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ABSTRACT

This thesis was concerned with female delinquency and the family, and it attempted to study various home situations and find out if they deterred or contributed to female juvenile delinquency. Research has shown that there was a greater propensity for female delinquents to come from homes which are in socially deprived, culturally disorganized lower class areas, where parental alcoholism, neglect and vicious conduct were evident. (Quay, 1965; Thomas, 1923)

Research has also shown (Sullenger, 1933; Elliott, 1929; Hodgkiss, 1933) that there was a relationship between broken homes and delinquency, particularly female delinquency. Other factors, however, such as marital adjustment, tension, perceived acceptance or rejection by the parents, happiness must also be examined. This study, therefore, attempted to find out if there was any relationship between female delinquency and the home situation - parental affection, tension, acceptance/rejection, supervision.

Control theory, the theoretical framework of this thesis, assumed that the norms and values of a society are widely shared and that there is an attempt to impose
these norms and values on all members. When the bonds of rationality and social responsibility are weak or broken, however, delinquent activity may ensue.

A self-report questionnaire was administered to 47 lower-class, white females, who have all had some contact with legal or school officials. An analysis of their responses indicated that there were no significant relationships at the .05 level of significance between any of the variables under study.
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INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency has been a topic of research for quite a few years. Female delinquency, however, has been a relatively neglected area of study. Since the number of delinquent acts that females committed were significantly lower than those committed by males, researchers felt that this was sufficient reason not to study this sex.

The research that had been conducted on female delinquency had indicated that the family had a strong impact on the female and her future actions. Due to the fact that the female was expected to be more carefully supervised by her parents, the normal well integrated family was able to shield the girl from delinquency. The girl from the disorganized household, on the other hand, was not given the same supervision, and as a result, was more exposed to criminogenic influences.

The family of the later part of the twentieth century was different from the family of the late 1800's and early 1900's. The nineteenth century farm family lived in relative physical isolation and lived in a subsistence economy. The latter day twentieth century
family, on the other hand, resided primarily in the cities and towns. It had lost its physical isolation and depended upon a profit and wage economy.

These economic and social changes were accompanied by concomitant changes in the domestic situation:

"a) economic production has shifted from the homestead to the factory, b) women, including mothers, are increasingly gainfully employed outside of the family, c) mechanization has lightened the burden of household management, d) the planning of the family size has led to smaller families and housing units." (Shulman, 1961, p. 379)

Nuclear family functions in the area of food and shelter, propagation, childrearing and habit training had not been unduly affected. After infancy, however, the child was affected to a greater extent by factors beyond the control and outside of the family (e.g. schools, media, peer groups and social clubs).

"Losses in family control had been accompanied by inevitable shifts in the relationships between parents and children." (Shulman, 1961, p. 380)

The father was the head of the nineteenth century family in such matters as discipline, planning of education, religion, farm management. The wife and children were obedient and fulfilled their numerous duties.
"At best, this social order possessed a stability grounded in the benevolent paternalism of intelligent management; at worst, it suffered from the cruelties and inefficiencies of unintelligent and ignorant despotism." (Shulman, p. 380)

The ideal family of the latter twentieth century was egalitarian. Decisions concerning discipline, education, spending, size of family, and home location are considered by both spouses. There is now a growing tendency for both the husband and wife to be employed. Maternal employment, once considered to be a lower-class phenomenon where the woman had no husband to support her, has become very common among the middle class. In fact, Tomeh (1975) stated that

"the highest incidence of working wives who are currently married have husbands whose income is in the category of eight to fifteen thousand dollars; where the husband's income is less than this amount, fewer, not more, wives are working." (p. 49)

It would appear, therefore, that if a wife worked because she had made the decision to work, she would be happier and more content than the wife who had to work out of necessity. Regardless of whether the wife was employed or not, the male was still considered to be the breadwinner, whereas the female was concerned with childrearing functions.
During early childhood, children received different cues for expected behavior from parents, siblings, and peers. Boys were expected to be self-assertive and interested in male toys and activities. Girls, on the other hand, were expected to be quiet, happy, not bossy and play with female toys. (Tomeh, 1975)

By the time children entered kindergarten, they were able to express sex-role preferences and distinctions. Girls were able to identify with feminine roles and boys with masculine roles. At this time, the child was also aware of the proper behavior of males and females, not only as children, but also as adults. Children were also

"aware of the relative worth of each of the sexes as well as the characteristics associated with each sex relative to status and prestige." (Tomeh, 1975, p. 17)

The girl in modern society is confronted with the situation that the restrictions inherent in the role of homemaker and wife have been diminishing gradually. She becomes aware of the freedom that she can enjoy, for with the increase in urbanization, there is a decrease in the traditional role of the female and more egalitarianism with her male counterpart. In fact

"the era when girl's sewed dresses
and boys sowed wild oats has yielded to a period when both are expected to achieve a degree of self-efficiency. Passivity is no longer a self-evident feminine virtue and status is not automatically conferred on the girl who is 'docile and chaste.' (Adler, 1975, p. 94)

Even with the many changes that have occurred in this inherently mobile society, a well-integrated family was able to enforce a greater amount of control over their children. If the children admired and respected their parents, they may hesitate to do something that would hurt or embarrass them.

Control is central to this thesis, which is concerned with female delinquency and the family. When an individual's bond to her family is weak or broken, delinquent activity may result. Consequently, this thesis is concerned with examining familial situations and their deterrence or contribution to female delinquent activity.
CHAPTER 1

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Female Delinquency and the Family

Female juvenile delinquency, the violation of the criminal code, or any provincial, federal or municipal by-law or statutes by a female under the age of sixteen (exceptions - British Columbia: seventeen; Manitoba and Quebec: eighteen) has been a relatively neglected area of study. Official statistics seemed to indicate that female delinquency was relatively negligible in volume and had a different quality than male delinquency. Females traditionally committed such crimes as running away, truancy, incorrigibility. Present research, however (Adler, 1975; Barton, 1965; Wise, 1967) indicated that the delinquency patterns of males and females are converging.

During the first few decades of the 1900's, studies on female delinquency were concerned with comparing female delinquents (usually institutionalized) to female non-delinquents (usually from an unmatched, non-random sample). The authors attempted to explain delinquent behavior by determining whether there were
any physical (Healy and Bronner, 1926; Burt, 1925; Lombroso, 1958), mental (Du Pre Lumpkin, 1932; Bronner, 1914), psychological (Bingham, 1923), or social (Du Pre Lumpkin, 1931) differences between the two groups. These studies indicated that institutionalized delinquent girls were less mature and stable, had lower intelligence quotients and were academically less successful than the non-institutionalized, non-delinquent girls.

Ecological studies (Shaw and McKay, 1929, 1942; Ncane, 1968; Bordua, 1958) indicated that the rates for delinquency were highest in areas adjacent to the central business district and declined as the periphery of the city was reached. Moses (1942) found that the areas encompassed by railroad properties, business districts and industrial areas had the highest rates for delinquency. Bordua (1958) made reference to unrelated individuals and family disorganization in his ecological study and suggested that the family may

---

1. H. Warren Dunham (1947); in his study "Current Status of Ecological Research in Mental Disorder", indicated that the distribution of manic depressives according to residence, inclined slightly toward the higher socio-economic level areas. An earlier study by Farris and Dunham (1939) revealed that all psychoses except manic depression, decreased in rates as the periphery of the city was reached.
play an important etiological role. Likewise, before him, Shaw and McKay suggested the possible influence of the family:

"... Individual and personality differences in family relationships and in contacts with other institutions and groups, no doubt influence greatly one's acceptance or rejection of opportunities to engage in delinquent activities." (p. 441)

Generally, delinquency flourished in socially deprived, culturally disorganized lower class areas. The physical appearance of the home was often dirty and run down, disordered and cluttered. (Thomas, 1923; Quay, 1965)

Burt (1923) found that poor or very poor homes bred more than half of the total number of delinquents. Overcrowding, alcoholism among parents, neglect, ill treatment and vicious conduct were evident.²

Fernald, Hayes and Dawley (1920) found that the females in their study came from poor home situations, with incidences of alcoholism, insanity and criminal records among the parents. Brockinridge and Abbott (1912) indicated that poor home environments, overcrowding, lack of cleanliness and drunkenness were

² One should be aware that when an author uses such words as alcoholism, overcrowding, ill treatment, they are often value judgements based on their own definitions and not actual findings.
evident in their study.

Nye (1958) indicated that there was little recreation in the home and the child usually had to seek enjoyment outside the home. Often, the recreational areas and facilities near the homes of the children were minimal or even non-existent (Breckinridge and Abbott, 1912), leaving these children with few alternatives for recreation. The physically unattractive home and surrounding neighbourhood of the delinquent often acted as a repellent, drawing the adolescent out of it. It also appeared to be inadequate as a socialization setting, although the individuals who were responsible for socialization constituted a more important causative factor. Sullenger (1933) stated that the family was the "basic and most essential unit of social organization." (p. 1088)

Thomas (1923) stressed that the family gave people definitions of role playing in a particular social context:

"The role which a girl is expected to play in life is first of all indicated to her by her family in a series of aesthetic-moral definitions of the situation." (p. 98)

The girl was regarded with a character of social sacredness. An almost magical value was placed on
purity and virginity. The girl was not aware of this until she learned it from others: "...if she is regarded with adoration, she correspondingly respects herself and tends to become what is expected of her." (Thomas, 1923, p. 98) As a result, the female had greater value because not only could she make a good marriage, but this marriage reflected recognition on her family. Middle-class females, whose lives were economically secure, were socialized to behave well and suppress their natural desires.

In the economically insecure family, working mothers seldom found time to counsel their children on moral issues.

