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ABSTRACT

This study is designed to examine empirically the distribution of delinquent activities among juveniles residing within a Canadian urban industrial environment.

Comparisons are made between officially recorded delinquent activities, and self-reported delinquent activities derived from questionnaires distributed among 942 juveniles residing within two police districts of the community. The findings are compared with the expectations derived by Albert K. Cohen concerning the distribution of delinquent activities which may be expected within an urban industrial environment. Cohen's theoretical middle-class measuring rod is tested against samples of middle and lower-class boys of the community.

The findings are that not all of Cohen's views about the distribution of delinquency which may be expected, are supported by this study. Cohen's theoretical concept of the existence of a middle-class measuring rod is not supported by the study, and delinquency is extensive among both middle and lower-class youths of the community. It becomes clear that the police are involved with only a small percentage of the delinquents of the community.

The recommendations are that further studies of a similar nature should be conducted within other urban industrial areas of Canada, in order to provide verification or negation of the suggested high level of delinquent activities among urban juveniles, and that more attention should be given to the many new and overt conditions which increase opportunities for delinquent activities among juveniles of today's society.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency has been a topic of sociological investigation during recent decades. The subject has received the attention of some of the most eminent practitioners of sociological research and a great body of new knowledge has been acquired. Yet, to the present time, much of this newly acquired knowledge remains controversial and the field continues to generate interesting and provocative intellectual interchanges between its practitioners.

"Official" records of juvenile crime tend to suggest that delinquency is primarily a problem existing among the lower-class juveniles of our society. However, there is mounting evidence which suggests that juvenile crime is common among all social classes.\(^1\) Those who propose that juvenile crime is shared throughout every societal stratum frequently imply that official records are a manifestation of official biases operating in the selection processes for the referral of juveniles to the Juvenile Courts.\(^2\) Others


caution against the unrestrained use of official records for research into juvenile crime but still find usage for such data in their research. The rationale for using official records for research into juvenile crime appears to stem from a belief that if many of the delinquent activities of the upper-classes fail to become officially recorded, so do many of the delinquent activities of lower-class juveniles. It is, thus implied that some kind of randomization exists within the official data making it relevant for some purposes of research.

Studies involving self-reported delinquent behaviour have frequently been used to measure the extent of delinquency existing within a community. Such studies have suggested that a significant proportion of the self-reported delinquent acts are undetected by the authorities, that relatively low correlations exist between official records and self-reported delinquencies, and that variations in self-reports are not always closely related to other variables in the same ways that theories of juvenile delinquency suggest. Self-reported data is gathered by means of a questionnaire or through interview, and consequently reliability may depend upon the


4Porterfield, 1946; Short and Nye, 1957; Erikson and Empey, 1963; Gold, 1970.

researcher's ability to create such conditions to obtain honest answers from the respondents. In order to permit accurate comparisons with official data, the self-reported delinquent acts should correspond to the official perceptions of what constitutes a delinquent act.

It would be a useful exercise to compare official data pertaining to juvenile crime within a community with the data obtained from a sample of self-reported delinquent acts obtained from juveniles residing within that community. In addition, it would be instrumental to conduct an empirical test of a theory, or a portion of a theory developed by a theoretician who has indicated a belief in the utility of official statistics for purposes of sociological research. Should data obtained from the self-reported delinquents differ substantially from data derived from official sources, then the reliance upon official data, or opinions deduced as a result, could create a detrimental effect upon the general implications of the theory. An empirical test of the theory, utilising the self-reported delinquents' data, may yield results different from those anticipated in the theory.

Albert K. Cohen, in his book, *Delinquent Boys, The Culture of the Gang*, wrestled with the problem of determining which statistics could be relied upon to ascertain the sources of "carriers" of the delinquent sub-culture, and concluded that the answer was within the statistics supplied.
by the police, Courts, and social agencies. Cohen reviewed
the literature rather carefully, and finally concluded his
examination, making the following comments:

"If many delinquencies of upper class children fail to
find their way into the police and court records, the
same is apparently true also of many delinquencies of
working-class children, and conceivably even more true."

Cohen's theory of delinquent gangs does appear to lack
substantial empirical support, and he has chosen to rely, at
least to some extent, upon official data describing delinquency.
As this theory encompasses components capable of being tested
empirically, it will, therefore, be selected for examination
during this inquiry.

6Cohen, Delinquent Boys, pp. 36-41.
7Ibid., p. 41.
CHAPTER II

THEORY

During the late 1800s Emile Durkheim argued that the existence of crime within a society could be explained without having to search for pathology-producing anomalies in the make-up of the individual. More recently, David Matza has stated that the principle legacy of the functionalists was to establish and extend appreciation of deviance as a natural product of human collectivities. A convergence of functionalism with the "social disorganization" theorists of the Chicago school was created by Merton's Anomie Theory. He specified the societal sources which may cause a breakdown of consensus about norms, and suggested the kinds of conditions which would become prevalent during the emergence of specific types of deviance. Thus the idea was developed that deviance would be more prevalent among the lower-class due to their limited access to the legitimate means of achieving society's goals. Anomie theory -


assumes that in any society there are dominant values and norms generally accepted by all members, yet fails to explain why only certain individuals among the members of the lower-class deviate from the norms.

Since about 1940, Edwin H. Sutherland's theory of differential association has dominated the sociological approach in criminology. Basically, Sutherland emphasizes the learning processes in becoming deviant. He hypothesizes that people acquire criminal behaviour patterns in the same ways that they acquire conventional behavioural patterns. Further, he contends that in their association with others, people learn values, norms, motivations, rationalizations, techniques and definitions which are both favourable and unfavourable to violations of the law. Accordingly, a person learns criminal behaviour patterns and is more likely to engage in criminal activity if he has been exposed to criminal definitions during a prolonged period of his early life, with more intensity and more frequency than he has been exposed to anti-criminal definitions. The theory fails to explain what processes are involved in the learning of criminal or conforming behaviour.


Cohen's delinquency subculture theory, in essence, is a modification of Sutherland's theory of differential association. Cohen views lower-class delinquent boys as comprising a subculture with a value system different from the dominant culture. He states that lower-class boys use the delinquent subculture as a mode of reaction and adjustment to a dominant middle-class society that indirectly discriminates against them because of their lower-class position. Lower-class youths, trained in a different value system, are therefore not adequately socialized so as to fulfill the status requirements of middle-class society. Despite their different socialization, they are unfairly exposed to the middle-class aspirations which they cannot fulfill, and in reaction, they manifest a delinquent adjustment - acting out their status frustrations in "non-utilitarian, malicious, negativistic forms of behaviour."  

Cohen suggests that the lower-class child substitutes norms that reverse the norms of the larger society. The gang becomes the vehicle for their delinquencies and consequently, the individual delinquent becomes the exception rather than the rule. The delinquent behaviour of females, middle- and upper-class males and lone delinquents falls outside the explanation boundaries of his theory.  

6Cohen, Delinquent Boys, p. 25.
Cohen estimates that female delinquency amounts to between one fourth and one sixth of male delinquency. Delinquencies of the kind institutionalized within the delinquent subculture are "positively inappropriate" as a response to problems arising within the female role. They are irrelevant to the vindication of her status and threaten the female's identification with her role as a female. Basically, female delinquency is sexual in nature.

Middle-class delinquency is "but a fraction of working-class delinquency." Cohen states that:

Insofar as the delinquency we find in the middle-class is subcultural in nature and fits the description of working-class subcultural delinquency, it throws into question the thesis of this book. The explanation we have offered assumes that the delinquent subculture is the outgrowth of conditions which are typically working-class. If it should turn out that the same phenomenon can flourish independently of those conditions, it would strongly suggest that those conditions are not necessary even in the working class .................

Cohen lists nine middle-class values described as "the middle-class measuring rod." These values are rejected by the lower-class child. They are:

- ambition;
- responsibility;
- the cultivation of skills and tangible achievement;
- postponement of immediate satisfactions and self-indulgence in the interests of long-run goals;
- rationality in the sense of the exercise of forethought;
- the rational cultivation of manners, courtesy and personality;

---

7 Cohen, op. cit., p. 158.
the control of aggression and physical violence; wholesome recreation; respect for property and its care.  

Empey and Lubeck failed to find support for Cohen's position on the values held by representatives of different social classes. Their "Silver Lake" experiment led them to suggest that, "We might discover as many differences within classes as we discover between them."  

Robert C. Sherwin developed a set of hypotheses in order to test Cohen's middle-class measuring rod against a group of middle- and lower-class non-delinquents and delinquents. He was able to derive some support for Cohen's position. The issue in question was, "Do social class and delinquent, non-delinquent representatives hold or endorse the values attributed to them by Cohen?" The hypotheses derived were:

Primary Hypothesis I

Middle-class non-delinquents subscribe to and endorse the values contained in the middle-class measuring rod with a greater frequency and/or intensity than lower-class delinquents.

This hypothesis, if accepted, would support Cohen's position by indicating that a middle-class measuring rod does exist, and that it is endorsed by middle-class representatives and

---


is relatively unimportant to lower-class delinquents. Its rejection would suggest that Cohen's position is erroneous.

**Primary Hypothesis II**

Lower-class non-delinquents subscribe to and endorse the values contained in the middle-class measuring rod with a greater frequency and/or intensity than lower-class delinquents.

The acceptance of this hypothesis would indicate that lower-class non-delinquents exhibit an attachment which is not shared by delinquents of the same social class. Since social class is held constant in this test it is crucial to Cohen's position.

**Secondary Hypothesis III**

Middle-class delinquents subscribe to and endorse the values contained in the middle-class measuring rod with a greater frequency and/or intensity than lower-class delinquents.

The acceptance of this hypothesis would indicate that there is not a common posture towards the middle class measuring rod between delinquents of the two social classes. Its failure would connote that delinquency may be associated with a common posture towards the middle-class measuring rod despite social-class differences.

The expected order of endorsement of the middle-class measuring rod should be:

1. Middle class non-delinquents
2. Middle-class delinquents
3. Lower-class non-delinquents
4. Lower-class delinquents

The replication of Sherwin's hypotheses, utilizing self-
reported delinquents as the sample, should provide useful information concerning the validity of one crucial aspect of Cohen's theory of delinquent subcultures.

In order to gain some insights into the validity of Cohen's positions with respect to female and middle-class delinquency rates, two samples will be obtained from the juvenile population of a city. One sample will be comprised of official data and the other sample will contain data reported voluntarily by juveniles of the community.

Concerning female delinquencies, Cohen's position is that female delinquents commit sexually-oriented delinquent acts, and not the same kinds of crimes that are attributed to male delinquents. Female delinquents should not comprise more than one-fourth of each sample.

Middle-class delinquents, according to Cohen, should be represented only as a fraction of the lower-class delinquents of each sample. It would appear that Cohen is indicating here that they should be significantly fewer in number than are the lower-class juveniles, although he is uncertain about the ratio.

Finally, Cohen's middle-class measuring rod will be tested against the self-reported data using the methods applied by Robert C. Sherwin.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The Community Structure

The samples of juvenile delinquents and non-delinquents will be obtained from the city of Windsor, Ontario, Canada. Windsor lies at the southern extremity of the peninsular of Southwestern Ontario. Its proponents frequently refer to Windsor as the "Sun Parlour of Canada" because of its comparatively moderate climate. The topography is flat.

During the year 1748 the Jesuit Father Armand de la Richardie established a mission across the Detroit River from Detroit which he called L'Assomption de la Pointe de Montreal du Detroit. The mission served the Huron Indians and a small group of French farm settlers who had begun to farm the lands close to the river bank.

