance in other theories. ^{1/} Consequently, it would probably be more relevant to reappraise this study in terms of the methodological approach.

It was apparent from the beginning that severe limits and limitations would be present in various forms. The first of these limitations occurred in the moderate sample size used. Perhaps then, if a larger number of the 223 cases available for study had been used a truer representation of the data would have shown up.

Another limitation which may have had an effect in preventing rejection of the null hypothesis is the fact that the

^{1/} McCord and McCord, op. cit.; p. 170

Clyde B. Vedder, THE JUVENILE OFFENDER; Doubleday and Co., Inc., New York, 1954; pp. 70-74

Herbert H. Bloch, et. al., MAN, CRIME, AND SOCIETY; Random House, New York, 1965; pp. 439-440

sample was divided into recidivist and non-recidivist groups. As a control group of non-delinquents was not used, it was necessary for purposes of comparison and statistical analysis, to divide the sample into the above mentioned groups. Although it is a relative distinction, it seems logical to conclude that a more valid test could have been applied if there had been a control group of non-delinquents for purposes of comparison. In this study a recidivist has been defined as a juvenile delinquent who has had more than one court appearance. However, this does not necessarily mean that a non-recidivist has committed only one delinquent act. The dividing line may have been in some cases tenuous, and a bias may have been introduced either in favour of, or against rejection of the null hypothesis. It would appear that the bias operated against rejecting the null hypothesis and, therefore, of accepting the hypotheses. As suggested above, in some cases, delinquents who were classed as non-recidivist may have been in reality, recidivist. It would seem logical to conclude, that this would not allow for the expected contrast between the two groups under study as suggested by the hypotheses in regard to hostility, quality of discipline, and rearing by parent substitutes. That is, the non-recidivist group, which was hypothesized to have the least hostility, better quality of discipline, etc., would

include recidivist which would weight the data in favor of accepting the null hypotheses.

An additional limitation was in the fact that the files from the Department of Public Welfare used as a data source, were not compiled for research purposes. Assumptions had to be made for example as to whether certain delinquents were recidivist or non-recidivist. The distinction was made on the basis of recorded court appearances. However, some delinquents classified on this basis as non-recidivist may have committed other offences which did not become known to the police. Some delinquents are not charged by the police for various reasons, which reflect the attitudes of the local police force. ^{1/} This is actually a judgement as to degree and severity of their anti-social behavior and attitudes. A distinction of the group as to recidivist and non-recidivist should provide a fairly accurate categorization of the group in terms of the severity of their delinquency. Moreover, even in defining these individuals in terms of recidivist and non-recidivist, the files lacked clarity, thus influencing selection and definition of these two groups.

A final limitation involves the resources which were

^{1/} This statement is based on the writer's own experiences at a Child Welfare Office in Saint John, N. B.

available to carry out this study. The Gluecks in their studies of personality traits and environmental factors made use of psychiatrists, psychologists, Rorschach tests and teams of social workers. These resources were not available in this study and, therefore, the data collected involved the use of value judgements as to the quality of discipline and the presence of hostility. This may have introduced a source of error into the study.

The first hypothesis which considered discipline and hostility did prove significant. It therefore, might be possible to infer certain conclusions. If this combination of trait and factor operate to produce juvenile delinquency, then perhaps, many other combinations of traits and factors compiled by the Gluecks operate in the same manner.

It seems evident that in any fundamental preventive attack on juvenile delinquency some reliable device is necessary which will enable identification of potential delinquents sufficiently early in life to permit of timely intervention. The Gluecks ^{1/} in UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY presented such an instrument based on certain factors in family life, especially parent-child relationships. That is, traits and factors are

^{1/} Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck, UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; op. cit.; pp. 257-264

isolated which they believe have the greatest influence on behavior. By continual study of the traits-factors, more refined and effective prediction tables might be devised.

McCord and McCord say that one of the most astonishing results of their research is the conclusion that delinquency is greatly determined by factors beyond the control of the individual. The fact that these determining factors can be analyzed, leads them to conclude that "criminality can be predicted". ^{1/}

A relevant question may be "why prediction?" Is it better for family life and for society generally, to allow delinquency-inducing influences to take their toll in persistent delinquency? Might it not be more expedient to detect such dangerous influences sufficiently early in life to allow something constructive to be effected?

In the final analysis, it would seem far better that endangered children be identified as early as possible in life with a view to some sort of preventative intervention. Psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers would probably agree that early discovery and treatment of deviant behavioral tendencies makes the task of rehabilitation easier.

^{1/} McCord and McCord; op. cit.; p. 176

Craig and Glick ^{1/} say that any device for the early discrimination between children who present a high potential of delinquency and those not headed for delinquency, requires two operations designed to test its validity and efficiency; the predictive indications of the original table have to be applied to other samples of cases than the one on which the device was constructed; the predictive factors have to be defined with sufficient objectivity to enable workers to rate the predictive score of the child on the basis of a visit to the home.