"In cases of great neglect, the girl cannot be said to fall because she has never risen. She is not immoral because this implies the loss of morality, but amoral, never having had a moral code." (Thomas, 1923, p. 98)

The family served to transmit values and prevent the child from being influenced by deviant patterns. (Toby, 1957). If the family was integrated, it had a better chance of warding off antisocial influences which emanated from peer or neighbourhood groups. Family protection was especially important at the pre-adolescent stage since outside influences may have a greater impact on behavior.
Many studies have been conducted on the subject of broken homes. Some researchers indicated that the broken home was a cause of delinquency. Others have suggested that other factors such as family cohesiveness and area of residence may affect delinquency.

Burt (1929), in a study of 197 delinquents and 400 controls in London, England, found that the incidence of broken homes among delinquents was twice as high when compared to non-delinquents (57.9 percent: 25.7 percent). He also found that the incidence of overcrowding, parental alcoholism, neglect, ill treatment and ineffective discipline were greater for the delinquent group than the control group.

Shaw and McKay (1932) attempted to minimize the importance of the broken home. They compiled a study using 7,000 Chicago school boys and 1,675 juvenile court cases, in which they held age and nationality constant. They found that the delinquent groups had only a slightly greater incidence of broken homes than those found in the control group (42.5 percent: 36.1 percent). These findings not only contradicted Burt's earlier findings, but they also indicated a high incidence of broken homes among the non-delinquent group. These findings, however, could be explained
by the large number of broken homes in the sample and the unreliability of the school interviews.

Hodgkinson (1933) used a sample of 362 Chicago delinquent girls and a control group sample of 362 school girls to repeat the Shaw and McKay study. She found that 66.9 percent of the delinquent girls (N=253) and 44.8 percent of the control group (N=162) came from broken homes. Her ratio of 1.49 delinquent girl to 1 non-delinquent girl was higher than the 1.18 to 1 derived by Shaw and McKay for their boys.

Katharine Lumpkin (1932), in a study of 252 correctional school girls, 11 to 18 years of age, found that 63.5 percent came from broken homes. These homes also showed tendencies toward alcoholism, mental disease and delinquent siblings.

Mabel Elliott (1929) compared the family structure of Sleightown farm girls with a sample of Philadelphia working class girls and found the respective proportion of broken homes to be 52 and 22 percent.

Sullenger (1933), in his study of 1145 delinquent children, found the 64.1 percent of the girls and 45.1 percent of the boys came from broken homes. Sullenger stated that

"a greater frequency of abnormal parental conditions is found"
as a causative factor of delinquency among girls than among boys." (p. 1091)

Ahnsjö (1941), in a study of 2,448 Swedish female inmates of the State Reformatory, found that 50 percent of the girls resided with relatives, 23 percent with their own parents; foster parents took care of 18 percent of the girls. Many of the girls had left home, and lived on their own. Ahnsjö indicated that the principal cause for detention was the home situation broken or "bad homes".

Maud Merrill (1947) used a matched sample of 300 court referrals and 300 school children, and found that there was a greater incidence of disrupted home life in the delinquent group than in the non-delinquent (51 percent and 27 percent). Hostile parental relationships were indicated in 20 percent of the delinquents and only 2 percent of the controls.

Wattenberg and Saunders (1954) did a study of 3,451 boys and 1,082 girls under 17 who were contacted by the Youth Bureau of the Detroit Police Department. When comparing the boys and girls, they found that a greater proportion of delinquent girls (59 percent) than delinquent boys (44 percent) came from broken homes. They also indicated that there was a greater incidence of quarreling, dislike of father and open
rejection by parents for the delinquent girls than for the delinquent boys.

Monahan (1957), in a six year study of 24,662 Philadelphia Court records, reported that first offender and recidivist girls were more likely than boys to come from broken homes. Fifty-five percent of white girls and 74.3 percent of negro girls came from broken homes as compared to 32.2 percent of the white boys and 57.9 percent of the negro boys.

He also found that although girls more often came from broken homes, they were less likely to engage in repeated offences, whatever the type of broken home. (p. 257)

"When the girl remains with the mother, there appears to be less likelihood of recidivism. The death of the mother, as compared to the death of the father, also leads to somewhat greater recidivism; while the loss of both parents is particularly severe on the negro girls...A child living in another family home and not with one of the parents is more likely to commit repeated offences." (p. 257)

Ruth Morris (1964), in a matched sample of 56 quartets (matched for social class, age, school grade and intelligence) found that delinquent girls came more often from broken homes than non-delinquent girls.
Delinquent girls are also more likely to come from homes broken by separation and divorce than non-delinquent girls.

Nye (1958) conducted a study in 3 Washington towns. He asked 1160 boys and 1162 girls in Grades 9 to 12 to answer an anonymous questionnaire. He found that the most delinquent girls had a slightly greater incidence of broken homes (36.4 percent) than the least delinquent girls (16.9 percent).

Gregory (1961) indicated that there was a greater tendency toward delinquent activity among girls a) who had separated or divorced parents, b) whose mother was dead, c) who lived only with their father, or d) who lived with neither parent.

Cowie, Cowie and Slater (1968) indicated that of the 318 girls in their study, 44 percent came from unbroken homes (living with their own parents). In less than 20 percent of the cases was the family background considered near 'normal'.

Thus far, much evidence has been cited to support the relationship between broken homes and delinquency, particularly female delinquency. When interpreting this relationship, however, it should be remembered that most of the delinquents used in the studies
(with the possible exception of Nye, 1958) were from institutions. There appears to be a tendency on the part of law enforcement agencies to institutionalize adolescents who come from broken homes (Weeks, 1940; Nye, 1958; Adler, 1975; Monahan, 1957; Wattenberg and Saunders, 1954). If the police knew the adolescent came from a 'good home' (implies legally intact), and this was the first time contact had been made with the law, a warning was usually given and the child sent back home with the parents, provided that the offence was not serious (Schwartz, 1940; Woode and Waite, 1940; Thomas, 1923).

Another source of bias must be recognized due to the fact that the police receive complaints from parents and/or neighbours with less provocation when children from broken homes are involved (Nye, 1958).

An alternative factor to be considered was that girls are usually more closely supervised in their pre-adolescent years than their male counterparts. Firm supervision is provided in the well-integrated family, but not to the same degree in the disorganized and broken family. The socialization of the child, particularly the girl and pre-adolescent, is interrupted
and perhaps made ineffective when a break in the family occurs. The break in the family may not be as important, per se, as the tension, arguing and quarrelling that was experienced by the child. Browning (1960) concluded that

"the broken home, as generally defined, is ineffective and probably meaningless as an indicator of family disorganization and other characteristics of family life known to be associated with deviant behavior. It does not include all homes which are sociologically and psychologically broken, nor exclude homes which are well integrated." (p. 43)

One cannot, however, exclude the premise that broken homes are causally related to delinquency. Hirschi and Selvin (1966) indicated that the broken home may not be a sufficient cause of delinquency, and other variables may be more strongly related to delinquency than broken homes. There are insufficient reasons, however, to conclude the non-causality of broken homes.

The quality of parental marital adjustment is closely related to the concept of the broken or unbroken home. Smith (1955) reported that the Results of the National Midcentury Committee on Children and
Youth ranked unhappy relationships between parents as the greatest cause for concern. He concluded that the traditional concept of the normal home as one where harmony prevails could be erroneous (p. 308). In other words, an unhappy, unbroken home could be as effective a causal agent as the broken home with regards to female delinquency.

Nye (1958) indicated that 22 percent of the most delinquent girls came from completely happy homes and 49 percent came from unhappy homes. He also found that

"the happiness of the marriage was found to be much more closely related to delinquent children than whether the marriage was an original marriage or a remarriage or one in which the child was living with one parent only." (p. 31)

It appears, therefore, that because girls spend more time under the control and influence of their parents, they are more susceptible to the anxiety and unhappiness produced in a turbulent home situation.

Morris (1964) indicated that delinquent girls rated their family relationships more unhappy than did the corresponding non-delinquent group. Tension between the mother and father, the mother and respondent and the whole family were experienced more often by the delinquent girl than by the non-delinquent.
Parent-child relationships may be an even more important factor in delinquency than parental-marital relations.

"If one endorses the common assumption that capacities for internal control are completely but closely related to previously imposed external restraints, then parental discipline assumes focal significance as a factor in delinquency." (Peterson and Becker, 1965, p.

Slocum and Stone (1963) reported that conforming behavior among girls was significantly associated with fairness of discipline. According to Nye (1958), 20 percent of the most delinquent girls reported that their father's punishment was always fair and 44 percent reported that it was unfair. He also indicated that the stricter the mother's discipline was, the less delinquency was indicated by the daughter. Thirty-seven percent of the most delinquent girls said that discipline by the mother was mild compared to 82 percent of the least delinquent girls who indicated that the discipline of the mother was very strict.

Inconsistency of punishment by mothers was statistically related to female delinquent behavior. Nye (1958) reported that 49 percent of the most delinquent girls indicated that their mother very often failed to give
the promised punishment, and 22 percent indicated the mother never failed to follow through.

When disciplinary techniques were explored, Nye found no relationship between delinquent behavior and physical punishment. A positive relationship was found, however, when love withdrawal was used as a disciplinary technique. When the adolescent's feelings of acceptance or rejection were taken into account, the correlation cited above seemed to disappear. Some studies, however, found a relationship between measure of delinquency and types of discipline (Rodman and Grams, 1967).

The data suggested that non-delinquency was related to the fairness and consistency of punishment. Most of the studies (especially Slocum and Stone, 1963; Nye, 1958) were based upon the recollection and perception of control and delinquent adolescents. It was possible, that despite similarities in disciplinary techniques, delinquents and controls perceive discipline differently. It was also possible that parents' differential response to delinquent and non-delinquent behavior resulted in different disciplinary techniques.