Before 1763, Canada was under French domination and was known as New France. During that same year, the British conquered and seized the territory but in 1796 they surrendered Detroit to the United States. This created an influx of British loyalists who settled and farmed the lands around Windsor, growth thereafter was slow.

\[\text{For further information concerning the history of Windsor see Neil F. Morrison, Garden Gateway to Canada (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1954).}\]
due largely to the difficulties of communicating with the outside world.

The completion of the Erie and Welland canals soon after 1830 permitted water access to the Eastern seaboard. The second half of the nineteenth century brought rail connections to the city which were conveniently in the path of commerce between Niagara and Detroit. By the end of that century, three railway links passed through the city to accommodate the Detroit trade and the growing agricultural industry of the area. Agriculture remained as the predominant source of revenue until the advent of the automobile early in the twentieth century.

The Ford Motor Company established a plant in the rural community of Sandwich East, located east of the city, and soon other auto-related firms established themselves in the area. The resulting rapid urban growth led to the amalgamation of the neighbouring communities of Walkerville, Windsor, East Windsor and Sandwich during the year 1935. Shortly before that event took place, a bridge and tunnel had been built across the Detroit River linking the community with Detroit.

Throughout its formative years, the city had undergone changes in its ethnic composition from predominantly French people to Anglo-Saxon. By the year 1951, the Anglo-Saxon groups represented fifty two percent of the city's population, and people of French extraction represented about twenty two percent. However, boom conditions brought about by the
advent of the auto industry brought large numbers of new ethnic groups into the city, including many Eastern Europeans.

During 1966, Windsor once again annexed portions of the adjoining communities, taking in the old town of Riverside, portions of Sandwich West and almost all of Sandwich East.

Today, the population stands at 197,235. Approximately 19,425 of the population is between ten and fifteen years of age. It is this portion of the population that will be examined during the course of this study: The highest concentration of juveniles is found in East Windsor, Walkerville, Riverside and Sandwich East. Male-female ratios are roughly equal before age fifty-five but females predominate among the older age categories.

Forty-four percent of the population is classified as "single," forty-six percent - "married," and ten percent either "divorced," "widowed," or "separated." Seventy-five percent state English to be their mother tongue, six percent - Italian, six percent - French and two percent - German. The balance of eleven percent is comprised predominantly of Ukrainian or South-Eastern European languages.

Of the city's estimated 11,000 unemployed persons, young males prevail. The majority of the city's work force is engaged in unskilled or semi-skilled labour at the automobile plants which dominate the economy. Due to high

---

2 Data obtained from Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, Municipal Directory, 1979, p. 34.
wages for employment within these automobile plants, many youngsters have been deterred from achieving the trade skills which require long training periods at low wages. As a result, much of the skilled work force has been necessarily imported from the countries of Western Europe.

Windsor's school "dropout" rates are not significantly different from the rates within other industrial regions of the Province. Many of those who leave school prematurely reside within the poorer city neighbourhoods.

Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay's studies of juvenile delinquency in Chicago led them to report that:

It may be said therefore, that the existence of a powerful system of criminal values and relationships in low-income urban areas is the product of a cumulative process extending back into the history of the community and of the city. It is related both to the general character of the urban world and to the fact that the population in these communities have long occupied a disadvantageous position. It has developed in somewhat the same way as have all social traditions, that is, as a means of satisfying certain felt needs within the limits of a particular social and economic framework.

Shaw and McKay's basic findings about rate distributions of delinquents were that the rates varied inversely with distance from the city's centre. Their theoretical interpretation was that the desirability of residential areas was inversely related to distance from commerce and

---

industry situated in or near the centre of an expanding city. The same inverse relationship therefore characterized housing costs and also the location of income groups.

Windsor, however, is an amalgamation of several established communities. Should the theory of Shaw and McKay be applied, we would have to deal with a series of overlapping concentric circles.

The city's proximity to Detroit has had very little impact upon its juvenile crime. The screening process created by the presence of customs and immigration personnel at the bridge and tunnel linking the two cities has evidently provided an adequate buffer. Very few juveniles from Detroit have ever been apprehended in the commission of a crime within the city of Windsor, in contrast about eight percent of Windsor's known juvenile offenders during 1977 came from the bedroom suburbs surrounding the city.  

For purposes of policing the city of Windsor, there is a division of eleven police patrol districts within the city. Each district contains a number of zones and there is a total of fifty zones within the city. This permits records to be kept by district and zone in matters involving the police. Sandwich, located at Windsor's northwest extremity, is known as police district number one, and contains five zones. Once an entity to itself, Sandwich was amalgamated into

4 Data derived from author's own study of Windsor Youth Branch files for the year 1977.
the city during 1935. South Windsor, located at the south-west extremity, is known as police district number three and can be subdivided into four zones. South Windsor has been a bedroom suburb of Windsor for about thirty years, but was absorbed into the city in 1966. For reasons to be outlined, these two police districts have been selected as the locations to be studied.

Within the age group of ten to fifteen years, there are 1,218 males and 1,168 females residing in the portion of Sandwich encompassed by district one. In the portion of South Windsor contained in district three, there are 1,398 males and 1,297 females within the same age category stated. Their combined numbers amount to slightly less than five percent of the total city population within this age span.\(^5\) The density of population per acre is similar, Sandwich being slightly more than eight persons and South Windsor slightly less than eight persons per acre. Eighty-one percent of the residents of Sandwich state that English is their mother-tongue as do eighty-three percent of the residents of South Windsor. The balance within both districts is comprised of similar variations.\(^6\) Sandwich contains three public schools, three separate schools, and one high school.

---

\(^5\) Derived from Tax Enumeration Statistics, Windsor City Hall.

\(^6\) Demographic and Social Data for Human Services Planning, Windsor and Essex County, Monograph II of the Social Planning Division, The United Way of Windsor & Essex County, 1979. Note that this data was derived from the 1976 Federal Census.
South Windsor contains five public schools, four separate schools and one high school.\textsuperscript{7} In balance, there should not be significant differences between the religious compositions of the two populations. Both neighbourhoods are similarly endowed with parks and recreational facilities. Essentially, there are two significant variations between the two districts. Almost twelve percent of the population of Sandwich is divorced, separated or widowed; whereas only four percent of South Windsor's residents have that status. Secondly, Sandwich is a working-class district whereas South Windsor is a middle-class district.

The business district of Sandwich lies close to the river, across from a heavily industrialized section of Detroit, and the entire neighbourhood suffers from pollution wafting across the river. Many of the residents are homeowners, but there are also two fairly large public housing sub-divisions which were inserted into Sandwich several years ago. The tenants within these sub-divisions probably have accounted for much of the variation between Sandwich and South Windsor in the broken-home category. The homes in Sandwich are small and many were built during wartime to accommodate factory workers who had entered the city to man a rapid industrial expansion. Although there is a middle-class belt around the University of Windsor, it forms only a small proportion of the district. Generally, Sandwich should be considered

\textsuperscript{7} Demographic and Social Data For Human Services Planning, op. cit.
to be a stable upper-working-class community. The majority of the residents are employed among the unskilled and semi-skilled workers of the auto-plants.

South Windsor began to develop as a middle-class suburban area shortly after World War II. The area structures are modern, erected on what was previously farmland. High housing costs for the area have restricted its residents to those with somewhat above-average incomes. Area residences range from small modern bungalows to large executive homes, which are all relatively unaffected by industrial problems. Many of the district's occupants are engaged in employment connected with the auto industry but there are also many professionals of other fields as well as merchants of the city, in addition. Generally, South Windsor should be considered to be a middle-class community, ranging from the lower-middle to upper-middle class levels.

The Assignment of Social Class

During the course of this study, consideration was given to the utilization of the Hollingshead two-factor index of social position. However, at a meeting with Windsor's Public School Board, objections were raised to the

---

8August B. Hollingshead, "Two Factor Index of Social Position," Sherwin, Social Class Values and Deviant Behaviour, p. 39-40. Hollingshead's index categorizes occupational levels and educational levels into sets of categories which have given values. Values are multiplied by a weight factor and then summed to produce 'social position score.' Unfortunately, the values placed upon occupational categories would not apply in a test of social-class position in Windsor, where there appears to have been a merger of closely-related social class categories, except perhaps in the area
inclusion of information specifically requesting identification of father's occupation. As an alternative, the question was replaced by one asking the respondents to identify one of twelve different occupational categories which was closest to the occupation of their fathers. This proved to be a difficult question for a substantial number of students. In addition, many students were unable to assess their fathers' educational levels, even though the question had been simplified for them by asking them to indicate whether or not their fathers had completed certain standard levels of education.

A second problem, related to the use of Hollingshead's two-factor index of social position, is probably of greater concern here. There has been no test of social status devised for this community. Windsor has been an area where factory employees have obtained considerable occupational security. Factory workers are paid above-average incomes with special considerations in the case of temporary lay-offs and they have excellent pension plans. Their occupation has thus become more desirable than many of the occupations listed at a much higher level by the Hollingshead test.

of aspiration. Using the Hollingshead index, seventy eight percent of the Sandwich sample would have been categorized as lower-class juveniles, and forty two percent of the South Windsor sample would have been categorized likewise. However, many of the Sandwich respondents who would have been categorized as middle-class using the Hollingshead index were from homes where the father's occupation was listed in service industries and sales occupations which are less lucrative and secure than many jobs within the labourer category locally.
Consequently, the Hollingshead two-factor index of social status is not standardized for a highly unionized industrial city such as Windsor, and it would therefore be misleading to utilize it for the purposes of this study. In its place, we will assign middle-class status to the residents of South Windsor and working-class status to the residents of Sandwich. This alternative may not be totally accurate, but it is likely to provide a better comparison between middle- and lower-class groups than those presently available.

The Assignment of Meaning to Delinquent Acts

There was no confusion about the meaning of delinquent acts in Windsor during the early 1860s. A check of the Court Register for the period 1861-64 revealed that a total of four juveniles had been charged during that period—all for the commission of the crime of theft. During September of 1861, William Young, described as "a juvenile," received a sentence of thirty days at hard labour for "the theft of a dollar bank note and a collector's receipt for taxes." During 1863, Ralph Hewston received a thirty day sentence for "simple larceny," and during 1864, Alfred Fortier likewise received thirty days at hard labour for stealing a pair of shoes. The last juvenile listed in the Register was a female, Elmira Jane Taylor, who received twenty days at hard labour for the theft of a "worked skirt." Interestingly, it appears that in the case of Elmira, an original sentence of thirty days had been scratched from the Register and
replaced with the twenty days. Evidently the Court of that period had given consideration to Elmira's sex in determining her final sentence. The very fact that only four juveniles had been arrested and taken before the Court would suggest that considerable discretion had been exercised by those who were responsible for bringing offenders to justice.

The efforts of the "child savers" began to take effect within Ontario during the latter portion of the nineteenth century. During 1874, Ontario passed an Act requiring juvenile offenders to be sent to residential institutions which were less severe than were the reformatories to which they had previously been sent. During 1890, the passage of "An Act For The Protection And Reformation of Neglected Children" was passed into law. The Act required that juvenile offenders were to be disposed of separately from other offenders, and it provided for the appointment of special commissioners to hear charges against them.

The present legislation in existence, the "Juvenile Delinquents Act" was passed in 1908. This Act defines a delinquent as a child under the age of sixteen years who has violated any federal or provincial statute or the By-laws of a municipality, or who is liable by any other Act to...