The New York Youth Board ^{2/} applied the Glueck Prediction Table to a sample of boys in New York City with the above criteria in mind and found the prediction table accurate in 91% of the cases. They concluded that the Glueck Prediction Table has value not only as an indicator of potential delinquency, but has value in enabling the therapist to determine the best kind of treatment for children who have already become delinquent.

Prediction tables are based on the assumption that home conditions will remain the same. It is not an attempt to predict

^{1/} Maude M. Craig and Selma J. Glick, A MANUAL OF PROCEDURES FOR APPLICATION OF THE GLUECK PREDICTION TABLE; New York City Youth Board, Oct., 1964; p. 7

^{2/} Maude M. Craig and Selma J. Glick, op. cit.; pp. 14-15

a child's destiny, but his destination which perhaps may be influenced or altered by effective action. Presently, considerable attention is directed towards children, but perhaps not enough toward the family. It may well be that the family needs treatment rather than the child.

By the use of prediction tables social workers could identify potential delinquents. Rather than wait until the child becomes a delinquent, work could be done with the parents and child to curb the process of the development of delinquency. That is, by the use of prediction tables, weakness could be determined in the family environment (factors) and in the child's personality (traits). This would provide the therapist with a concrete, decisive and scientific frame of reference in preventive therapy.

McCord and McCord say that, "as delinquency preventives, strong evidence indicates that present public reform schools and social work programs fail". ^{1/} On this basis it would appear more effective to embrace a program that focused on the original source (if this can be determined) which caused the delinquency. If this original source is the family, then a method of identifying the

^{1/} McCord and McCord, op. cit.; p. 38

specific factors in the family environment which are contributing to the delinquency, would be an invaluable diagnostic tool and treatment aid.

If the family itself is a contributing agent in producing delinquency then it must be incorporated into the treatment plan. Through the use of prediction tables the therapist would recognize which factors in the family system to modify, minimize or eliminate, if possible, through treatment.

Prediction tables could be applied to all school children during their first years at school. Those families containing children who had a high potential for deviant behavior could be placed under supervision. This would be a preventive measure and seems to have more merit than waiting until the child is brought before the courts at which time rehabilitation is that much more difficult.

Social workers in the field of corrections are so busy managing the children who have become delinquent, that little time is spent on trying to break the vicious cycle that is building up in delinquency. Those concerned with the problem of juvenile delinquency must evaluate their efforts and decide if it would not be just as worthwhile, if not more important, to increase activity in the preventive area.

APPENDIX

FAMILY STRUCTURE

11. When delinquent was born mother was (circle and show date under):

Single	Married	Cohabiting	Deserted	Separated	Divorced	Widow
()	()	()	()	()	()	()

12. Mother's present status is (circle and show date under):

Single	Married	Cohabiting	Deserted	Separated	Divorced	Widow
()	()	()	()	()	()	()

13. Note here and on back, with dates, any significant changes in status of mother, and explain:

()
over

14. If delinquent has not always made his home with his biological mother (as living with father only, with foster or adoptive parents, or other) explain here and on back, giving relevant dates:

()
over

15. If delinquent has been separated from either or both parents intermittently or permanently, explain here and on back, identifying absent parent and giving dates or periods of absence:

()
over

16. Note here and on back and references in record to physical or mental ill-health or hospitalization of either parent, identifying and giving dates:

()
over

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

17. Relationship between father and mother is

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very good good fair poor very poor

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

18. Relationship between father and delinquent is

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very good good fair poor very poor

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

19. Relationship between mother and delinquent is

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very good good fair poor very poor

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

20. The reputation of the family in the community is, or relations with neighbors are:

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very good good fair poor very poor

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

21. Discipline for the delinquent was

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
(a) very lax lax firm strict very strict

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
(b) very erratic erratic consistent very consistent

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very kindly kindly harsh very harsh

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

()
over

22. Check and report here and on back any reference in record to

- () constant quarrelling (identify family members, subjects, frequency)
- () physical abuse (show of whom by whom, frequency, severity)
- () drinking which affects family unity (show by whom, attitudes of other members, frequency, severity)

()
over

WORK, EARNINGS, ETC.

23. Father's occupation:

24. Earnings:

25. Is father employed () full-time or () part-time

:.....:.....:.....:.....:
 almost always usually sometimes very rarely

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

26. Mother's occupation:

27. Earnings:

28. Is mother employed () full-time or () part-time

:.....:.....:.....:.....:
 almost always usually sometimes very rarely

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

29. Note here and on back if mother has worked since delinquent's birth, indicating periods mother was in the home, and what provision was made for mother-substitute when she was not; give dates:

()
over

30. Do family consider their income to be

:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very adequate adequate inadequate very inadequate

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

31. Have the family received welfare assistance

:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very frequently frequently rarely very rarely

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

32. Report here and on back any reference to criminal behavior on part of either parent or of siblings, showing date, nature of offence, relationship of offender to delinquent:

()
over

F A M I L Y H O U S I N G

33. Is family housing

:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very good good fair poor very poor

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

34. Is overcrowding (more than one person per room, omitting bathroom) shown

() explicitly or () implicitly in the record

35. What rent (or equivalent) is paid for housing:

()
over

36. Is the neighborhood where the family lives

:.....:	:.....:	:.....:	:.....:	:.....:
very good	good	fair	poor	very poor

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

37. Since delinquent's birth family has moved

() not at all () once () more than once

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

38. Explain here and on back if present housing and neighborhood are not typical for family since before delinquent's birth:

()
over

ASSOCIATIONS

39. Is it () explicitly or () implicitly either () confirmed or () denied in the record that delinquent was a member of a gang?