Lack of parental affection was often associated with juvenile delinquency. Wattenberg (1956) showed
in his Detroit survey, that a higher percentage of delinquent girls felt picked on at home, disliked their father and were hostile to their mother. Morris (1964) attempted to measure adolescent satisfaction concerning their parents by asking them to indicate whether they wanted to spend more or less time with the parents. She reasoned that anyone who wanted less time with their parents were showing hostility toward them (p. 86). If the respondents were satisfied with the status quo, an average to good relationship was indicated. Her results showed that non-delinquent girls were significantly more satisfied with their parental relationships.

Nye (1958) used an acceptance-rejection variable and found a significant positive correlation between the child's delinquency and the parent's rejection of the child. He argued that

"the indifferent or hostile parent is unlikely to give the sympathetic and constructive supervision needed by adolescents." (p. 73)

The parents would not be concerned with the child getting into trouble until it happened and became the cause of embarrassment to them.

Mutual rejection between mother and child and father and child occurred in 48 percent of the most delinquent adolescents. Mutual acceptance between
the mother and child occurred in 14 percent of the most delinquent adolescents, and in 13 percent of the father-child relationships.

Riege (1972), in her study of 25 female delinquents and a matched sample of 25 non-delinquents, found that they were not well loved by their parents, i.e., the delinquent girls did not receive the 'right amount' of love. She also found that the delinquent girls felt that their fathers do not spend enough time with them. Konopka (1966) indicated that when the adolescent girl perceived her father's love or affection as deficient, she tended to feel a loss or lack of security, which led to loneliness and despair. This feeling of rejection often caused the adolescent to seek 'outside' solace. This was often accomplished by truancy, running away and precocious sexual relationships.

Weinberg (1958) stated that the interplay of discipline and affection in parent-child relationships was very important in affecting the personality of children and predisposing them to delinquent associations and behavior. Clark and Wenninger (1964) provided indirect evidence for the importance of the parent-child relationship when they found that favourable attitudes toward legal institutions were more closely
related to adjustment to paternal and maternal discipline, rather than to social class factors.

Broken homes are not a single class phenomenon. Traditionally, they were associated with the lower class, and consequently a strong relationship with female delinquency had been established. However, the phenomena of 'broken homes' permeates all social strata. A valid correlation may be drawn between female delinquency and the following:

a) parental affection, b) persistent tension, c) perceived lack of acceptance by the parents of the child.

Female Delinquency and Official Records

There has been an under-representation of females in official statistics because of the sex differences in delinquent involvement and the differential handling of girls within the system. The sexual double standard of chivalry and paternalism (Pollak, 1950; Thomas, 1923; Chesney-Lind, 1973; Weis, 1975) contributed to the maintenance of this under-representation in official statistics. There was the tendency to guard the reputation of the young girl who had accidently gone astray; unless the offence was very serious, she
did not receive official attention (Schwartz, 1940).

Or as remarked by Wood and Waite (1940):

"It would not be safe to assume that the relatively small number of court appearances of delinquent girls indicated a corresponding absence of misbehavior. It is usually the policy both of the police and of the agencies to treat unofficially all minor offences of young girls to spare them the stigma of a court appearance. When girls are apprehended and brought to court, it is in most cases for some serious offence." (p. 291)

If her family was willing to take the girl back into their home, the police would generally let her go without pressing charges. (Thomas, 1923). If the girl came from a broken home, there was a greater tendency to detain her (Monahan, 1957; Wattenberg and Saunders, 1954). This policy was evident in the official statistics. There has been an over-representation of girls who were brought before the courts with the background of a broken home. Monahan (1957) reported that 55 percent of the White and 75 percent of the Negro girls came from broken homes. It was assumed that girls gravitate to delinquent behavior as a result of poor home situations. Institutionalization was necessary to protect the girl from herself or from
her family (Adler, 1975; Cavan, 1962). The girl was usually institutionalized because of some sex-typed offence, such as truancy or incorrigibility. Usually, she was treated quite harshly; in fact, more harshly than her male counterpart. (Weis, 1975; Adler, 1975)

Traditionally, the family had to exert great control over their daughter's behavior. Female children were encouraged to be dependent, obedient and responsible. Her basic concern was over her physical appearance because she hoped to attract a suitable male; "her prime and perishable claim to respectability was her virginity." (Adler, 1975, p. 90) If she did deviate, it was usually a sexual deviation, where the girl traded physical experience for recognition, security and financial gain.

"Sexual misbehavior, so the thinking goes, is common to the distressed female because it represents her misguided efforts to compensate for affectional relationships, missing from the home." (Adler, 1975, p. 91)

In addition,

"some of the offences for which females were charged in the past resulted less from a violation of the legal code than a breach of social propriety." (Adler, 1975, p. 108)

Adler (1975), Barton (1965), Wise (1967) had
suggested that the sexual character of female delinquency had been overestimated and that the number of incidents of other female delinquency on the part of the courts had been underestimated.

"These studies suggest that if female deviant behavior were being randomly sampled by the juvenile courts, males would still predominate over females in numbers of offenses, but they would be roughly similar in the kinds of offenses." (Adler, 1975, p. 91)

Since parental expectations of boys and girls are now less sexually discriminatory, this has forced girls to compete actively with boys in such areas as athletics, vocations and deviant behavior (Adler, 1975).
Criticism of Official Records vs Self Report Studies

Official records indicate the number of individuals who have been charged by police, appeared before the court, or who have been judged delinquent. These data are available from any number of sources: police, courts, mental health centres and correctional institutions. Zay (1963) suggested that official data indicated the method and the extent of deviance as defined by the agencies of social control.

Distortions may occur due to deliberately disregarded or unapprehended offenders. (Barton, 1965) Distortions also occur because there is little consistency across the country with regard to the official age of classifying a person as a delinquent. A female could be charged as a delinquent in one province but not in another due to age variation in the provincial laws. Cohen (1955) warns that "police, court and social agency statistics describe samples of the total delinquency population, not the population itself, hence the samples may sometimes be grossly unrepresentative" (p. 36). Ambiguities may occur because of the inability to distinguish between the number of offences and the number of offenders.

Hagan (1977) considers the following to be common
deficiencies of official data:

"1) an indeterminable amount of deviant behavior goes undetected, is handled by private means, or otherwise remains beyond public knowledge (e.g. crime against bureaucracies, white collar crime).
2) some deviant behavior that is reported to public agencies is not recorded (e.g. American studies indicate that up to 26 percent of the incidents reported to the police go unrecorded).
3) categories of deviant behavior are vaguely defined and variously recorded (e.g. mental illness)
4) bases used in computing rates vary, and are frequently inappropriate (e.g. using the number of males and females as the base for computing rape rates).

(p. 34)

When one works with official data, the challenge is to identify the source(s) of the deficiencies and to suggest a solution - either by correcting them or making some compensation for the deficiencies. Hindelang (1974) suggested that

"researchers who refuse to examine even a blurred reflection of the phenomenon may be discarding an opportunity to reduce ignorance about the phenomenon in question; further, by refusing to explore ways in which prior indicators of a phenomenon may be improved; lack of progress toward more satisfactory measurement is more likely to be ensured." (p. 2)

Nettler (1974) indicated that discretion on the part of the police had an effect on the official
statistics because

"what are counted finally, as crimes are the more obvious offences, the more serious offences, offences whose victims have brought complaints, and offences, some of whose victims are dead - those crimes, in short, for which the public put pressure on their police to make arrests". (p. 57)

Self-report statistics, on the other hand, provide information about the frequency and types of offences, and the number of offenders. These statistics, usually obtained by anonymous questionnaires, seem to provide a clearer and more accurate index of delinquency that that furnished by official statistics.

There are serious questions, however, regarding the reliability (consistency) and the validity (accuracy) of self-report measures. Measures of reliability testing the internal consistency of the delinquency scale and assessing retest consistency of the measurement, have been devised (Nettler, 1973). The internal consistency test has been proved valid most often.

An internally consistent self-report measure means that a respondent who scored criminally on the more serious items would also score high on the more trivial ones. Nye and Short (1957) used a scaling technique in their questionnaire which identified questions that
did not 'hang together' for their specific population. Scaling assured that if an individual scored high on the serious offences, a similar score would be achieved for the trivial offences.

A more important consideration with self-report measures was their validity. Do they give an accurate measurement of delinquency? There are mixed findings. Hirschi (1969) found low correlation with self-reports validated with other self-reports. Voss (1963) found a strong correlation between charges laid, confessions of delinquency and juveniles incarcerated. McCandless and his associates (1972) found a low correlation (.12) between measures of admitted and committed delinquency.

Consideration should also be given to possible memory lapses and lying or deceit among the respondents. In addition, the period of time surveyed should be definite rather than indefinite.

"Nonetheless, self-report data are suggestive of the volume and social location of various forms of deviance." (Hagan, p. 36)

There is disparity between the number of self-reported habitual serious offences and the number of officially apprehended and recorded ones. Self-report measures, if very carefully and rigorously constructed to detect exaggeration, inconsistency in response and over-
conformity, would be a valid measure of an individual's behavior. "Precisely how representative the responses are of the subjects' real behavior must remain uncertain." (Barton, 1965, p. 167)

In other words, even though there are distortions and discrepancies in both official data and self-report measures, these faults can be corrected, or if not corrected, they can be controlled for. The questionnaire, if rigorously and carefully constructed, can detect exaggeration in the answers of the respondents. In addition, the researcher can collect data much more rapidly using self-report questionnaires, than if he had to rely on official data alone.
CHAPTER 11

THEORY

Control theory, the theoretical framework of this thesis, assumed that the norms and values of a society are widely shared and that there is an attempt to impose these norms and values on all members. When the bonds of rationality and social responsibility are weak or broken, however, delinquent activity may ensue.