9 Photostat copies of the records for the four early juvenile offenders will be found in the Appendices.

commital to an industrial school or juvenile reformatory. The Act provides for the Juvenile Courts to have jurisdiction in all juvenile matters. Efforts have been under way for several years to revise the Act, so far without success.\(^1\)

It has been a rule of practice among the police forces of Ontario that they exercise considerable discretion in their enforcement of the Act. Dennis Conly studied the police dispositions of juvenile offenders during the month of December, 1976, and it was found that within the province of Ontario, approximately twenty-five percent of juvenile offenders were charged, the balance either being referred to agencies or cautioned and released.\(^2\)

As a rule of thumb, it may be stated that in Windsor, police charge juveniles who have committed the kinds of offences for which adults would be charged. Exceptions to the rule would include the enforcement of truancy laws which are under the control of the educational authorities, and the enforcement of certain status offences, such as drinking liquor while under the age limit, and petty traffic infractions which are dealt with through an informal process. Nye and Short developed an eleven-item scale for reporting involvement.

\(^1\) Proposed new legislation, "The Young Offenders Act," has been tabled in Parliament for several years, but has not been enacted upon.

In delinquent behaviour by male school youths. Among their offence categories were: skipping school without excuse, sexual relations with the opposite sex, defying parental authority in their faces, and running away from home.13 None of the foregoing "delinquencies" would be enforced by the Windsor police. To be sure, runaways are held and returned to their parents, and the school authorities enforce truancy laws in cases of persistent truancy, but there are no laws governing defiance of parents or even sexual relations with the opposite sex except in certain specific circumstances.

Clinard and Quinney feel that it is necessary to delineate types of criminal behaviour according to the societal context of the criminal and the criminal act, in order to study crime as a social phenomenon. They developed a typology of criminal behaviour systems listed as follows:

- violent criminal behaviour,
- occasional property criminal behaviour,
- public order criminal behaviour,
- conventional criminal behaviour,
- political criminal behaviour,
- occupational criminal behaviour,
- corporate criminal behaviour,
- organized criminal behaviour,
- professional criminal behaviour.


behaviours into the various categories must require a series of value judgments, some of which are likely to be incorrect. It may be more appropriate in a study of this nature to utilize the legal offence categories for which juveniles are charged. An examination of the juvenile records for the year 1977 revealed that juvenile offenders committed offences within the following categories in descending order of frequency:

1. shoplifting
2. other thefts
3. willful damage to property
4. breaking & entering
5. disorderly conduct
6. assaults
7. vehicle thefts
8. traffic violations
9. arson
10. possession of weapons
11. bicycle thefts
12. liquor offences
13. possession of stolen goods
14. drug offences
15. indecent assaults
16. indecent acts
17. robberies
18. frauds
19. by-law offences
20. miscellaneous offences

Miscellaneous offences would include a variety of offences not categorized. Their numbers in each category are too few to list them within a separate category. Due to the fact that the foregoing categories are the kinds of offences for which juveniles are most frequently charged, they will form the basis for the offences listed in this study of juvenile delinquency in Windsor.

Official Juvenile Crime in Windsor

The reported incidences of crime occurring in Windsor throughout the year 1978 will be tabulated for each of the

15 Information retrieved by author from Windsor Police Youth Branch files.
fifty police zones throughout the city.

Information will be extracted from reports filed within the office of the Windsor Police Youth Branch relative to delinquent acts reported during the year. Whenever a juvenile is apprehended by police for committing a crime and there appears to be reasonable and probable grounds for believing that the juvenile did commit the offence, a police youth form is filed within the office.

The following variables are contained within a youth file:

- age
- sex
- whether from 'intact' or 'broken' home
- school grade level
- type of school attended
- religion
- whether or not the offence was admitted
- a list of contacts before the current contact
- number of others present during each offence listed
- country of birth, i.e. Canada or elsewhere
- racial origins of juvenile (not always available)
- offence category
- Sellin-Wolfgang score for each offence committed
- police action taken against the juvenile
- month of offence
- attitude of offender as perceived by police
- attitude of parent(s) as perceived by police
- zone where offence occurred
- zone where offender resides
- file number

All of the foregoing variables will be extracted from the files of the Police Youth Branch, since the amount of work required to remove those variables essential for this investigation will not be greatly exceeded by doing so.

The data for the two police districts, Sandwich and South Windsor will be extracted and compared with a survey sample obtained from the two districts. The data
will also be examined for differences in the delinquency rates of males and females, and for differences between the sexes in the types of crime committed.

According to Cohen, this sample should represent but a small fraction of delinquency occurring within the two districts. Female delinquency should not amount to more than one quarter of male delinquency and should be sexually-oriented. The lower-class district, Sandwich, should have a significantly larger percentage of delinquents than does South Windsor.

Thorston Sellin and Marvin E. Wolfgang developed an index of crime which alleges to measure the amount of harm caused to a community by any particular criminal or delinquent act. 16 Dr. Andre Normandieau of the University of Montreal modified the original version of the index for usage within Canada. 17 The Windsor Police Youth Branch utilized this

16 Thorston Sellin & Marvin E. Wolfgang, The Measurement of Delinquency (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964). Subsequently a manual describing the adaption of the Sellin-Wolfgang index for Canadian usage was published by Dogan D. Akman and Andre Normandeau, Centre for Study of Criminal Statistics, Department of Criminology, University of Montreal, Montreal, P.Q., during 1966. The manual is entitled, "A Manual for Constructing a Crime and Delinquency Index in Canada." The Windsor Police Youth Branch has modified this latter version of the index to meet bureaucratic needs within the department. A copy of the instructions issued to Youth Branch detectives describing point scores for the various offence categories will be found in the Appendixes.

17 Ibid.
version of the Index to determine the course of action to be taken against delinquent juveniles. If juveniles who have accumulated two or less points during the two years preceding their most recent offence are cautioned and released. Those who have accumulated three or four points during that time span are asked to enter a voluntary Diversion Programme and those who have accumulated five or more points are charged before the Juvenile Court. This index provides a useful instrument for measuring the extent and seriousness of the delinquent activities of categories of offenders and will be utilized in this study.

The data obtained from the police files could be questioned for its validity on the grounds that most of the juveniles within the sample have not been adjudged guilty through the legal process. However, the Windsor police records show that close to ninety percent of the officially recorded delinquents admitted their guilt, and in every case, sufficient evidence existed to permit charges to be laid if necessary. It is probably the most accurate description of delinquent activities known to the police that can be obtained. Should only those who were adjudged delinquents be represented, it is likely that the sample would be reduced to about five percent of its present size. This informal process is the norm in police-juvenile

---

18 Thorsten Sellin and Marvin Wolfgang, op. cit.
encounters within the city of Windsor. Slippage may occur due to the failure of certain members of the force to record data pertaining to delinquent activities, but this is not likely to be significant because a failure to record such data could result in disciplinary action against the officer.

It is anticipated, as Cohen had predicted, that the sample of juveniles known to the police will be a very small percentage of the delinquencies encountered within the survey sample which will be obtained. Jay R. Williams and Martin Gold conducted a survey of 847 thirteen to sixteen year old boys and girls who comprised the probability sample of the 1967 National Survey of Youth. That sample was compared with juveniles known to the police and it was found that only six percent of the boys and two percent of the girls who had committed offences were listed in the police files.

Short and Nye, in a comparison of institutionalized and non-institutionalized boys and girls, found that significantly higher proportions of the official delinquents committed all of the offence categories they had devised for their research, and had committed them more frequently than the boys and

19 In fact, during 1978, twelve percent of juvenile "contacts" were actually charged. Of those, slightly more than half entered a formal diversionary programme as an alternative to facing Court process.

girls who were non-institutionalized. 21

Cohen's position is that, despite the small proportion of delinquencies which become known to the police, the courts, and other social agencies, the official data probably reflects fairly accurately the division of juvenile crime by social class. That position will be examined by comparing the official data with the self-reported data obtained from the sample.

Constructing the Questionnaire

The questionnaire is required to be clearly comprehensible to students who were aged between ten and fifteen years at some period during 1978. It will, therefore, be worded as simply as possible. Since it is proposed to administer the questionnaire to students in their school classes, it is unlikely that the Boards of Education would entertain a questionnaire which could not be completed within a brief period. It was determined therefore to devise a questionnaire which could be completed by the younger students within about fifteen minutes. These factors preclude the use of extensive instruments of measure to determine values and attitudes, and to identify particular offences according to their legal propinquities.

Twenty two categories of offences were chosen for the
questionnaire and they are intended to conform with the
expected delinquent activities in which juveniles are
engaged in significant numbers. These expectations are
derived from previous personal studies of juvenile delinquent
activities in Windsor, related to official data.

In order to identify the values contained in Cohen's
middle-class measuring rod, a self-image check list which
had been devised by Robert C. Sherwin was inserted into the
questionnaire. This check list contains an abbreviated
version of Cohen's middle-class measuring rod and also
contains data intended to identify Walter Miller's lower-class
focal concerns.22 The data pertaining to Miller's focal
concerns was not removed because it may become useful for
a further study in this field.

Other variables inserted in the questionnaire include
age, sex, grade level, the family home situation and a
request for identification of the father's occupation and
level of education.23

22 Sherwin, Social Class Values and Deviant Behaviour,
pp. 43-44.

23 Father's education and grade level were inserted
for consideration of using the Hollingshead two-factor
index of social position.
Obtaining Consent to Administer the Questionnaire

In order to administer a questionnaire to school students, the consent of both Public and Separate School Boards of Windsor was required. In addition, it was felt that sanction for the project should be received from the Windsor Police Commission. Copies of the thesis proposal and a tentative questionnaire were sent to the three Boards for their consideration.

It was felt that any request for knowledge about sexual offences committed by juveniles may not be sanctioned by the Boards, so no questions of that nature were listed on the questionnaire. While such information is significant for considerations of Cohen's position regarding the sexual orientation of female delinquent acts, the loss of this information may not be of great importance for this study. The former offence category of 'sexual promiscuity' no longer exists within our juvenile legislation. Of all known juvenile offenders of Windsor during 1977, only 2.6 percent of them were involved in sexual offences, such as indecent assaults and indecent exposure.

The Windsor Police Commission objected to the inclusion of religious variables within the questionnaire, and requested that some questions should be rephrased to provide greater clarity. The loss of the religious variable should not be significant because knowledge of the religious 'balance' between the two police districts can be obtained through
knowledge of the distribution of this variable among the schools in which the questionnaires are to be distributed. In conclusion, the Board of Police Commissioners wrote that they would not object to the use of a questionnaire containing their proposed amendments.

At a meeting with the Public School Board, there were objections to the inclusion of a question requesting that the father's occupation be listed. This question was subsequently amended into twelve categories of occupation, one of which could be checked off as being closest to the occupation of the respondent's father. A question "Did the police catch you" was required to be replaced by the question "Were the police involved." This alteration could create some uncertainty about whether or not the police were actually involved with a particular juvenile who was party to an offence. Nevertheless, its adjustment became necessary because some Board members felt that the direct question originally cited may be found offensive by some individuals.

At a meeting with the Education Committee of the Separate School Board, the modified version of the questionnaire was accepted and no objections were raised about its contents.

The Pre-Test of the Questionnaire

A pre-test of the questionnaire occurred at a city high school which will be unnamed in this report due to an
agreement with educational authorities not to identify individual schools. Questionnaires were administered by teachers to forty six students aged between fourteen and sixteen years.

The students appeared to have no difficulties in completing the questionnaire within the fifteen minute time frame. Clearly, there was a good understanding of the questions by the students except in one category, "father's occupation," where they were asked to fit their fathers' occupations into one of twelve categories. Since these students were among the older students to be tested, it was clear that it would become a problem to answer. The Public School Board's researcher was approached and it was agreed to accept the insertion of an addition to the questions by asking the respondents to list their father's occupation should they be unable to fit it into one of the twelve categories.

The Distribution of the Questionnaire

Ideally, a questionnaire should have been distributed to all juveniles aged ten to fifteen who during 1978 resided in the police districts of Sandwich and South Windsor, failing which a true random sampling of those juveniles should have been obtained. Unfortunately, those ideal states could not be achieved in a study of this nature. Therefore, it was decided that schools which appear to be representative of
the populations within each district would be selected for the distribution of the questionnaire.