40. Is it () explicitly or () implicitly either () confirmed or () denied that delinquent was a leader of a gang?

41. Does the delinquent follow the example of the gang, and do what they like to do

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
always usually sometimes occasionally rarely

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

42. Does the delinquent, if he is not leader, emulate the leader

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
always usually sometimes occasionally rarely

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

PERSONALITY

43. Does delinquent exhibit hostility to others

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very frequently frequently sometimes rarely very rarely

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

44. Does delinquent exhibit resourcefulness or daring

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very frequently frequently sometimes rarely very rarely

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

45. Does delinquent exhibit difficulty in relations with authority figures (parents, teachers, police, probation officers, etc)

:.....:.....:.....:.....:.....:
very frequently frequently sometimes rarely very rarely

() explicitly or () implicitly or () uncertain from the record

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

B o o k s

- Abrahamsen, David WHO ARE THE GUILTY; Rinehart and Company, Inc., New York, 1952.
- Barron, Milton L. THE JUVENILE IN DELINQUENT SOCIETY; Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1954.
- Bloch, Herbert A. & Geis, Gilbert, MAN, CRIME AND SOCIETY; Random House, New York, 1962.
- Burgess, Ernest W. & Locke, Harvey J., THE FAMILY; American Book Company, New York, 1945.
- Cloward, Richard A. & Ohlin, Lloyd E., DELINQUENCY AND OPPORTUNITY: A THEORY OF DELINQUENT GANGS; The Free Press of Glencoe, Chicago, 1963.
- Dornbusch, Sanford M., & Schmid, Calvin F., A PRIMER OF SOCIAL STATISTICS; McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1956.
- English, Horace B. & English, Ava Champney, A COMPREHENSIVE DICTIONARY OF PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOANALYTICAL TERMS; David McKay Company, Inc., New York, 1958.
- Eysenck, M. J., CRIME AND PERSONALITY; Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1964.
- Farnsworth, D. L., MENTAL HEALTH IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1957.
- Glueck, Sheldon & Glueck, Eleanor, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND DELINQUENCY; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1962. ✓
- DELINQUENTS IN THE MAKING; Harper & Brothers, New York, 1952.
- PREDICTING DELINQUENCY AND CRIME; Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass., 1960

- 500 CRIMINAL CAREERS; Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1930. ✓
- UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; The Commonwealth Fund, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1950. ✓
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford THE FAMILY, AS PROCESS AND INSTITUTION; The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1962 (2nd ed.).
- Kvaraceus, William C. THE COMMUNITY AND THE DELINQUENT; World Book Company, New York, 1954.
- McCord, William & McCord, Joan, with Irving Zola, ORIGINS OF CRIME; Columbia University Press, New York, 1959.
- Neumeyer, Martin H., JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN AMERICAN SOCIETY; Harper & Brothers, New York, 1949.
- Nye, Ivan F., FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS AND DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR; John Wiley & Sons, Inc., London, 1958.
- Reckless, Walter C. THE CRIME PROBLEM; Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1950. ✓
- Schneiders, Alexander H., PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT AND ADJUSTMENT IN ADOLESCENCE; The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1960.
- Schulman, Harry Manuel, JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN AMERICAN SOCIETY; Harper & Brothers, New York, 1961.
- Siegel, Sidney, NONPARAMETRIC STATISTICS; McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1956.
- Sutherland, Edwin H., PRINCIPLES OF CRIMINOLOGY; J. B. Lippencott Co., Chicago, 1934.
- Tappan, Paul W., JUVENILE DELINQUENCY; McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1949.

The White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, THE
DELINQUENT CHILD; The Century Co.,
New York, 1932.

Vedder, Clyde B.,

THE JUVENILE OFFENDER; Doubleday &
Co., Inc., New York, 1954.

Government Publications

Dominion of Canada "The Juvenile Delinquent Act", THE
REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA; Queen's
Printer, Ottawa, 1952; Vol. III
C. 160

Articles

- Craig, Maude M., & Glick, Selma J., "Ten Years Experience
with the Glueck Prediction Table",
CRIME AND DELINQUENCY; National
Council on Crime and Delinquency,
Vol. IX, No. 3, January 1963
- Hardman, Dale S., "The Case for Eclecticism", CRIME
AND DELINQUENCY; National Council
on Crime and Delinquency, Vol. X,
No. 3, January 1964
- Glueck, Sheldon "Theory and Fact in Criminology"
THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF DELINQUENCY;
Published by the Institute for the Study
and Treatment of Delinquency and
Bailliere Tindall and Cox, Ltd.,
Vol. VII, No. 2., October 1956