Traditionally, constraints were seen by the control theorists as operating within and being imposed on the individual. Reiss (1951) postulated that when personal and social controls disintegrated, delinquency resulted. He used indicators such as primary group, personal, community and institutional controls to distinguish between recidivist and non-recidivist delinquents. Reiss found a significant association between the outcome of probation and the control indicators. The strongest association was found to be between the variables that

"measured...the adequacy of personal controls of the individual and his relation to social controls in terms of his acceptance of or submission to social control." (p. 206)
Walter Reckless (1961) focused on 'inner' and 'outer containment'.

"Inner containment consists mainly of self-components, such as self-control, good self-concepts... while outer containment represents the structural buffer in the person's immediate social world which is able to hold him within bounds." (p. 44 - 45).

The success of the family contributed to inner containment in that the children internalized the 'good values of society'. Control theorists are also interested in the role of the police, community and other agencies (outer containment) when the family fails.

Generally, deviance was regarded by the control theorists, as the result of 'bad' or 'inadequate' socialization into 'good' or 'conforming' values. (Hagan, 1977, p. 88) Or as stated by Parsons (1951)

"The relevance of tendencies to deviance, and the corresponding relevance of mechanisms of social control, goes back to the socialization process and continues throughout the life cycle." (p. 320)

In other words, people must be made to believe that they must want the 'good life' as defined by society. Hirschi (1969) classified the elements of the bond individuals have to society. He suggested that...
attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief were the elements of this bond.

Attachment, to Hirschi, was important because it made us sensitive to the expectations and wishes of others; it made us concerned about their feelings. This attachment may add meaning to our lives, making an act of deviance an act against the wishes and expectations of those we love. On the other hand, if we were unattached to anyone, there was a greater likelihood that we would be unaffected by any restraints and there would be more freedom to deviate.

The second element of the bond was commitment, the energy and time invested towards the achievement of a goal. (eg. an education, job security, business dealings and adventures, reputation). Many individuals achieved these goals and did not want to lose them. In other words, these accumulation of goals are like an 'insurance policy': to deviate from the rules could result in the loss of the accumulated investments. It is this commitment to the goals that have been achieved that keeps the individual 'honest' because to be dishonest could result in the loss of these achievements. Those who deviate, however, often feel that they have 'nothing to lose.'
Involvement, the third element, supposes that an individual keeps himself occupied so that there was no time left to deviate. An individual would not have time or opportunity to deviate if he was fully occupied with conventional or conforming things.

Belief in the values of society was the fourth element of the bond, according to Hirschi. He assumed

"that the beliefs that free a man to commit deviant acts are unmotivated in the sense that he does not construct attainment of illicit ends." (p. 25).

In addition, he assumed

"that there is variation in the extent to which people believe they should obey the rules of society, and, furthermore, that the less a person believes he should obey the rules, the more likely he is to violate them." (p. 26)

The assumption, is therefore, that there are no moral obligations to conform to the norms of society if a person is unconstrained by the values of that society. Therefore, people are more likely to deviate from the rules of society, if they believe they should not obey these rules.

Control theory, thus, assumed that the bond to society would be weak for an individual if he was not
fully committed, attached, involved and believed in this bond. One may ask, how is this bond formed? There are a plethora of theories with regard to this query. Particular attention, however, has been placed on the role and relationship within the family and the 'personal stake an individual develops in conforming to the rules of society'. (Hagan, p. 89)

The family has been emphasized as a causal factor in deviant behavior. Wilkinson (1974) suggested that the family was important in the early 1900's because there was a negative attitude towards divorce, and the child was controlled by the family. From approximately 1930 to 1950, there was a shift of responsibility regarding education, recreation, religion, and protection from the family to other social institutions, such as the school. In addition, there was a less harsh attitude towards divorce.

Wilkinson outlined the position of the family as a causal agent in delinquency today in the following quote:

"the decline in concern for the... home...came about not because scientific evidence provided conclusive grounds for rejecting it, but because cultural and ideological factors favouring its acceptance early in this century became less important..... (p. 735)"
Nye (1958), however, believed that the family was important in delinquency research.

He proposed a theory of social control which suggested that the following behavior and attitude patterns were important in the creation of the social bond:

1) direct control imposed from without by means of restriction and punishment
2) internalized control exercised from within through conscience
3) indirect control related to affectional identification with parents and other non-criminal persons
4) availability of alternative means to goals and values

Parents control the child directly by use of consistent discipline and restriction of the child's activities and choice of friends. However, as Nye suggested, this type of control was only effective when the

"child can expect to be detected in the delinquent act, is actually within the physical limits of the home or is otherwise under the surveillance of adults." (p. 7)

The mores of a society are internalized into the conscience of children to some degree. Total effectiveness would eliminate the need for any other type of control. This was not the case, however, since
mores were violated in every society. Nye suggested that this

"lack of effectiveness may be related to lack of agreement on the mores, frustration by the mores of the achievement of basic values and limitations on guilt as a punishment factor". (p. 6)

Another important consideration in the formation of conscience was the type of relationship the child had with its parents. "It (was) probable that few children accept the teachings of the parent unless they accept the 'teacher' (parent)." (Nye, p. 6) If an adolescent felt affectionate towards and accepted by his parents, he would stay out of trouble simply because he didn't want to hurt, embarrass or disappoint his parents.

Property and person of the members are protected by the laws of society, but these laws also made it difficult for the members to achieve their goals quickly and conveniently. A long, laborious route was involved to achieve some of the goals, whereas the satisfaction of other goals was forbidden.

Adolescents have needs (Maslow's hierarchy of needs) that want to be satisfied. Even though the family can only satisfy some of the needs of the child, it also affects his chance of having his needs satisfied by his
peer groups, in school or in an occupation. The family can prepare the child in its interaction with others, or it can totally fail in indicating acceptable behavior to meet the needs in and outside the family.

In summary, control theorists argued that there are some individuals who are not bound as tightly to the norms and values of society as others are. It is those with the weakest ties that deviate the most.

In this thesis, control was measured by the feelings of acceptance or rejection within the family, supervision, parental trust and communication. As suggested by Nye and Hirschi, the family was the prime teacher of societal norms and values. Good feelings and attachments within the family should serve as a deterrent to delinquent activity. The stronger the feelings and attachment (bond), the more likely the individual will take it into account if and when a criminal act is contemplated.

In control theory, parental ideals and expectations are transmitted to the child via the bridge of the emotional bond between the parents and the child. A child who was alienated from the parents

"will not learn or will have no feelings for moral rules and will not develop an adequate conscience or superego." (Nye, p. 71)
Therefore, a weakening of the bond to the parents increased the probability of delinquent behavior, whereas, a strengthening of this bond decreases the probability of delinquent involvement.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

An anonymous self-report questionnaire was administered to forty-seven white lower-class females (as measured by their parent(s) occupation on the Blumen scale) between the ages of eleven and seventeen. Each girl had some contact with school or legal officials, but no official action had been taken against any of them.

The questionnaire was divided into three sections: a) background information; b) behavior during the past year; c) perception of parents, family and other situations (see Appendix B).

In the first section, background information, questions were asked concerning the girl herself (age, religion, grade in school, who she lives with), her parents (marital status, education, occupation, birthplace) and other siblings in the family (total number of brothers and sisters, how many are older and younger).

The second section of the questionnaire probed
the behavior of the respondents during the past year. She was asked to indicate the number of times she participated in various unlawful activities, some of which pertained to juveniles in particular (skipping school; staying away from home, running away from home, having sexual relationships, being suspended from school, curfew violations) or to the criminal code in general (using or selling drugs, liquor; stealing; driving without a license; break and entry; vandalizing public or private property; group or individual fights; carrying a concealed weapon).

The third part of the questionnaire consisted of questions about the respondent and the way she perceived her relationship with her parents and family. The questions probed such areas as parental acceptance or rejection of the respondent; their acceptance of her friends; their communication with the respondent; the respondent's influence in making family decisions.

The final question in the third part of the questionnaire

1. These questions are a slightly modified version of some of the questions in the Hirschi, 1969, study.
was taken from Ruth Morris' study (1964), which asked the respondent to indicate a typical day at their home, using pluses (good feelings) and minuses (bad feelings).

The questionnaires were administered during the month of March, 1977, by the counsellor of the girls. Prior to the administration of the questionnaires, the researcher instructed the counsellor in how to administer the questionnaire and the need for anonymity.

After the questionnaires were completed by the girls (took approximately 20 minutes), they were coded and given an identification number, and the original questionnaires destroyed. The information was then transferred to computer cards and analyzed by the computer.
Operationalization of the terms:

Broken homes:

The central bond which unites a family in our society is the conjugal relationship between the husband and wife. The family is considered to be broken when this conjugal bond is broken.

"Family disorganization is social disorganization in the most literal sense, for it is the breakdown of the primary group." (Elliott and Merrill, 1961, p. 345)

In 'broken homes', there is a disruption and weakening of the role patterns of the individual participants. This can occur through death, separation, divorce, or desertion.

Therefore, 'broken homes' in this thesis refers to any families that are broken through desertion, death, divorce or separation.

Unbroken or intact homes:

The family has been defined as a "unity of interacting personalities" (Burgess, 1926, p. 3). It was initially formed because certain social, emotional or psychological needs of its members were met by this unit.

The original unit (husband, wife, children) will continue to exist in some harmony when there is co-
operative interaction and mutually functional values. In addition, the organized family members may sacrifice personal interests for the interests of the group.