After meeting with several school principals, and discussing the objectives of this research, it was their opinion that students would probably respond more truthfully if the questionnaires were administered by the teachers. They would be asked to assure the students that nothing contained within their completed questionnaires could or would be used against them in any way; that they were to circle the appropriate responses to the questions asked, and thus would not become identified even to their teachers. The students were to be further instructed not to place their names or addresses anywhere on the questionnaire. They were advised that the objective of the study was to gain additional knowledge about the behaviour of young people in today's society and that the researcher was a sociology student of the University of Windsor. Teachers were to stress the need for truthful answers to the questions asked in order for the research to be meaningful and of value to the community.

According to the data obtained by the city of Windsor's Tax Enumeration Census for 1978, 1,398 males and 1,297 females presently aged between ten and fifteen years reside within South Windsor's police district, and 1,218 males and 1,168 females within that age category reside within the Sandwich police district. Therefore, a sample
of approximately 1,000 juveniles would represent about twenty percent of the combined juvenile populations of the two police districts. It is anticipated that a sample of this size may overcome many of the problems associated with the failure to randomize according to the rules of randomization.

Approximately ninety percent of the public high school students within each district actually live within the boundaries of their own districts, and about ninety-five percent of public and separate school students of the schools within each district actually live within their districts. Thus there is a minor problem of slippage associated with defining district of residence with the school attended.

A second problem of slippage occurs with the presence of vocational schools throughout the city. Vocational schools usually select those students whose academic achievements fail to meet the standards required for entry to the city's high schools. These vocational schools are filled with students from many police districts through the city and it is likely that many of these students are from the lower class. A small percentage would reside within South Windsor and a larger percentage of them would come from Sandwich. However, the age categories involved, fourteen to fifteen years, will not affect the younger juveniles' representation within the sample.
Consideration was given to entering one vocational school located close to both South Windsor and Sandwich for the purpose of having boys and girls from South Windsor and Sandwich fill out questionnaires. However, this would have created difficulties because only parts of each class would be comprised of Sandwich and South Windsor students and it would not be appropriate to attempt to single them out as recipients of the questionnaire. It is not anticipated that the bias stemming from this source is sufficient to have a strong impact upon the results of the survey.

One other form of slippage stems from the absence from school on any given day of chronic truants and those students who have left school before attaining the age of sixteen years.

The school authorities were concerned over the possibility that individual schools would become identified and compared for the self-reported delinquent acts of their students. In deference to those concerns, no details will be provided which would identify individual schools in that regard. It can be stated that the largest proportion of the sample was received from six schools, three being within each district. In addition, thirty-two questionnaires were obtained from one other school. The test questionnaires received from this school have been included in the overall sample but are not included in any tests of comparison between the two police districts.
I am satisfied that the sample thus obtained reflects satisfactorily the religious, racial and ethnic compositions of the juveniles of the two police districts being tested. In addition, there are few differences of race, religion and ethnicity between the populations of the two districts.

A total of 1,050 questionnaires were distributed among the schools. Of those, 978 were returned completed or largely completed. Most of the incomplete questionnaires contained sufficient data to permit them to be included in the sample. Much of the missing data was related to incomplete middle-class measuring rod items. In thirteen cases, there was a failure to identify age and sex. Four questionnaires implied involvement by the respondents in every offence category listed. Six other respondents raised strong doubts about the honesty of their responses when it became apparent that they had given very little attention to the wording of the questions. This became apparent when it was observed that questions would be ticked off straight down a column.

In order to seek out this kind of response, some of the yes-no response requests had been reversed. Nine students appeared to have lacked adequate reading comprehension, deduced from the manner in which they had answered some of the questions. All of these questionnaires were removed from the sample. Four computer cards were destroyed during a card sorting operation so that the total sample left amounted to 942 cases. Forty five of those cases, though used
within the overall sample, were excluded from consideration during comparisons between Sandwich and South Windsor because they came from a school which had many students from locations other than the two districts.

Verification of the Data

A crucial question which cannot be answered with certainty, is whether or not the behaviours attributed to themselves by the respondents accurately reflected their delinquent acts of 1978.

Cohen himself has suggested that juveniles would respond frankly to those seeking this kind of data where the circumstances would assure them of anonymity.24 Certainly, the students who were asked to respond to this questionnaire were assured of their personal anonymity. Not only were they verbally assured, but the fact that they had but to circle the correct responses to questions would also provide them with confidence that they could not become identified.

Some students may have falsified their questionnaire responses out of caprice, or perhaps due to feelings of antagonism upon being asked to respond to this type of questionnaire. Teachers with whom this consideration was discussed advised that most students had filled out the questionnaire without apparent resentment. Many of the

students appeared to enjoy the change of routine brought about by the introduction of the questionnaire. They appeared to approve of the objectives of the questionnaire as explained to them by their teachers. One teacher remarked that she felt some students derived a certain amount of satisfaction from the act of sharing knowledge about their delinquent activities with others. However, as with all questionnaires, whatever the safeguards, there can be no conclusive evidence of validity.

One means of assessing the authenticity of the students' responses to the questionnaires is to examine the responses to the questions concerning delinquent acts. Those types of offences which are normally expected to have a high level of juvenile involvement should be more prevalent within the sample. It is likely that there is a high level of juvenile involvement in such offences as marijuana possession, consuming liquor, petty assaults and shoplifting. All of these offences were found at a high level within the sample.

Slippage may occur as a consequence of the transfer of meaning. Because of the age category of the respondents, the offence categories were defined in a simple fashion. The legal definitions are actually far more complicated. Undoubtedly the basic ingredients of each offence were presented, but no consideration was provided for certain conditions which must be present for legal guilt to be established. There was an absence of knowledge about
mens rea, or "guilty mind" and in the case of thefts, the animus ferandi, or intent to steal. Many assaults for example, may have been acts of self-defence in which only sufficient force for self-protection was used.

There also may have been problems of memory recall by the respondents. They were asked to remember events which took place at least six months and as far back as eighteen months before they received the questionnaire. My own suggestion is that it is likely that juveniles retain memories of unlawful activities in which they had participated for periods longer than their memories of many other activities. The fear of being apprehended, or group discussions about past escapades, may serve to retain their unlawful activities within their memories for periods longer than what is usual for many other events of their lives. Certainly many juveniles who have been apprehended by the police are able to recall past delinquent events with a remarkable clarity. Nevertheless, there is bound to be some slippage due to poor memory recall. Events which occurred within the recent past may have been listed by some of the respondents.

Whatever limitations are imposed upon the accuracy of the survey because of the considerations mentioned, or because of other considerations, the author read all of the completed questionnaires and derived an impression that the respondents had dealt with them in a serious manner. It
Is likely that they responded truthfully and their responses are closely related to their actual involvement in delinquent activities during 1978.
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Official and Self-Reported Data

The official data was obtained from the files of 1,002 juveniles who had been recorded as delinquents during 1978. The self-reported data is derived from a sample of 942 students who reside in the police districts of Sandwich and South Windsor. Table I compares the two samples for their concordance.

| TABLE I |
| Sample Concordance Between Official Delinquents and Self-Reporting Sample |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Delinquents</th>
<th>Self-Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 1,002</td>
<td>N = 942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 10 - 12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 13 - 15</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents home</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken homes</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The self-reporting sample is not yet categorized for involvement or non-involvement in delinquent acts. Therefore, within the category of sex, the sample group represents an
approximation of the sex distribution throughout the city. The home situation reported for the sample group closely represents differences between married, 2-parent families, and widowed, separated or divorced families in Windsor.

The examination of the official data reveals that 1,002 juveniles had been involved in delinquent acts during 1978. Some of these juveniles had committed more than one delinquent act and a total of 1,354 offences were dealt with by apprehending juvenile offenders. Charges were laid against twelve percent of the 1,002 juveniles as they had accumulated five or more points under the Windsor Police Youth Branch's modified Sellin-Wolfgang index of crime measurement. Of the twelve percent who were charged, only approximately five percent actually entered the Court process. The balance among them chose to enter a diversionary programme as an alternative to Court. However, some of the five percent who did face Court proceedings were also charged on several other occasions throughout the year. Cohen stated that it was certain that the delinquencies officially recorded were never more than a fraction of the total number, and the foregoing information supports his contention.

The official data also revealed that more than one juvenile offender had been involved in at least sixty four percent of all of the official cases. Because the Windsor Police do not record a contact without having a basis of

\[1\] Cohen, *Delinquent Gangs*, p. 36.
reasonable and probable grounds, it is likely that others were involved in many of the balance of thirty six percent of all cases. It is known that friends were present in many instances of delinquent acts but they were not officially recorded for the reason mentioned. The data thus may fit Cohen's conception of gang activity.

Of the 942 juveniles within the self-reporting sample, fourteen percent stated that they had not been involved in any delinquent activities during 1978. Those declaring their delinquent acts reported a total of 15,412 delinquent acts among them. Because the highest category used in the questionnaire to determine the extent of involvement was six, the actual totals would have exceeded that figure by, perhaps, several hundreds.

By using the modal Sellin-Wolfgang scores of the official data for each offence category, and applying those scores to the offence categories, listed for the self-reporting delinquents, an estimated sixty seven percent of the self-reporting sample would have achieved a score in excess of four points and would thus have been charged by the police, had their delinquencies become known to them. Had each juvenile offender committed an equal number of offences, each would have been involved in an offence on at least nineteen occasions during the year.

Cohen has inferred that the data obtained from self-reported delinquents may be swollen because of the inclusion of many trivial acts which, though officially
delinquent, are far less serious than most of the delinquent acts which cause juveniles to be brought before the Courts.\(^2\)

Table II (a & b) reveals the order of frequency for the official data and provides a comparison with the self-reported data.

\[ \text{TABLE II} \]

(a) \hspace{2cm} (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Frequency for Offence Categories Within Official Sample of Delinquents</th>
<th>Order of Frequency for Offence Categories Within Self-Reporting Sample of Delinquents &amp; Non-Delinquents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Order</strong></td>
<td><strong>#</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shoplifting</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other thefts</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wilful damage</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>break &amp; enter</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disorderly</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assaults</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic viol.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take vehicle</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle thefts</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss. stolen goods</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquor offences</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug offences</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weapons offences</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miscellaneous</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frauds</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robberies</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex/offsences</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prowling</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noteworthy that offences in the "disorderly" category predominate among the self-reporting delinquents, but offences within that category are placed fifth among the official data.

\(^2\) Cohen, op. cit., p. 41.
The serious offence of breaking and entering is listed fourth among the official delinquents and last among the self-reporting delinquents. Generally, it becomes apparent that Cohen's opinions are reflected within the data of the two samples. Nevertheless, if the self-reported data are an accurate reflection of community behaviour among juveniles aged between ten and fifteen years, it must be concluded that official agencies of social control have only a minor impact upon the behaviour of juveniles. The self-reporting sample is comprised of only 4.85 percent of the total juvenile population within the age category of ten to fifteen years. If one could project the sample into the general population of that age category, which cannot be done with any assurance of accuracy, only approximately one of every 235 delinquent acts were resolved by the police by charge, or otherwise, during 1978. But the police have involvement with many juveniles against whom insufficient evidence could be obtained to register them as 'official' delinquents. Table III illustrates responses to the question, "Were the police involved," among the juveniles who were involved, frequently or otherwise, with the various offence categories.