Occasional tensions and bickerings are present during the interaction of the family, but they still function as an organized unit. When the tensions become too great for one or both parents, there is a desire to dissolve the unit. When the desire to dissolve the unit becomes an actuality, the unit becomes split and disorganized.

Therefore, 'intact or unbroken homes' refer to the unit in which the original parents and children reside, where no dissolution has taken place, either legally or otherwise.

**Unhappy homes:**

Unhappiness can be found in broken or unbroken homes alike. Quarrelling and discord between parents is a source of tension and frustration, not only to the parties concerned, but also to their offspring. The children can become adversely affected by the turmoil within the family unit. Because females are generally more supervised than their male counterpart, the unhappiness and disharmony in the home may be more
demoralizing for the female.

A young person from a broken home probably experienced much unhappiness during the time preceding the break in the family. This unhappiness may still be evident after the break, especially if the parent with custody of the children is frustrated, blaming their spouse for the predicament they are in. Perhaps the parents are unable to adjust to the new situation and vent their anger on the children.

Thus, an unhappy home, in this thesis, will be defined as one in which there is an excessive amount, or constant tension, disharmony and discord as perceived by the female respondents.

'Low' delinquency and 'high' delinquency

Using a self-report questionnaire, each respondent was asked to indicate the number of times different violations were committed. Those who indicated that they participated in 100 or less violations in one year were considered to be 'low' delinquent girls, and those who indicated a participation rate of more than 100, were considered to have a 'high' delinquency rate.
The major hypothesis to be tested was concerned with the home situation of the respondent—whether it is broken or intact. The hypothesis stated that girls from broken homes will indicate a greater frequency of delinquent activity than girls from intact homes.

The minor hypothesis to be tested are as follows:

a) Girls from homes in which there was perceived tension and/or poor parental relationships, would have a greater tendency toward delinquent involvement than girls from perceived cohesive families.

b) Girls from tension-filled intact homes would indicate greater frequency of delinquent activity than girls from broken homes.

c) Girls from homes in which rejection by the parents was perceived would have a greater tendency toward delinquent involvement than girls from families in which they feel accepted.

d) There will be a greater amount of supervision among low-delinquent girls than among high delinquent girls.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

An analysis of the questionnaires indicated that all 47 girls came from the lower socio-economic class as measured by the Blishen scale.\footnote{1} In addition, the girls all indicated that they were Canadian born.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of the Respondents</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{1}{The Blishen scale, A Socio-economic Index of Occupations, was used to measure the social class of the respondents. A score of 39.99 and lower was considered to indicate a lower socio-economic class.}
Table 1 illustrates the age distribution of the respondents. The majority of the girls (76.6 percent: 36 girls) were between the ages of 14 and 16, with age 15 being the mode or category with the largest frequency. The mean age of the girls was 14.4 years.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade in School</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2, we see the grade distribution of the girls. Over 90 percent of the girls (43) were in Junior High School (Grades 7 or 8) or High School (Grades 9 through 13). The mean grade in school was 8.4 and the mode was Grade 9.
Table 3

Religious Distribution of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the religious distribution of the respondents. Over half the girls (55.3 percent: 26 girls) indicated that they were Catholic. This finding was slightly higher than the percentage of Catholics in the Windsor area, which, according to the 1971 Census, was approximately 51.5 percent. It was also slightly higher than the percentage of Catholic girls who had 'contact' with the Windsor Police Department in 1977 (48.3 percent: 57 girls). (O. Hughes, Youth Branch Office, Windsor Police Dept.)
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Other Siblings</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 illustrates the sibling distribution in the families of the respondents. All but one girl had other brother(s) and/or sister(s). Approximately sixty-six percent of the girls (51) had 3 or 4 other siblings in their family. The mean number of other siblings in the family was 3.4 and the mode was 3 other siblings.

This finding was higher than the Ontario pattern where the mean number of children per family was 1.6. (Census, 1971) The greater number of children in the family of the respondents could be a function of religion — (approximately 55 percent indicated they
came from Catholic homes) and the Church's stand on birth control. Or this finding could be a function of selection where parents of larger families have less direct control over their children, who subsequently may come into contact with law enforcement officials.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Employment</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the distribution of employment of the parent(s) of the respondents. More than sixty percent (30 mothers and 35 fathers) were employed on either a full or a part-time basis. This finding was much higher than the provincial average which showed that 37.6 percent of the females in Ontario (over eighteen) were employed. (1971 Census)
When both parents are employed, less time is available to spend with the children. If the child felt that the parents have no time for her, she could turn to her peers for acceptance and comfort. And in order to remain accepted by her peers, the girl could become involved in activities which are violations of the law.

Nye (1958) found a greater incidence of delinquency among children in which the mother worked. The Gluecks (1959) found that there was a higher incidence of delinquency among children whose mothers were irregularly employed. These women were often married to men who had poor work habits and frequently, the wife herself was unstable. Not only could the children of working parents be lacking direct control, but also indirect control in that the parents may not have a great deal of time to spend with their offspring, and the child may not fully comprehend the need for the mother to be employed.

If the mother worked because she wanted to and her offspring are aware and accept this need of the mother, the family may be happier because the mother is content with herself and it is reflected in her attitude towards her children.
Table 6

Distribution of the Education Of the Parents of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some Grade School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Grade School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish High School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The educational level of the parents is indicated in Table 6. Approximately eighty percent of the parents of the girls had at least some high school education, with the majority (31.9 percent of the mothers and 44.6 percent of the fathers) indicating that their parents had some other training as well. This level of education was higher than the average educational level found in Windsor. According to the 1971 Census, approximately 43 percent of Windsorites had achieved less than a Grade 9 education.
The higher education level of the sample could possibly be attributed to an overestimation of the education achieved by the parents of the respondents. It could also indicate that the daughter did not know what level of education was achieved by the parents and consequently 'guessed' at a response. A further consideration is that because of the relatively high unemployment rate in this area, individuals may work at jobs that do not tap the full capabilities of the individual, i.e., they are glad to be working and they could not be too choosy as to which job they accepted.

Table 7
Distribution of the Marital Status of the Parents of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married and living together</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Dead</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Dead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7, the distribution of the marital status of the parents of the respondents, indicates that slightly more than half (53.3 percent: 25 girls) of the girls came from homes in which the natural parents were living together. In addition, approximately 34 percent (16 girls) of the girls indicated that their parents were either separated or divorced.

Table 8
Place of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residing Home</th>
<th>Both natural parents</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother and stepfather</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster home</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 illustrates with whom the girl lived. Approximately 53 percent (25 girls) lived with their
own natural parents. Twenty-five percent (12 girls) lived with their mother only, whereas 10.6 percent (5 girls) lived with their father and no female guardian.

Windsor Police Department figures showed that 66.5 percent of those individuals who had contact with law enforcement officials resided with their own parents, and 27.1 percent resided with their mother only.

Family situation, i.e., a broken or unbroken home, was determined by using Table 8. Using the broken-unbroken home dichotomy, 53.3 percent of the girls came from unbroken or intact homes and 46.7 percent (22 girls) came from broken homes.
## Table 9
Mean Rate of Offences Admitted to by the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drank wine, beer or liquor</td>
<td>30.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violated your curfew</td>
<td>15.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent out of class</td>
<td>13.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made excessive noises</td>
<td>9.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped school</td>
<td>9.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoked marijuana</td>
<td>8.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in an individual fight</td>
<td>6.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheated in tests in school</td>
<td>3.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged public or someone else's property</td>
<td>3.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-marital sex</td>
<td>2.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a group fight</td>
<td>2.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed someone else's identification</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove without a license</td>
<td>1.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used fake identification</td>
<td>1.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed out all night</td>
<td>1.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen things costing between $10. &amp; $50.</td>
<td>1.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold marijuana</td>
<td>1.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone joy riding</td>
<td>1.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen things costing between $50. &amp; $200.</td>
<td>1.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended from school</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run away from home</td>
<td>1.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used 'LSD or 'speed'</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen less than $50. in cash</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalized private property</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried a concealed weapon</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold 'speed' or other chemicals</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen a bicycle</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen more than $50. in cash</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked a stranger for money</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk driving</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken into a house or office</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen more than $200. in cash</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen things costing more than $200.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 lists the types of offences and the mean number of times each offence was said to be committed. The offence which was committed most often was under-
age drinking. It was committed, or said to be committed an average of 30.66 times in the past year. Curfew violations and being sent out of class were the second and third most frequent offences cited by the respondents. They occurred 15.45 and 13.94 times respectively.

The least frequent offences were theft of more than $200.00 in property or cash, breaking into a house or office, and drunk driving. No one admitted to having committed these offences.

From Table 9, it appeared, therefore, that the most frequent offences were violations of the Juvenile code rather than the Criminal Code. It could be that because of the nature of the most occurring offences, no formal action was taken against the respondents. Those respondents who indicated an involvement in the more serious crimes may not have been apprehended for the particular crime, but something else; and when asked to indicate their involvement in different crimes in this questionnaire, showed a hidden involvement in delinquent activity. However, the reliability of the respondent's responses must be ascertained before whole-heartedly accepting the findings.
Table 10
Distribution of Rates of Delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Delinquent Acts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 shows the distribution of the rates of delinquent activity for the respondents. A girl was judged to have a 'high' delinquent rate if she had a score greater than 100 and a 'low' delinquent rate if she scored 100 or less.

With the dividing point between 'high' and 'low' delinquency at 100 delinquent acts, one can categorize 33 girls (70.2 percent) to have a 'low' delinquent activity rate and 14 girls (29.8 percent) to have a 'high' delinquent activity rate.