It appears that the police are most likely to become involved in matters considered by them to be more serious. Breaking and entering and arson appear to have been priority items for police attention. There is substantial support for Cohen's belief that a large proportion of self-reported
TABLE III
Extent of Police Intervention
With Self-Reporting Delinquents
Reporting Involvement
In 22 Categories of Offences
N = 804

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disorderly by</th>
<th>Number of Juveniles Involved</th>
<th># with whom Police were Involved</th>
<th>Category Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using bad language</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consume liquor</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic violations</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke pot</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from stores</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damage</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructing</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Stolen Articles</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other thefts</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have weapon</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from neighbour</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery by threats</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary arson</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take auto</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from autos</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break and Enter</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal bicycle</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take drugs</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery - violence</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery - armed</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

delinquent acts are likely to be comparatively minor acts of delinquency.

Reiss and Bordua made the following comments about crime and its clearance by police:
... both the volume of crime known to the police and the proportion cleared by arrest is some function of how much resources it takes to gain knowledge of a particular crime and clear it by arrest. No department can exceed its resource capacity. Since beyond a certain point the amount of resources necessary to clear a crime exceeds the willingness of the society to allocate additional resources, it perhaps is not surprising that three out of all four crimes known to the police will remain unsolved.

**Sex Differentials**

According to Cohen, female delinquencies are at most one quarter as frequent as male delinquencies. This is certainly true of the delinquents listed within the files of the Windsor Police Department during 1978. Only fifteen percent of the 1,002 official delinquents were females. The overwhelming majority of them had been involved in shoplifting offences. Of the 151 females listed for their first offence during 1978, seventy five had been apprehended for shoplifting, twenty one for assaults, fifteen for being disorderly, ten for liquor offences and the balance had committed a variety of offences in small numbers. Only eight females had scored more than five points on the Sellin-Wolfgang Index of crime measurement. Many of the female shoplifters were known to have been apprehended while stealing articles intended for self-beautification or adornment. The official data would thus tend to support Cohen's views.

---

In order to provide comparisons between male and female delinquent acts among the self-reported delinquents and non-delinquents of Sandwich and South Windsor, offences were organized into four general categories. All forms of thefts were categorized together. Destructive acts included property damage and the two categories of arson. Unruly conduct included assaults and the two forms of disorderly conduct listed within the questionnaires.

**TABLE IV**

Comparisons Between Male and Female Self-Reported Delinquents and Non-Delinquents of Sandwich & South Windsor for Their Involvement in 4 Categories of Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Category</th>
<th>MALES N = 435</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>1-4 Offences</td>
<td>5+ Offences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly conduct</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thefts</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Offences</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive Acts</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Category</th>
<th>FEMALES N = 453</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>1-4 Offences</td>
<td>5+ Offences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly conduct</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thefts</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Offences</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive Acts</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status offences included liquor and drug offences. The differences may be examined above in Table IV.
It is apparent that there are differences of involvement within the categorized delinquent acts between the sexes, but the differences are far less significant than the differences predicted by Cohen. Unruly conduct consisted largely of disorderly acts and assaults. Within this category, which would probably fall within Cohen's definitions of "corneriness and hell-raising," there is a surprisingly high level of female involvement. Though the females are less extensively involved within all categories of offences, there is no support for Cohen's prediction of male delinquency being at least four times as frequent as female delinquency.

Obviously, then, if the self-reporting delinquents have truthfully represented their delinquencies in their questionnaire responses, a great deal of female delinquency remains hidden from the official agencies of crime control. It is possible that changes within the attitudes and values of females have occurred since Cohen made his prediction of the extent of female involvement in delinquent acts. It is also possible that attitudes and values within the overall society have traditionally excluded a large number of female acts of delinquency from the files of official agencies of crime control.

Social Class Differentials

The test of social class differentials is of the greatest significance in this study. Should it be found that there are few differences between the middle- and lower-
class categories of offenders, then Cohen's theory would not hold. It is essential that the lower-class delinquents reveal a greater amount of involvement in most categories of offences, and markedly so.

The official data reveals that 169 juveniles of Sandwich aged between ten and fifteen years were recorded as delinquents by police. Only fifty eight juveniles of South Windsor within that age span were so recorded. The official data thus would appear to lend support to Cohen's stated opinion that lower-class juveniles are significantly more involved in delinquent acts than are middle-class juveniles. However, the data obtained by the police is not likely to represent more than a token sample of delinquents from the two districts. Further, these token samples may be biased because of differences in police activities within the two districts and different attitudes towards reporting delinquent acts between the two districts.

In order to test Cohen's position that lower-class juveniles are more likely to become involved in delinquent activities than are middle-class juveniles, and with a greater frequency and intensity, the following hypothesis will be tested:

The lower-class juveniles of Sandwich who responded to the questionnaire about their delinquent or non-delinquent activities during 1978 will manifest a significantly higher involvement in delinquent activities than the middle-class juveniles of South Windsor who responded to the questionnaire about their delinquent or non-delinquent activities during 1978, and this is due to their social class positions.
Transforming this hypothesis into the null form, we will stipulate that no differences should appear between the involvement in delinquent activities of either social class group. We expect to reject the null hypothesis and accept its alternatives. Since the testing of this hypothesis will involve the examination of twenty two categories of offences, and the hypothesis stipulates that the amount of difference between the two categories of juveniles should be significant, at least two thirds of the tested relationships should be significant in the direction predicted in order to reject the null hypothesis. The .05 level of significance will be applied in this test.

The results of the test are found within Table V. Since the predicted level of significance was achieved in sixteen of the twenty two offence categories tested, we can reject the null hypothesis and accept its alternatives. It is noted that significance at the .01 level would have been achieved in half of the twenty two categories. Cohen's position is thus supported by the results of this test.

It remains now to examine the data for males only, within the two districts, in order to ascertain values as measured by Cohen's middle-class measuring rod. We have received support for Cohen's position that lower-class boys are more likely to become delinquent but Cohen's beliefs about female delinquency are not substantially supported by this study.
### TABLE V

Comparisons between Middle- and Lower-Class Respondents as Represented by Their Districts of Residence, for Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Activities Related to 22 Categories of Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Categories</th>
<th>SANDWICH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>S. WINDSOR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non off</td>
<td>end</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>off end</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>off end</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>off end</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery-violence</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery-threats</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery-armed</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break and Enter</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take vehicle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal bicycle</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal-neighbours</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from auto</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from store</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel elsewhere</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have stolen goods</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have weapons</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary arson</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly-langu.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly-obstr.</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke pot</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take other Drugs</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consume liquor</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic violation</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.11**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .01 level
* significant at .05 level

+ secondary arson denotes deliberately or recklessly set fires which could have caused fires in valuable buildings or structures.
Cohen's Middle-Class Measuring Rod

In this section, we will be examining the components of the middle-class measuring rod and testing it for its validity among two samples of male delinquents and non-delinquents; one representing middle-class respondents, and the other, lower-class respondents.

Due to the small number of completely non-delinquent male respondents, traffic offences will be excluded from consideration in this section. Also, those boys whose Sellin-Wolfgang index scores amounted to less than five points will be categorized as non-delinquents and those who were assigned five or more points will be categorized as delinquents. These conditions are necessary to provide measurable numbers within the tables. They may also comply with Cohen's concerns about the prevalence of trivial acts among self-reported data.

The testing of each hypothesis will involve the examination of a number of relationships, therefore, should at least one half of the tested relationships achieve the predicted statistical significance, the null hypothesis will be rejected and its alternatives will be accepted. This arbitrary standard should be sufficiently high to avoid the erroneous rejection of the null hypothesis on the basis of chance, and sufficiently low to avoid an assumption that the techniques of measurement are free of defects.
PRIMARY HYPOTHESIS I: Middle-class non-delinquents subscribe to and endorse the values contained in the middle-class measuring rod with a greater frequency and/or intensity than lower-class delinquents.

Transforming this hypothesis into the null form, no differences should appear when the middle-class non-delinquents' endorsement of the middle-class measuring rod are compared with the lower-class delinquents' endorsement. We should expect to reject the null hypothesis and accept its alternatives. The testing of this hypothesis should provide an indicator of whether or not a middle-class measuring rod exists within the boundaries of the city of Windsor and if it is endorsed by middle-class juveniles.

Cohen has defined eleven items among the checklist responses as having a positive valence, and they are expected to be more frequently endorsed by middle-class respondents. These eleven items are: ambitious, thrifty, trustworthy, courteous, polite, college-bound, intelligent, studious, neat, good manners, and interest in art and literature. Four other items are defined as having a negative valence and therefore should be more frequently rejected by the middle-class respondents than by the lower-class respondents. These four items are: stubborn, lazy, bored, and gambler. The final item - good athlete - is ascribed by Cohen to the middle class, but others have also ascribed it to

---

working-class boys. As a result, this item will be considered to be value-neutral. Table VI presents the responses made to the middle-class measuring rod items.

Only four of the middle-class measuring rod characteristics reflect differences significant at the .05 level. The measuring rod items - courteous and polite - would have achieved significance at the 0.10 level, but the balance of the measuring rod items do not reveal a significant differentiation in the responses made by middle-class non-delinquents and lower-class delinquents. Table VI reveals the percentages of middle-class non-delinquents and lower-class delinquents who responded affirmatively to the middle-class measuring rod. The former were more supportive of the measuring rod items in twelve of the fifteen categories.

We cannot reject the null hypothesis and cannot therefore conclude that middle-class non-delinquents subscribe to or endorse the values contained in the middle-class measuring rod with a greater frequency and/or intensity than lower-class delinquents.

PRIMARY HYPOTHESIS II: Lower-class non-delinquents subscribe to and endorse the values contained in the middle-class measuring rod with a greater frequency and/or intensity than lower-class delinquents.

Transforming this hypothesis into the null form, no differences in value endorsement should appear between
### TABLE VI

**Self-Ascription of Middle-Class Measuring Rod Characteristics by Middle-Class Non-Delinquents and Lower-Class Delinquents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Middle-Class Non-Delinquents</th>
<th>Lower-Class Delinquents</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Val. No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>+ 51 91</td>
<td>5 9</td>
<td>165 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrifty</td>
<td>+ 19 35</td>
<td>35 65</td>
<td>75 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>+ 49 89</td>
<td>6 11</td>
<td>162 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>+ 45 83</td>
<td>9 17</td>
<td>137 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>+ 51 91</td>
<td>6 9</td>
<td>150 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Bound</td>
<td>+ 44 80</td>
<td>16 30</td>
<td>117 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>+ 37 70</td>
<td>25 45</td>
<td>131 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studious</td>
<td>+ 38 70</td>
<td>6 11</td>
<td>140 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Manners</td>
<td>+ 49 89</td>
<td>6 11</td>
<td>142 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Lit.</td>
<td>+ 22 43</td>
<td>29 57</td>
<td>75 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td>- 24 44</td>
<td>30 56</td>
<td>121 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>- 20 36</td>
<td>35 64</td>
<td>70 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>- 19 36</td>
<td>34 64</td>
<td>60 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambler</td>
<td>- 15 30</td>
<td>35 70</td>
<td>99 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Athlete</td>
<td>+ 43 80</td>
<td>11 20</td>
<td>153 78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valence indicates the predicted direction middle-class respondents should differ from lower-class respondents.

*Statistically significant at the .05 level.
lower-class non-delinquents and delinquents. Should Cohen be correct, the null hypothesis should be rejected and its alternative accepted. We have failed to demonstrate the existence of a middle-class measuring rod when testing middle-class non-delinquents against lower-class delinquents. However, this test may provide additional insights into the adequacy of Cohen's formulation. The responses to the self-image word check list are presented in Table VII.

Of the fifteen middle-class characteristics expected to produce statistically significant differences between the categories compared in Table VII, six of them actually achieve significance at the .05 level. These items are: courteous, good manners, interest in art and literature, stubborn, lazy and gambler. The measuring rod items - polite, studious and neat would have achieved significance at the .10 level. The computed percentages for all fifteen categories fall in the predicted direction. We cannot reject the null hypothesis, however, and we cannot conclude that lower-class non-delinquents subscribe to and endorse the values contained in the middle-class measuring rod with a greater frequency and/or intensity than lower-class delinquents.

SECONDARY HYPOTHESIS III: Middle-class delinquents subscribe to and endorse the values contained in the middle-class measuring rod with a greater frequency and/or intensity than lower-class delinquents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Val. No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious *</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrifty *</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous +</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite +</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Bound +</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent +</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studious +</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat +</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Manners Interested in Art, Lit. +</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valence indicates the predicted direction lower-class non-delinquents should differ from lower-class delinquents.

*Statistically significant at the .05 level.
Transforming this hypothesis into the null form, no differences should appear when the middle-class delinquents' endorsement of the middle-class measuring rod items are compared with the lower-class endorsement of the same measuring rod.

The responses are presented in Table VIII. Only one of the fifteen measuring rod characteristics actually achieved significance at the .05 level in the predicted direction, and that was the "courteous" item. The measuring rod items - thrifty, trustworthy, polite, college bound, studious, and good manners, would have achieved significance at the 0.10 level in the predicted direction. The item "lazy" was significant at the .05 level in the opposite direction, and "neat" would have been statistically significant in the opposite direction at the 0.10 level. An examination of the computed percentages in Table VIII reveals that the middle-class delinquents responded more favourably in the predicted direction in eight instances, but in six instances, the lower-class delinquents responded more favourably in the predicted direction. While the two delinquent categories are not identical in the degree to which they accept the middle-class measuring rod, there is significantly less difference between them than there is between the non-delinquent categories of either social class. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Consequently, we are unable to state that middle-class delinquents will subscribe to or endorse the values contained in the middle-class measuring rod with a greater frequency and/or intensity than lower-class delinquents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Middle-Class Delinquents</th>
<th>Lower-Class Delinquents</th>
<th>Corrected Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Val. No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>+ 110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrifty</td>
<td>+ 59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>+ 120</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>+ 113</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>+ 112</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Bound</td>
<td>+ 85</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>+ 98</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studious</td>
<td>+ 51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat</td>
<td>+ 77</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Manners</td>
<td>+ 107</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in Art, Lit.</td>
<td>+ 46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stubborn</td>
<td>- 82</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>- 70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>- 47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambler</td>
<td>- 64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Athlete</td>
<td>+ 107</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valence indicates the predicted direction middle-class respondents should differ from lower-class respondents.

*Statistically significant at the .05 level.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was designed to examine empirically the distribution of juvenile delinquent activities among juveniles residing within an urban industrial environment. The study also provided an opportunity to examine the views of a theoretician upon this subject. The views expressed by Albert K. Cohen were selected for comparisons with the findings derived from this study, largely because Cohen provided clear definitions about the expected differences of delinquent activities which may be found.

It is reasonable to assume that Cohen was influenced by his own expectations about the distributions of delinquent activities within an urban community when he developed his theory of male juvenile working-class delinquent gangs. Should Cohen's expectations fail to be reflected in an empirical test, there would be reason to question the validity of his theory. In addition, at least one critical aspect of Cohen's theory, i.e., the existence of a middle-class measuring rod which is rejected and "turned around" by lower-class male gang members, could be tested empirically, and empiricism appears to have been lacking in the development of this aspect of the theory. Thus empirical support for or against the middle-class measuring rod items would
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permit further qualification of the theory.

Cohen has indicated a belief that official statistics record only a small fraction of offenses committed by juveniles. This inquiry upholds that belief, and the data uses the same criteria that is used to define official delinquents. The self-reported data indicates that Cohen's small fraction may amount to less than one two-hundredth of all delinquent acts occurring within the age group of ten to fifteen years, during one full year. It is not known whether or not he had that kind of small fraction in mind, but he was aware of studies which had, at that time, pointed in that direction.

Cohen indicated that the data obtained from self-reported respondents is swollen by the inclusion of many trivial acts which, though defined as delinquent, are far less serious than most of the delinquent acts which are brought before the Courts. The results of this inquiry would tend to support that conclusion because many of the delinquent acts reported by the respondents were truly of a trivial nature. Many acts of a disorderly nature would probably not have been acted upon either by the public or the police beyond a verbal caution. Many assaults occur among juveniles which do not result in serious harm and they are passed off by persons in authority, and the public.

Cohen, Delinquent Boys, page 39, quoted from the findings of Frederic M. Thrasher, William W. Wattenberg and Austin L. Porterfield, all of whom had identified the existence of extensive hidden delinquency.
as part of the growing-up process.

However, the survey data revealed that the majority of the respondents (67%) had been involved in delinquent acts of sufficient seriousness and frequency to have been charged by the police had their delinquencies been detected. Cohen agrees that the majority of juveniles are delinquents, but he declines to revise his opinion that delinquency is most heavily concentrated among the working class.²

We have attempted to determine whether or not a middle-class measuring rod exists within the city of Windsor, and if it does, whether or not the rod items are differentially endorsed by delinquent and non-delinquent representatives of middle- and lower-class boys.

The following rank order is obtained by ordering the four categories of social class according to their endorsement of the measuring rod items. The percentages are achieved by obtaining the mean endorsement for each group.

1. Lower-class non-delinquents - 75 percent
2. Middle-class non-delinquents - 70 percent
3. Middle-class delinquents - 64 percent
4. Lower-class delinquents - 62 percent

The middle-class non-delinquents should have achieved the highest level of endorsement but failed to do so, being five percentage points lower in ranking than the lower-class non-delinquents. There are only two percentage points

²Cohen, Delinquent Boys, p. 38.
separating the middle- and lower-class delinquents. The only substantial differences in endorsement are between delinquent and non-delinquent boys, but all groups provide a majority who endorse the middle-class measuring rod. This result does not support Cohen's predictions of a pattern of differential endorsement. The results are indicative of delinquent - non-delinquent status being more closely associated with the middle-class measuring rod than are the social class positions of the respondents. Furthermore, the results do not support Cohen's contention that lower-class delinquents reject the values contained in the middle-class measuring rod.

Cohen states categorically that female delinquency amounts to between one sixth and one fourth of male delinquency, and is mostly sexually-related delinquency. The official statistics support this contention because most females were shoplifters who stole articles intended for self-beautification, and females did comprise slightly less than one sixth of the total number of official delinquents filed within the Windsor Police Department throughout the year 1978.

The self-reported data however, fails to provide support for Cohen's beliefs about characteristic female delinquency. Cohen had emphasized that females did not commit the kinds of offences which boys commit. He spoke specifically about stealing, other property offences, "unneriness and hell-raising," as primarily the practices of the male.³ While males outscored females within all

³ Cohen, op.cit., p. 45.
of those categories, the differences were not as significant as Cohen has proposed. Only in one category, "the destruction of property," were females involved less than one half as much as were males. Nor were the females greatly behind the males in the frequency and seriousness of their involvement in delinquent activities in general.

The comparison between social class and delinquent activities is probably the most important one and it is crucial that Cohen's views should be supported in order for his theory to be upheld. A comparison between official delinquents of Sandwich and South Windsor, representing lower- and middle-class delinquents respectively, supported Cohen's contention that delinquency is most heavily concentrated among working-class groups. The Sandwich group outnumbered the South Windsor group by almost three to one.

Similar differences were not indicated within the self-reported data, but that data provided evidence to support Cohen's contentions about the relationship between social class and delinquent activities. Lower-class boys were more frequently involved in twenty-one of twenty-two offence categories which had been examined. The exception, the taking of an automobile without consent of the owner, may perhaps be explained by the greater availability of automobiles among the middle-classes. Undoubtedly, many of the middle-class respondents took vehicles belonging to members of their families without first obtaining consent.
Finally, Cohen's middle-class measuring rod was tested against the sample of lower-class and middle-class boys of Sandwich and South Windsor and the results failed to provide support for this important aspect of his theory of delinquent gangs. Lower-class non-delinquents actually obtained the highest scores in support of the middle-class measuring rod. The majority of both categories of delinquents did support the values contained within the middle-class measuring rod and there were few differences in the extent of their support. No evidence is found to support Cohen's view that the middle-class measuring rod is inverted in the case of lower-class delinquents.

Should the data obtained from the self-reported delinquents be correct, it is doubtful that Cohen's theory of delinquent gangs can be supported when applied to a Canadian urban industrial society.

It is possible that there are differences within the social class categories which exist within Canada, when compared with the social class categories existing within the United States. Unfortunately, there appears to be a dearth of literature dealing with this subject in Canada.

It also appears possible that the distinctions made between the delinquent and non-delinquent status of the boys used within this study inadequately reflect the distinctions made by Cohen between the two categories of boys. The delinquent ascription was given to those boys who would have achieved a minimum score of five points, using the
Sellin-Wolfgang Index of Measurement. The non-delinquent ascription was given to those boys who had scored less than five points. In other words, some of the 'non-delinquents' were actually petty and occasional offenders and a few of the 'delinquents' were only slightly more involved in delinquent activities. However, a majority of those categorized as delinquent scored considerably more than five points, using the Sellin-Wolfgang Index as the measurement of delinquent activities.

Cohen mentioned that he was referring to delinquent gangs of boys in his study. It may be that this experiment failed to adequately identify boys as gang members. Previous studies of juvenile delinquents of Windsor had revealed that the vast majority of official delinquents committed their offences with other juveniles, or in the presence of other juveniles. It was on that basis that no special effort was made to identify boys as gang members, but rather to assume a kind of gang membership among most of the juvenile delinquents. Whether or not this adequately reflects Cohen's understanding of gangs is certainly questionable.

We cannot state that the data is correct. We can only say that there is no strong reason why it should not be correct, or reasonably so. Undoubtedly a greater measure of scientific accuracy could have been achieved in this test, but at what cost? It does not appear that funds will be provided to conduct similar experiments with the kind of accuracy that science seeks. This writer was unable to obtain even a
very small allowance from government to cover expenses incurred during this experiment.

The importance of obtaining data relevant to delinquency research apparently may not be understood by some functionaries in the criminal justice process. Yet the results of inquiries of this nature must be relevant to their functions of maintaining the justice system. I am suggesting that it would be well for the bureaucrats to have some idea of what is actually going on! Should they actually be aware of the extent of delinquency, it is not manifested within the literature sent out for public consumption.

My suggestion is that it would be most useful to have similar experiments carried out within other industrial communities of our country and particularly of our province of Ontario. Should the results obtained match the expectations derived from this study, then we will have reasonable assurance of its validity. We will then be in a position where we understand the magnitude of the problem. Having knowledge of the extent and form of delinquency will enable us to develop appropriate means of combatting the problem. Government, which has a vital stake in this issue, can then apply the appropriate means of combatting this apparently serious problem.

There are causes for delinquency patterns presently existing within a society which are extremely subtle and complex, and best left to the theoreticians of the social sciences to determine and explain. There are also some
rather obvious conditions existing within society which tend to lead to increased delinquent activity among its juvenile members.

The data presented in Table II reveals that from a sample of 942 lower- and middle-class youngsters aged ten to fifteen years, there were at least 976 occurrences of shoplifting among them. Most of these juvenile shoplifters were not apprehended during the commission of their offences, and for obvious reasons. There has been a trend towards the 'supermarket' in which articles are displayed in tempting arrangements on large counters. Many such counters are frequently unattended by staff. The purchaser has but to pick up his purchases from the counters and take them to a checkout area at one end of the store where he or she is required to make payment for the articles. Many shoppers simply "browse" around in these supermarkets and, without making purchases, leave by way of the checkout areas. This procedure permits those who have accepted an opportunity to steal, to conceal merchandise and walk out of these supermarkets without paying for it. Presumably, this merchandising method is financially rewarding for the merchants, but its negative aspect is that people, and particularly young persons, may be tempted to take advantage of the opportunities to steal, and obviously many of them do.