The central hypothesis of this study was that girls from broken homes would indicate a greater frequency of delinquent activity than girls from intact homes. Previous research (Nye, 1957; Wattenberg and Saunders, 1954) has shown that there was a greater propensity toward delinquent activity or greater visibility in delinquent activity if the individual came from a broken home. The control of the children, especially direct control, may be sacrificed by the parent in the broken home situation. This is especially evident in children who are left alone, or in the hands of an outside person while the parent works.

The null hypothesis to be tested asserts that there is no difference in delinquent activity between girls.
from broken homes and girls from intact homes.

Table 11

Home Situation by Delinquent Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Situation</th>
<th>Parents Living Together</th>
<th>Parents Living Apart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17 (36.2%)</td>
<td>16 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8 (17.0%)</td>
<td>6 (12.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .00116  df = 1  ns

Using chi square as the test of significance, a value of .00116 was obtained when comparing delinquent behavior and the home situation of the respondents. This relationship, shown in Table 11, was not significant at the .05 level and did not provide any evidence that there was a relationship between delinquent behavior and the home situation of the girls.

When individual offences and the home situation were compared, no significance was found at the .05 level. This was evident in an analysis of Table 12.
Table 12

Home Situation by Individual Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Intact</th>
<th>Broken</th>
<th>Chi square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask stranger for money</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold Marijuana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used fake identification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drank beer, liquor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made excessive noise</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen a bicycle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoked marijuana</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheated in tests in school</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed out all night</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed identification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold 'speed' other chemicals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged public property</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk driving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended from school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven without a licence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen things costing $40. to $50.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used speed or LSD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen things costing $50 - $200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run away from home</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violated your curfew</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gone joy riding</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen things costing more than $200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent out of class</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen more than $50. in cash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-marital sex</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen less than $50. in cash</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break into a house, or office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried a canceled weapon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual fight participation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen more than $200. cash</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group fight participation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalized private property</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even though there was no significant association found between the type of offence and the home situation, it was interesting to note that often the girls from intact homes indicated a slightly greater frequency of delinquent activity, especially for curfew violations and cheating in school. A possible explanation for the curfew violation findings is that parents may be less tolerant of their daughter's tardiness than a parent in a single parent family.

A possible explanation for the cheating violation is that the girl's perception of parental expectations demands that she do well in her academic studies. Consequently, if she feels that she is not suitably prepared for a test, she may seek 'help' from those around her.

Of note also was that girls from broken homes indicated a slightly greater frequency of petty theft (stealing things costing up to $50). The parent in the single parent family may be employed during the day, and is not around to directly control the offspring. In addition, the finances may be such that the adolescent is not given any spending money from her parent. Because it is quite natural for a girl to go shopping, and the nature of the merchandise displays in stores, it is relatively easy for her to pretend she is shopping and 'accidentally' drop something in her purse or pocket.

After examining both Tables 11 and 12, we concluded that there was no statistical significance at the .05 level and we could not reject the null hypothesis.
The first sub-hypothesis to be tested was concerned with tension and/or poor parental relationships and delinquent behavior. The null hypothesis to be tested stated that there was no difference in delinquent activity between girls from homes in which they perceived there was tension and/or poor parental relationships and girls from perceived cohesive families.

Tension and cohesiveness was measured by the following item which was taken from Ruth Morris' 1964 study:

"All families have their ups and downs. There are good times and bad times; sometimes we quarrel and sometimes we enjoy each other. Think about a typical day in your family. Each plus (+) means a time when your family feels good towards each other, get along well. Each minus (-) means a time when they seem to you to feel bad or angry towards each other, argue and don't get along very well. Which of the circles do you think gives the closest picture to the amount of pluses and minuses in an average day?

(a) (b) (c) (d)

A respondent who circled an (a) or (b) was considered to come from what they perceived to be a cohesive home. Those who circled a (c) or (d) perceived their
homelife to be tense and/or having poor parental relationships.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Adjustment by Delinquent Behavior</th>
<th>Cohesive Family</th>
<th>Tension-Filled Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17 (37.8%)</td>
<td>15 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6 (13.4%)</td>
<td>7 (15.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .009, df = 1  N.S.  Missing = 2

An analysis of the data in Table 13 indicated that the achieved chi value of .009 was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Therefore, we cannot reject the null hypothesis that there was no difference in delinquent activity between girls from cohesive and tension-filled home situations.

It appears, therefore, that the homelife of the respondents, i.e., the cohesiveness or lack of cohesiveness perceived within the family by the respondent, does not unduly deter an individual from delinquent activity.
The second sub-hypothesis was concerned with comparing tension-filled intact home girls and girls from broken homes with regard to their rates of delinquent activity. The null hypothesis stated that there was no difference in the frequency of delinquent activity between girls from tension-filled intact homes and girls from broken homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Situation by Delinquent Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension Filled Intact Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (18.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (46.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square = .00126 df = 1 N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of Table 14 indicated that the achieved chi square value of .00126 was not statistically significant at the .05 level. Therefore, we cannot reject the null hypothesis that there was no difference in delinquent activity between girls from tension-filled
intact homes and those from broken homes.

A further analysis was done on the results found in Table 14 using the low delinquent behavior variable and the home situation variable. Even though the chi square value of 1.232 was not statistically significant at the .05 level, the achieved value was much stronger than the initially obtained value of .00126.

The home situation, therefore, especially the broken home situation, may have some influence on delinquent activity. It is possible that the control exercised in the one-parent home was not a sufficient deterrent to their offspring's involvement in delinquent activity. On the other hand, even though the intact home was tension filled, there may have been more control of the daughter by the parents, which served to restrict her opportunity for outside involvement.

The third sub-hypothesis was concerned with delinquent activity and the respondent's perceived acceptance or rejection by her parents. If a parent was indifferent or hostile to a child, constructive and sympathetic supervision would likely be lacking. The parents would not be concerned about their child until trouble occurred. Then the parents would be embarrassed because one of
their offspring had got into trouble. In addition, hostility or indifference on the part of the parents often bred 'negative emotions' in the offspring towards the parents.

The null hypothesis stated that there would be no difference in the delinquent activity between girls from homes in which they perceived there was rejection or a hostile parental attitude and girls from families in which they perceived to be accepted. Rejection and acceptance was measured by the following item:

"Does your father (mother) seem to accept you and what you do?"

If the respondent indicated that her mother and/or father usually accepted her, she was considered to have a warm and acceptable relationship with the accepting parent. If the parent(s) sometimes accepted their daughter, the relationship was considered to be indifferent, and if the parent(s) never accepted their daughter, she was considered to experience a hostile parental attitude.

An analysis of Table 15 showed that the achieved chi square values of 5.022 for the father and 1.905 for the mother were not statistically significant at the .05 level. We cannot, therefore, reject the null
Table 15
Parental Acceptance by Delinquent Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquent Behavior</th>
<th>Acceptance by Father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warm (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 5.022  df = 2  N.S.

Acceptance by Mother

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquent Behavior</th>
<th>Acceptance by Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warm (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6 (15.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.905  df = 2  N.S.

hypothesis that there was no difference in delinquent activity between girls from homes in which they perceived there was rejection or a hostile parental attitude and girls from families in which they perceived they were accepted.
There appears, however, a stronger relationship with the daughter's perceived acceptance by her father. Even though it was not statistically significant, it was consistent with research (Nye, 1957; Konopka, 1966) that the father had an important role in the socialization of the daughter. Perceived lack of affection could lead to loneliness and despair, and a lack of security, and could force the daughter to seek solace from sources outside the family.

The fourth sub-hypothesis was concerned with supervision and delinquent activity. Control theory suggested that direct control inhibited delinquent activity. However, since most acts of delinquency required little time, and parents could not spend every moment of every day with their offspring, the actual time spent with the parents would only minimally contribute to deterring delinquent activity. The important consideration was whether parents were present 'in spirit' with their offspring when they were confronted with a tempting situation. If parental reaction was not questioned in such a tempting situation, the child was free to be tempted.

If, on the other hand, the child wondered what her parents would think, she might not be tempted because
her parents knew where and with whom she was. This supervision was measured by the following item:

"Does your father (mother) know where and with whom you are when you are away from home?"

Low supervision was indicated by the respondents who said that their parents never knew where they were. High supervision was indicated by parents who usually knew where and with whom their children associated.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Supervision by Delinquent Behavior</th>
<th>Father's Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4 (12.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.065 df = 2 N.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi square = .8937  df = 3  N.S.

The null hypothesis to be tested stated that there would be no difference in the amount of supervision between girls with high delinquent behavior and those with low delinquent activity. Table 16 illustrated the comparison between parental supervision and delinquent behavior. An analysis of this table indicated that the achieved chi square of 2.065 for father and .8737 for mother was not statistically significant at the .05 level.

Therefore, we cannot reject the null hypothesis that there was no difference in the amount of supervision between the girls with high delinquent behavior and those with low delinquent activity.

Even though there was no significant difference in supervision between high and low delinquent girls, it was interesting to note that the majority of the girls perceived their parents to be indifferent as to their whereabouts and acquaintances. Perhaps the traditional strict supervision that a young female in the past was raised on, is being replaced by a more free and equalitarian (especially if there are boys in the family) upbringing, and this freedom is being perceived as indifference by the offspring of the parents.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This thesis, which was concerned with female delinquency and the family, attempted to study various home situations and find out if they deterred or contributed to female juvenile delinquency. Research has shown that there was a greater propensity for female delinquents to come from homes which are in socially deprived, culturally disorganized lower class areas, where parental alcoholism, neglect, and vicious conduct were evident. (Burt, 1923; Quay, 1965; Thomas, 1923)

The family, which serves as the transmitter of social values, often protects the pre-adolescents and girls who are more influenced by outside sources. This protection, however, is most influential if the family is well-integrated.

Research has shown (Sullenger, 1933; Elliott, 1929; Hodgkiss, 1933; Monahan, 1957) that there was a relationship between broken homes and delinquency, particularly female delinquency. Other factors, however, such as marital adjustment, tension, perceived acceptance or
rejection by the parents, happiness must also be examined. Because girls spend more time under the influence and control of their parents, they are more susceptible to the anxiety and unhappiness that can be found in a turbulent home situation.

If a girl felt accepted by her parents, they could indirectly control her because she would attempt to stay away from compromising situations that could rob her of her parents' acceptance. An offspring who felt rejected by her parents would probably not feel any real need to stay away from a compromising situation, especially if she was with peers who accepted her.

This study, therefore, attempted to find out if there was any relationship between female delinquency and the home situation - paternal affection, tension, acceptance/rejection, supervision.

A self-report questionnaire was administered to 47 lower class white females, who have all had some contact with legal or school officials. An analysis of their responses indicated that there were no significant relationships at the .05 level of significance between any of the variables under study. The null hypothesis could not be rejected for any of the hypotheses:

Major hypothesis: Girls from broken homes will
indicate a greater frequency of delinquent activity than girls from intact homes.

Minor hypotheses: (1) Girls from homes in which there is perceived tension and/or poor parental relationships, will have a greater tendency toward delinquent involvement than girls from perceived cohesive families.

(2) Girls from tension-filled intact homes will indicate greater frequency of delinquent activity than girls from broken homes.

(3) Girls from homes in which rejection by the parents is perceived will have a greater tendency toward delinquent involvement than girls from families in which they feel accepted.

(4) There will be a greater amount of supervision among low delinquent girls than among high delinquent girls.

It was evident from this study that no significance was found in any of the above hypotheses at the .05 level of significance. The possible reasons for such an outcome will be subsequently explored.

It may be of some note, however, that a stronger association was achieved in the second (using the 'low' delinquent variable only) and third (paternal acceptance only) minor hypotheses. (The achieved chi square values were 1.232 and 5.022 respectively.)
The chi square value of 5.022 for the third minor hypothesis was significant at the 0.10 level of significance. This was the only chi square value which was significant at this level. It appeared that even though the daughter perceived her father as indifferent, some form of indirect control may have been present in the low delinquent group. This observation gives some support to Nye's theory that indirect control was an important aspect in the formation of the social bond.

The small size of this sample posed a classical danger of being non representative of the delinquent population at large. This may have been one reason for the lack of appreciable significance found in this study as previously alluded to. It is also possible that the reliability of the respondents can be questioned in that they may have over-estimated or under-estimated their involvement in delinquent activities. This problem, however, is common to many self-report questionnaires.

The administrative mechanics of choosing this sample may have affected the homogeneity of the sample. A more elaborate design would have included a matched control group as well as a random delinquent sample from various social institutions.

Such a design would have allowed us to generalize
with more confidence to the population from which we drew our sample.

On the basis of this study, one could not discount the possibility that the family no longer plays as important a role in nurturing delinquent behavior. Traditionally, there was a stigma attached to the broken home - or offspring from the broken home. The days of 'staying together because of the children', however, are slowly passing and one parent families are increasing in number.

The love and acceptance of the parent in the single parent family may be more acceptable to the offspring than the tension that may be experienced constantly if the parents stayed together. The lack of significance found in this study may reflect this trend.
APPENDIX A

Defining Juvenile Delinquency:

A child under seven years of age was considered by Common Law to be incapable of committing a crime. A child between the ages of eight and fourteen, was not assumed to be criminally responsible unless there was proof of malicious intent in his or her actions. Even over a century ago, in some Canadian provinces, there existed special criminal legislation dealing specifically with children. When conditions warranted it, the old Equity Courts served as the guardians of the children.¹

In 1894, Canada passed its first national legislation dealing with child offenders. Children under sixteen were entitled to private trial and detention apart from adult prisoners. In Ontario, when dealing with female offenders under thirteen, the court consulted with a local Children's Aid Society and often placed the child in an industrial school or a foster home, in lieu of

¹. The old Equity Courts were "set up in the fourteenth century to mitigate the harsh technicalities of the common law. They disappeared as separate courts in most jurisdictions towards the end of the nineteenth century, although their function was assumed by other courts." W.T. McGrath, "The Juvenile and Family Courts", in W.T. McGrath (ed), Crime and Its Treatment in Canada, Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1965, p. 210
sentencing.

In 1908, the Juvenile Delinquents Act, the first federal legislation dealing with delinquency as we know it today, was passed after amendment. A new Juvenile Delinquents Act was passed in 1929. (Newfoundland's juvenile courts are under the provision of the Child Welfare Act, 1944, rather than the Juvenile Delinquents Act).

A juvenile delinquent is one

"who violates any provision of the Criminal Code, or of any federal or provincial statute, or of any by-law or ordinance of any municipality, or who is guilty of sexual immorality, or any similar form of vice, or who is liable by reason of any other act to be committed to an industrial school or juvenile reformatory under the provision of any federal or provincial statute." (Criminal Code)

A child was guilty of delinquency if he or she was convicted in court, regardless of what action brought the child before the court. There was no legal distinction made between a child involved in a serious offence and one involved in a by-law infraction. Also, there was little consistency in the enforcement of the act. A Report of the Solicitor General's Committee for New Legislation to Replace the Juvenile Delinquents Act (1975) stated that
the administration of juvenile justice in Canada is characterized by the fact that the twelve provincial and territorial systems that have the responsibility for dealing with young persons in conflict with the law, function on different levels of sophistication and availability of resources. There is little coordination of activities between provincial justice processes and except for the Act, which is federal legislation, there is no satisfactory mechanism that has the capacity to unify and help coordinate the future development of the field on a national basis." (p. 6)

The Juvenile Delinquents Act lacks uniform application. If a person was under sixteen years of age to a maximum of eighteen (as directed by the Governor General in Council), the person was amenable to the Juvenile Delinquents Act. The maximum age varies across Canada (sixteen to eighteen) and it also varies from province to province with regard to the sex of the offender.

In Saskatchewan, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, the Yukon, North West Territories, the age is sixteen years; in British Columbia the age is seventeen years; in Manitoba and Quebec the age is eighteen; in Alberta the age is seventeen for boys and eighteen for girls; in Newfoundland the Act does not apply, but the age under provincial legislation is seventeen.
Presently, there is an attempt being made to update and rectify the Juvenile Delinquents Act. Eighteen years is the maximum age for an individual to be charged under the proposed "Young Offenders Act." This maximum age and a minimum age of twelve are proposed so that there is some uniformity in enforcing the Act. In addition,

"It is assumed that deviant behavior by children under the age of twelve is better and more effectively dealt with under provincial legislation pertaining to child welfare or youth protection." (Highlights, p. 5)

(Individuals mature at different ages, but for the most part, the age of civil responsibility within the various jurisdictions is eighteen or nineteen).

The proposed new act also recommended that status offences (eg. truancy) be excluded as these would not be considered offences in the case of adults. Consequently, only offences against federal statutes and regulations would be dealt with by the youth courts. The provinces would deal with offences against provincial statutes and municipal by-laws.

The proposed new law also permits the young person to be represented by counsel. In addition, the police must explain to the young person the consequences of making a statement, and allow him to consult a lawyer,
parents, relative or responsible adult.

The young person would have the same rights as an adult with respect to appeals. He would also have more protection against the consequences of a criminal record because access to the young persons' record would be controlled and restricted and the adult record system would not have any record of any findings of guilt.

In summary, therefore, the proposed new act attempts

"a) to abolish status offences and deal with the specific offence committed;
b) to ensure that young offenders benefit from all the rights and protections enjoyed by adults and to offer certain special guarantees of those rights;
c) to encourage acceptance by young offenders of responsibility for criminal acts committed;
d) to set up procedures and sentencing practices that will ensure to the young person the protection that a young person needs;
e) to protect society from the effects of juvenile crime;
f) to ensure that a young offender's experience with criminal justice will tend to turn the young person away from further involvement in criminal activity."

(Highlights, p. 2)
APPENDIX B

The Questionnaire: The instrument used to gather the information for this thesis was the questionnaire. It was divided into three parts:

a) the first part of the questionnaire consisted of a number of factual questions about the respondent and her family.

b) the second part of the questionnaire consisted of a number of behaviors or situations that the respondent may have encountered during the past year.

c) the third part of the questionnaire consisted of a number of questions about the respondent and her relationship with her parents and family.
1. Date of birth: __________________________________________

2. Your religion:
   a) ___ Roman Catholic
   b) ___ Anglican
   c) ___ United Church
   d) ___ Presbyterian
   e) ___ Jewish
   f) ___ Baptist
   g) ___ Lutheran
   h) ___ Other (Please specify ________________________________)

3. Your race:
   a) ___ Black
   b) ___ White
   c) ___ Other (Please specify ________________________________)

4. What grade are you in at school now?
   a) ___ Grade
   b) ___ Do not go to school
   c) ___ Other (Please specify ________________________________)

5. How long have you lived at your present address?
   _______ years _________ months

6. How many brothers do you have? _______
   How many of them are older? _______
   How many of them are younger? _______

7. How many sisters do you have? _______
   How many of them are older? _______
   How many of them are younger? _______

8. Please check one of the following:
   a) ___ Parents are living together
   b) ___ Parents are separated
   c) ___ Parents are divorced
   d) ___ Father is dead
   e) ___ Mother is dead
   f) ___ Other (Please specify ________________________________
9. With whom are you living?
   a) ___ Both your own parents
   b) ___ Mother and a stepfather
   c) ___ Mother only
   d) ___ Father and a stepmother
   e) ___ Father only
   f) ___ A foster home
   g) ___ Other *(Please specify)_