The deterrence factor created by the advertised presence of store security staff, and by campaigns devoted
to the identification of shoplifting with other forms of
theft, is quite obviously rather limited. Clearly, one
appropriate method by which shoplifting can be reduced is
to protect the merchandise within the stores by placing it
under glass, and having sufficient staff available to
monitor purchasers. Whether or not this procedure would
create a reduction in purchases is another question.
Perhaps those within our justice system should move towards
a requirement for reasonable care of property by its owners
when enforcing the laws of theft.

There were 1,888 incidences of the consumption of
liquor reported by the 942 juveniles within the sample of
self-reported delinquents and non-delinquents. Beer and
liquor firms utilize every avenue of the media to promote
the sale of their products. Television provides subtle
means for identifying beer consumption as the manly thing
to do among young adults. Such advertising surely has an
impact upon young persons who are striving to become adults,
yet we prohibit these young persons from consuming alcohol
by law. How can we expect them to respect this law in the
presence of such subtle persuasion? It may help if liquor
firms were required to state what the law is in relation
to minors, every time they programmed such advertising.

Society permits twelve and thirteen-year old boys
to become vendors of ice cream, and sixteen-year old clerks
to take care of specialty stores which are permitted to
remain open during late evening hours. These young people
become easy prey for other young persons who may choose to rob them, and the robbery rates thus soar!

Buildings and structures are constructed with a concern for aesthetics, but little concern for their safety from vandals. Many modern structures have glass facings and are thus easily vandalized. Many are built in isolated locations and thereby become susceptible to vandals when left unattended. The 942 juveniles of the self-reporting sample reported being involved in 794 incidences of willful damage to property during one year. 4

We have examined some of the conditions which may have an important impact upon delinquency rates. But these conditions do not explain why perhaps a majority of juveniles appear willing to engage in many of the delinquent acts which are thereby made available to them. The delinquent subculture theorists identify groups in which "certain forms of delinquent activity are essential requirements for the performance of the dominant roles supported by the subculture," 5 and suggest that they are most commonly found in lower-class areas of large cities. Though these theorists may suggest the existence of delinquent subcultures within other social class categories, there is a tendency for


them to restrict their studies to the subcultural groups found within the lower-classes of urban industrial areas. As a result of that tendency, a significant proportion of delinquent activity remains unexplained. If we examine Table V, we can observe that the proportion of delinquent activities attributed to middle-class juveniles, though lower than that attributed to lower-class juveniles, is rather high. In addition, those offence categories which appear to have a high involvement rate among the lower-class juveniles also have a fairly high involvement rate among the middle-class juveniles. In other words, the two groups are doing the same kinds of things, and differ only in frequency of involvement, and probably not to the extent presumed by the subcultural theorists.

SOME NOTES ON THE WINDSOR POLICE YOUTH BRANCH

The Windsor Police Department provides special services for combatting the delinquency problem of the community. Much of the investigative work is performed by uniformed officers of the patrol division, but there is a specialized staff comprised of eight veteran detectives and an inspector who are responsible for ensuring adequate investigation of crimes committed by young persons, and appropriate dispositions of such cases.

The service thus provided matches or exceeds the same kinds of services provided by other police departments of the province. It is likely that juvenile apprehension rates are high when compared with those of most other
communities. However, the police are capable only of providing examples in their activities directed against juvenile crime because of the limitations of manpower, and the exceedingly high volume of delinquent activity.
APPENDIX I
The Questionnaire

Dear Student:

Would you please help me by filling out this questionnaire? We are not trying to find out who filled it out, only whether you can help with this survey. Therefore, please do not write your name and address anywhere on this questionnaire. Your help is appreciated. Thank you.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS

What age did you reach during 1978? 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
Boy girl

Are you a
Both mother and father at home
Mother but no father at home
Father but no mother at home
Relatives or others in their home

Do you live with

What grade did you reach in 1978? 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
Grade school finished grade school
High school finished high school
College finished college
Advanced degree professional school

Which of the following is closest to your father's education?

Which of the following occupational categories is closest to that of your father?

Unemployed
Unskilled labourer
Skilled manual worker
Technician
Clerical and sales
Semi professional (tool design etc)
Small business owner
Medium business owner
Professional (teacher, librarian)
Business manager of large concern
Major professional (doctor, lawyer)
Higher executive (company director)

List below if father's occupation is unlisted in column to the right.
For the following list of words, place a check (✓) next to the words which, in your estimation, apply to yourself. Check (✓) next to the words which you feel apply to yourself as you are most of the time, not as you would like to be, or as others think you are. If you feel any of the words do not apply to you, place an (X) next to the word that does not apply.

lonely
brave
a rebel
chicken
stubborn
courteous
tough
good dancer
a leader
a loner
studious
smooth talker
out for kicks
timid
good manners
troublemaker
polite
bored
can "con" or outwit others
nervous
masculine

ambitious
thrifty
sentimental
trustworthy
lazy
loyal
obedient
sharp dresser
a fighter
popular with opposite sex
well liked
daring
neat
gambler
aggressive
interested in art, literature

athletic
college bound
intelligent
neglected by others
handsome
The next set of questions are only about things done during 1978 - not any other year - please answer them as truthfully as possible. The answers will not and cannot be held against you in any way whatsoever. Please circle the correct response to each question. If the answer to the first part of any question is no, then do not answer the second or third part of the question.

Did you hit someone intending to hurt him or her? Yes No

Were the police involved? Yes No

How often did this happen during 1978? 1 2 3 4 5 6 more

Did you assault someone intending to steal from him or her? Yes No

Were the police involved? Yes No

How often did this happen during 1978? 1 2 3 4 5 6 more

Did you threaten someone with violence if he or she did not give you money or things? Yes No

Were the police involved? Yes No

How often did this happen during 1978? 1 2 3 4 5 6 more

Did you use a weapon to take things from someone? No Yes

Were the police involved? No Yes

How often did this happen during 1978? 1 2 3 4 5 6 more

Did you break into a house or building to steal? Yes No

Were the police involved? Yes No

How often did this happen during 1978? 1 2 3 4 5 6 more

Did you deliberately damage the property of others? Yes No

Were the Police involved? No Yes

How often did this happen during 1978? 1 2 3 4 5 6 more

Did you take and drive a motor vehicle without the consent of the owner? Yes No

Were the police involved? Yes No

How often did this happen during 1978? 1 2 3 4 5 6 more

Did you steal a bicycle? Yes No

Were the police involved? No Yes

How often did this happen during 1978? 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you steal from people in your own neighbourhood? : Yes No
Were the police involved? : Yes No
How often did this happen during 1978? : 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you steal from parked cars? : Yes No
Were the police involved? : Yes No
How often did this happen during 1978? : 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you steal from stores? : Yes No
Were the police involved? : Yes No
How often did this happen during 1978? : 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you steal from any other places? : Yes No
Were the police involved? : Yes No
How often did this happen during 1978? : 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you buy or accept stolen goods knowingly? : Yes No
Were the police involved? : Yes No
How often did this happen during 1978? : 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you own a real weapon which you know is illegal? : Yes No
Were the police involved? : Yes No
How often did this happen during 1978? : 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you deliberately set fire to a building? : Yes No
Were the police involved? : Yes No
How often did this happen in 1978? : 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you set other fires which could have caused damage to a building? : Yes No
Were the police involved? : Yes No
How often did this happen during 1978? : 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you curse or swear at people in public? : Yes No
Were the police involved? : No Yes
How often did this happen during 1978? : 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you obstruct people from walking on the sidewalk? : Yes No
Were the police involved? : Yes No
How often did this happen during 1978? : 1 2 3 4 5 6 more
Did you smoke pot?
Were the police involved?
How often did this happen during 1978?
Did you take downers or uppers?
Were the police involved?
How often did this happen during 1978?
Did you drink beer or liquor except at home with your parents?
Were the police involved?
How often did this happen during 1978?
Did you break any traffic laws?
Were the police involved?
How often did this happen during 1978?
Before 1978, did you commit any of the offences mentioned in the questionnaire?
How often ...

Thank you for your patience.
APPENDIX II

TABLE IX

Reported Offences within the Designated Offence Categories, for Police Districts Sandwich and South Windsor During 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Category</th>
<th>Sandwich</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S. Windsor</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willful Property Damage</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot; Thefts</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thefts from Vehicles</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Thefts</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking &amp; Entering and Attempts</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Thefts and Attempts</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot; Liquor Offences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Weapon</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Juveniles</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Traffic Offences</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot; Fire Matters</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Stolen Property</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Marijuana</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Other Drugs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery with Weapon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors Consuming Liquor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery with Violence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2817                                    N = 1162

"-" indicates less than one percent.

Total "occurrences" of all kinds investigated by police: for Sandwich N = 4372. For South Windsor, N = 1875.
TABLE X

Official Delinquents of Sandwich and South Windsor by Offence Categories for 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Sandwich</th>
<th>South Windsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Other' Thefts</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willful Damage</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Thefts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break and Enter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Vehicle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Offences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession Stolen Goods</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Offences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frauds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robberies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Offences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prowling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 169  \quad N = 59

* denotes population aged ten to fifteen years.
TABLE XI
Percentage Endorsement of Middle-Class Measuring Rod Items by Middle- and Lower-Class Delinquents and Non-Delinquents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Middle-Class Non-Delinq.</th>
<th>Middle-Class Delinq.</th>
<th>Lower-Class Non-Delinq.</th>
<th>Lower-Class Delinq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrifty</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polite</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Bound</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studious</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Manners</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in Art, Lit.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stubborn</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not lazy</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not gambler</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not bored</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE XII**

Father's Educational Level as Listed By Self-Reporting Delinquents and Non-Delinquents of Sandwich and South Windsor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sandwich</th>
<th></th>
<th>South Windsor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished High School</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished Grade School</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Grade School</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 376 100%  N = 363 100%
TABLE XIII

Father's Occupational Level
As Listed by Self-Reporting
Delinquents and Non-Delinquents
of Sandwich and South Windsor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sandwich</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>South Windsor</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher executive,</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company director, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major professional,</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus. Mgr. large concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. Business owner,</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Prof. Small Bus.,</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician, Sales, Cler.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled Labourers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Semi-Skilled Labourers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 407 100%  N = 383 100%

Missing Observations = 107

Note: It is possible that a number of respondents overstated their parents' qualifications. The word "college" appeared to have been understood by some to include Technical Training Schools. Many respondents may have felt their fathers' assembly-line work to be skilled.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Official Delinquents</th>
<th>Self-Reporting Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Official Delinquents</th>
<th>Self-Reporting Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents At Home</th>
<th>Official Delinquents</th>
<th>Self-Reporting Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother only</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>Official Delinquents</th>
<th>Self-Reporting Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of School Attended</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Self-Reporting Sample Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British &amp; Irish</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West European</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ethnic origins were identified by name only in some instances, and therefore may be inaccurate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District of Residence</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside City Limits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Delinquent</th>
<th>Self-Reporting Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District Where Offences Occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%

### Attitude of Parent(s) As Perceived by Investigating Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathetic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconcerned</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%

### Admissions of Guilt:

(To Police)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admitted Offence</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denied Guilt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%

(Through Questionnaire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admitted Offence</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denied Guilt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%

### Sellin-Wolfgang Scores (1978)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 points</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more points</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%

*Estimated based upon modal S.W. scores for official delinquents. (Traffic offences were excluded during this calculation.)*

### Police Action Taken (First offence in 1978)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caution &amp; Release</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Diversion</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge Laid</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Offence Committed (First Offence)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Self-Reporting Sample</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Self-Reporting Sample</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>not listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

Windsor Police Youth Branch

Guidelines for Action to Be Taken Against Juvenile Offenders

The criteria for the selection of juvenile offenders for court process or other action are to be determined by usage of these guidelines which are based on the Sellin-Wolfgang Index.

1. Value of property stolen, damaged, or destroyed.
   Under $50.00 - 1 point; $50 to $150.00 - 2 points; $151.00 to $975.00 - 3 points; $976.00 to $3,250.00 - 4 points; $3,251.00 to $5,500.99 - 5 points; $5,501.00 to $12,500.00 - 6 points; $12,501.00 to $27,250.00 - 7 points; $27,251.00 to $100,000.00 - 10 points; $100,001.00 to $150,000.00 - 11 points; $150,001.00 to $200,000.00 - 12 points. Over $200,000.00 - 13 points.

In all cases of Theft and Wilful Property damage in any form, the points will be calculated according to the scale provided above.

In all forms of Breaking and Entering, 2 points are provided for the breaking and entering and additional points will be measured according to the amount stolen or the amount intended to be stolen.

In cases involving Robbery where no weapon has been used, there would be 3 points for the robbery plus points accumulated according to the amount stolen. In cases of robbery where a weapon of any form was used, there would be 4 points for the robbery plus the accumulation of points according to the amount stolen.

Assaults causing death would accumulate 28 points. Assaults causing very severe injuries resulting in hospitalization would accumulate 7 points. Assaults involving less serious injuries but where hospitalization is required would accumulate 5 points. All minor assaults accumulate 2 points. Twelve
points are accumulated if the offence is Rape and in cases of Indecent Assault, the minimum points would be 3 and the most serious kind of Indecent Assault would accumulate 5 points.

Auto Thefts or Taking Auto Without Consent each accumulate 2 points for the auto theft plus points for damaged property in accordance with the scale. In addition with this category, juveniles who drive vehicles and breach the Highway Traffic Act by not having licences would accumulate additional single point. For the most serious Traffic offences, such as Dangerous Driving, 2 points would be allowed.

In all cases of Arson, 2 points should be allowed for the Arson, and additional points added for the amount of damage caused.

In all matters pertaining to Summary Conviction offences against the Criminal Code, 1 point should be allowed.

Breaches of the Narcotic Control Act such as simple possession, allow 1 point. In cases of Trafficking, then the matter would come under a different jurisdiction.

All offences under the Liquor Licence Act and other Provincial Statutes should be given an assignment of 1 point.

Where a juvenile has accumulated 5 points during the two years prior to the occurrence of his last offence, a charge should automatically be laid. Where a juvenile has accumulated 3 points during the same period, he should be entered into the pre-charge Diversion Program. Where a juvenile has accumulated 4 points during the same period, a decision is to be made by the investigating officer to determine whether the child should be entered into pre-charge Diversion or the court process. Further, if any doubt as to the number of points to be assigned an individual, the officer I/C Youth Branch should be consulted. In situations where a juvenile has accumulated 3 points but the investigating officer believes he should be entered into the court process,
A report is to be submitted in writing setting out the reasons for the deviation from the normal process.
District and Zone Boundaries.

(Centre of streets to determine division of zones)

District 1 - Zone 1 (1-1)
Bounded by: Detroit River, Huron Church Road, Wyandotte Street, Campbell Avenue.

District 1 - Zone 2 (1-2)
Bounded by: Huron Church Road, Wyandotte Street, Campbell Avenue, Tecumseh Road.

District 1 - Zone 3 (1-3)
Bounded by: Huron Church Road, Tecumseh Road, Penn Central Railway, Totten Street.

District 1 - Zone 4 (1-4)
Bounded by: Prince Road, Essex Terminal Railway, Huron Church Road.

District 1 - Zone 5 (1-5)
Bounded by: Prince Road, Detroit River, Huron Church Road, Essex Terminal Railway.

District 2 - Zone 1 (2-1)
Bounded by: Huron Church Road, Totten Street, Penn Central Railway, Dougall Road, E.C. Row.

District 2 - Zone 2 (2-2)
Bounded by: Maiden Road, Huron Church Road, Fourteenth Street.

District 2 - Zone 3 (2-3)
Bounded by: Huron Church Road, Maiden Road, Fourteenth Street, LaSalle Street, Sprucewood, Matchette Road, Morton Drive, Essex Terminal Railway, Prince Road.

District 2 - Zone 4 (2-4)
Bounded by: Morton Drive, Detroit River, Prince Road, Essex Terminal Railway.

District 3 - Zone 1 (3-1)
Bounded by: Huron Church Road, E.C. Row, Dominion Boulevard, Norfolk Street.

District 3 - Zone 2 (3-2)
Bounded by: Huron Church Road, Norfolk Street, Dominion Boulevard, Mount Royal Drive, Cousineau Road, Talbot Road (Hwy. #3).
District 3 - Zone 3 (3-3)
Bounded by: Dominion Boulevard, E.C. Row, Dougall Avenue, Penn Central Railway, Cabana Road.

District 3 - Zone 4 (3-4)
Bounded by: Cousineau Road, Mount Royal Drive, Cabana Road, Penn Central Railway, MacDonald-Cartier Freeway, Talbot Road (Hwy. #3).

District 4 - Zone 1 (4-1)
Bounded by: Campbell Avenue, Detroit River, Crawford Avenue, University Avenue.

District 4 - Zone 2 (4-2)
Bounded by: Campbell Avenue, University Avenue, Crawford Avenue, Wyandotte Street.

District 4 - Zone 3 (4-3)
Bounded by: Crawford Avenue, Detroit River, Ouellette Avenue, University Avenue.

District 4 - Zone 4 (4-4)
Bounded by: Crawford Avenue, University Avenue, Ouellette Avenue, Wyandotte Street.

District 4 - Zone 5 (4-5)
Bounded by: Campbell Avenue, Wyandotte Street, Crawford Avenue, Tecumseh Road, Penn Central Railway, Tecumseh Road.

District 4 - Zone 6 (4-6)
Bounded by: Crawford Avenue, Wyandotte Street, Ouellette Avenue, Giles Boulevard.

District 4 - Zone 7 (4-7)
Bounded by: Crawford Avenue, Giles Boulevard, Ouellette Avenue, Tecumseh Road.

District 5 - Zone 1 (5-1)
Bounded by: Ouellette Avenue, Detroit River, Glengarry Avenue, Howard Avenue, Niagara Street, Mercer Street, Elliott Street.

District 5 - Zone 2 (5-2)
Bounded by: Howard Avenue, Glengarry Avenue, Detroit River, Parent Avenue, Niagara Street.
District 5 - Zone 3 (5-3)
Bounded by: Ouellette Avenue, Elliott Street, Mercer Street, Niagara Street, Parent Avenue, Giles Boulevard.

District 5 - Zone 4 (5-4)
Bounded by: Ouellette Avenue, Giles Boulevard, Parent Avenue, Shepherd Street.

District 5 - Zone 5 (5-5)
Bounded by: Ouellette Avenue, Shepherd Street, Parent Avenue, Tecumseh Road.

District 6 - Zone 1 (6-1)
Bounded by: Parent Avenue, Detroit River, Gladstone Avenue, Niagara Street.

District 6 - Zone 2 (6-2)
Bounded by: Gladstone Avenue, Detroit River, Walker Road, Niagara Street.

District 6 - Zone 3 (6-3)
Bounded by: Parent Avenue, Niagara Street, Gladstone Avenue, Ellis Street.

District 6 - Zone 4 (6-4)
Bounded by: Gladstone Avenue, Niagara Street, Walker Road, Ottawa Street.

District 6 - Zone 5 (6-5)
Bounded by: Parent Avenue, Ellis Street, Gladstone Avenue, Ottawa Street, Walker Road, Tecumseh Road.

District 7 - Zone 1 (7-1)
Bounded by: Parent Avenue to Canadian Pacific Railway, Tecumseh Road to Canadian Pacific Railway.

District 7 - Zone 2 (7-2)
Bounded by: Tecumseh Road to E.C. Row., Parent Avenue to Chesapeake & Ohio Railway.

District 7 - Zone 3 (7-3)
Bounded by: Canadian Pacific Railway to Penn Central Railway, McDougall Avenue to Penn Central Railway.

District 7 - Zone 4 (7-4)
Bounded by: Canadian Pacific Railway to E.C. Row, Parent Avenue to McDougall Avenue (Remington Park Area).
District 8 - Zone 1 (8-1)
Bounded by: Cadillac Street to Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, Seminole Street to Riverside Drive (Drouillard Road Area).

District 8 - Zone 2 (8-2)
Bounded by: Seminole Street to Riverside Drive, Cadillac Street to George Avenue.

District 8 - Zone 3 (8-3)
Bounded by: Seminole Street to Tecumseh Road, George Avenue to Chesapeake & Ohio Railway.

District 9 - Zone 1 (9-1)
Bounded by: Canadian National Railway to Riverside Drive, Jefferson Avenue to George Avenue.

District 9 - Zone 2 (9-2)
Bounded by: Westminster Boulevard to George Avenue, Tecumseh Road to Canadian National Railway.

District 9 - Zone 3 (9-3)
Bounded by: Canadian National Railway to Tecumseh Road, Westminster Boulevard to Jefferson Avenue.

District 10 - Zone 1 (10-1)
Bounded by: Jefferson Avenue to Parkview Street, Tecumseh Road to Riverside Drive.

District 10 - Zone 2 (10-2)
Bounded by: Parkview Street to Lauzon Road, Tecumseh Road to Riverside Drive.

District 10 - Zone 3 (10-3)
Bounded by: Tecumseh Road to Riverside Drive, Little River Road to Lauzon Road.

District 10 - Zone 4 (10-4)
Bounded by: Little River Road to Easterly limits, Tecumseh Road to Riverside Drive.

District 10 - Zone 5 (10-5)
Bounded by: Tecumseh Road to E.C. Row, Jefferson Avenue to Lauzon Road.

District 10 - Zone 6 (10-6)
Bounded by: Tecumseh Road to Southerly limits, Lauzon Road to Easterly limits (Forest Glade Area).
District II - Zone 1 (11-1)
Bounded by: Howard Avenue to Parkwood Street, E.C. Row to Division Road.

District II - Zone 2 (11-2)
Bounded by: E.C. Row to Southerly limits of District, Parkwood Street to Chesapeake & Ohio Railway.

District II - Zone 3 (11-3)
Bounded by: Tecumseh Road to Southerly limits, Chesapeake & Ohio Railway to Pillette Road.

District II - Zone 4 (11-4)
Bounded by: Tecumseh Road to Southerly limits, Pillette Road to Jefferson Avenue.
Mary Anne Spencer vs. Amira Anne Wright, a juvenile offender.

Nature of Charge: Stealing a worked chair.

Conviction

2d. Month paid at Justice's Office

Costs

As follows:

Clerk

Constable

Witnesses

Both sums to be paid on or before the 31st day of ______ and in default of payment to be imprisoned in the Common Gaol at Sandwich for the space of 30 days, if not sooner paid.

Ontario committed in accordance to Convictions.
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VITA AUCTORIS

NAME: ORVILLE LLOYD HUGHES

1924: Born in South Wales

1940: Graduated from St. George's Selective Central Boy's School, Ramsgate, Kent, England

1940-1945 Served with the British Army during World War II.

1945-1948 Served as a British Policeman in Palestine.

1948-1952 Served with the Bermuda Police Force

1952-present Member of the Windsor Police Department

1975: Graduated from University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario. B.A. Sociology

1979: University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario. M.A. Sociology

At present, Inspector in charge of the Youth Bureau, Windsor Police Department