10. Who is the chief wage-earner in your family?
    a) ___ Father
    b) ___ Mother
    c) ___ Both work and contribute equally
    d) ___ Some other male guardian
    e) ___ Some other female guardian

11. What is the highest level of education attained by your father?
    a) ___ Some grade school
    b) ___ Completed grade school
    c) ___ Some high school
    d) ___ Completed high school
    e) ___ Completed high school and also had some other training, but not college (e.g. technical training)
    f) ___ Some college or university
    g) ___ Completed college or university
    h) ___ Some graduate work
    i) ___ Graduate degree (MA, PhD, MD, etc.)
    j) ___ Not applicable

12. What is the highest level of education attained by your mother?
    a) ___ Some grade school
    b) ___ Completed grade school
    c) ___ Some high school
    d) ___ Completed high school
    e) ___ Completed high school and also had some other training, but not college (e.g. clerical training)
    f) ___ Some college or university
    g) ___ Completed college or university
    h) ___ Some graduate work
    i) ___ Graduate degree (MA, PhD, MD, etc.)
    j) ___ Not applicable
13. Where were your parents born?
   a) [ ] Both parents were born in Canada.
   b) [ ] Father is foreign born. (Country of birth ______)
   c) [ ] Mother is foreign born. (Country of birth ______)
   d) [ ] Both parents are foreign born. (Countries of birth:

   _____________ Mother ___________________ Father

14. Father's occupation: Exactly what does he do? eg. welder in a factory, truck driver, assembly line worker, teacher, etc.
   DO NOT GIVE THE NAME OF THE PLACE OF WORK OR BUSINESS

   Occupation: __________________________

15. Mother's occupation: Exactly what does she do? eg. sales clerk, housewife, bank teller, nurse, etc.
   DO NOT GIVE THE NAME OF THE PLACE OF WORK OR BUSINESS

   Occupation: __________________________

16. Does your father work?
   a) [ ] No, he does not
   b) [ ] He works part-time
   c) [ ] He works full-time
   d) [ ] Not applicable

17. Does your mother work? (Other than being a housewife.)
   a) [ ] No, she does not work
   b) [ ] She works part-time
   c) [ ] She works full-time
   d) [ ] Not applicable
Part II

How many times during the past year have you done the following?

1. Stopped a stranger on the street and asked for money.
   0 1 3 6 10 15 20 30 50 100

2. Sold marijuana.
   0 1 3 6 10 15 20 30 50 100

3. Used phony or fake identification.
   0 1 3 6 10 15 20 30 50 100

4. Drank wine, beer or liquor.
   0 1 3 6 10 15 20 30 50 100

5. Made excessive loud noises so as to disturb or annoy those people around you.
   0 1 3 6 10 15 20 30 50 100

6. Stolen a bicycle.
   0 1 3 6 10 15 20 30 50 100

7. Smoked marijuana.
   0 1 3 6 10 15 20 30 50 100

8. Cheated in exams or tests in school.
   0 1 3 6 10 15 20 30 50 100

9. Stayed away from home all night without your parents' permission or them knowing your whereabouts.
   0 1 3 6 10 15 20 30 50 100

10. Skipped school.
    0 1 3 6 10 15 20 30 50 100
11. Borrowed an identification card that belonged to someone else.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100

12. Sold LSD, heroin, 'speed', or other chemicals.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100

13. Damaged public or someone else's property.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100

14. Driven a motor vehicle while high on wine, liquor or beer.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100

15. Been suspended from school.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100

16. Driven without a license.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100

17. Stolen things that cost between $10.00 and $50.00.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100

18. Used such drugs as LSD, 'speed'.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100

19. Stolen things that cost between $50.00 and $200.00.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100

20. Run away from home.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100

   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
22. Gone joy riding.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
23. Stolen things that cost more than $200.00
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
24. Been sent out of class.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
25. Stolen more than $50.00 in cash.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
26. Had a sexual relationship with a male.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
27. Stolen less than $50.00 in cash.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
28. Broken into a house or office.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
29. Carried a concealed weapon.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
30. Participated in an individual fight.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
31. Stolen more than $200.00 in cash.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
32. Participated in a group fight.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
33. Vandalized private property.
   0  1  3  6  10  15  20  30  50  100
Part III

1. Does your father seem to accept you and what you do?
   a) ___ usually
   b) ___ sometimes
   c) ___ never
   d) ___ not applicable

2. Does your father know where and with whom you are when you are away from home?
   a) ___ usually
   b) ___ sometimes
   c) ___ never
   d) ___ not applicable

3. When you come across things that you don't understand, does your father help you with them?
   a) ___ usually
   b) ___ sometimes
   c) ___ never
   d) ___ not applicable

4. How often do you go to sports events with your father?
   a) ___ often
   b) ___ sometimes
   c) ___ never
   d) ___ not applicable

5. How often do you watch television with your father?
   a) ___ often
   b) ___ sometimes
   c) ___ never
   d) ___ not applicable

6. Do you share your thoughts and feelings with your father?
   a) ___ often
   b) ___ sometimes
   c) ___ never
   d) ___ not applicable

7. Has your father met your friends?
   a) ___ most of them
   b) ___ some of them
   c) ___ none of them
   d) ___ I have no friends
   e) ___ not applicable
8. Does your father ever punish you in the following ways?
   a) ___ by slapping or hitting you
   b) ___ by not letting you do the things that you want to do
   c) ___ by nagging and scolding you
   d) ___ by telling you that you are hurting his feelings
   e) ___ by calling you bad names
   f) ___ other (please specify ______________________)
   g) ___ not applicable

9. Would your father stick by you if you got into really bad trouble?
   a) ___ certainly
   b) ___ probably
   c) ___ maybe
   d) ___ I doubt it
   e) ___ I don't know
   f) ___ not applicable

10. How are most decisions made between you and your father?
    a) ___ he tells me what to do
    b) ___ we talk about it, but he decides
    c) ___ I decide, but I have to get his permission
    d) ___ we talk about it until we agree
    e) ___ I do what I want, but he wants me to consider his opinion
    f) ___ I do what I want
    g) ___ not applicable

11. Does your mother seem to accept you and what you do?
    a) ___ usually
    b) ___ sometimes
    c) ___ never
    d) ___ not applicable

12. Does your mother know where and with whom you are when you are away from home?
    a) ___ usually
    b) ___ sometimes
    c) ___ never
    d) ___ not applicable
13. When you come across things that you don't understand, does your mother help you with them?
   a) ___ usually
   b) ___ sometimes
   c) ___ never
   d) ___ not applicable

14. How often do you go shopping with your mother?
   a) ___ often
   b) ___ sometimes
   c) ___ never
   d) ___ not applicable

15. How often do you watch television with your mother?
   a) ___ often
   b) ___ sometimes
   c) ___ never
   d) ___ not applicable

16. Do you share your thoughts and feelings with your mother?
   a) ___ often
   b) ___ sometimes
   c) ___ never
   d) ___ not applicable

17. Has your mother met your friends?
   a) ___ most of them
   b) ___ some of them
   c) ___ none of them
   d) ___ I have no friends
   e) ___ not applicable

18. Does your mother ever punish you in the following ways?
   a) ___ by slapping or hitting you
   b) ___ by not letting you do the things that you want to do
   c) ___ by nagging and scolding you
   d) ___ by telling you that you are hurting her feelings
   e) ___ by calling you bad names
   f) ___ other (please specify ____________________)
   g) ___ not applicable
19. Would your mother stick by you if you got into really bad trouble?
   a) ______ certainly
   b) ______ probably
   c) ______ maybe
   d) ______ I doubt it
   e) ______ I don't know
   f) ______ not applicable

20. How are most decisions made between you and your mother?
   a) ______ she tells me what to do
   b) ______ we talk about it, but she decides
   c) ______ I decide, but I have to get her permission
   d) ______ we talk about it until we agree
   e) ______ I do what I want, but she wants me to consider her opinion
   f) ______ I do what I want
   g) ______ not applicable

21. How much influence do you have in making family decisions?
   a) ______ a lot of influence
   b) ______ some influence
   c) ______ very little influence
   d) ______ none
   e) ______ not applicable

22. Which of your parents most often punishes you?
   a) ______ almost always my mother
   b) ______ usually my mother
   c) ______ both mother and father equally
   d) ______ usually my father
   e) ______ almost always my father
   f) ______ I never get punished
   g) ______ not applicable

23. In general, what do your parents think of your friends?
   a) ______ strongly approve
   b) ______ approve
   c) ______ disapprove
   d) ______ strongly disapprove
   e) ______ they do not know them
   f) ______ I have no friends
   g) ______ not applicable
24. Which of your parents would make the final decision if they were deciding how the children should be punished?
   a) ___ father always
   b) ___ father usually
   c) ___ father and mother equally
   d) ___ mother usually
   e) ___ mother always
   f) ___ I don't know
   g) ___ not applicable

25. Which of your parents would make the final decision if they were deciding where to live?
   a) ___ father always
   b) ___ father usually
   c) ___ father and mother equally
   d) ___ mother usually
   e) ___ mother always
   f) ___ I don't know
   g) ___ not applicable

26. Would you like to spend more time with your parents?
   a) ___ no, I spend enough time with them
   b) ___ yes, a lot more time
   c) ___ yes, a little more time
   d) ___ not applicable

27. All families have their ups and downs. There are good times and bad times; sometimes we quarrel and sometimes we enjoy each other. Think about a typical day in your family. Each plus (+) means a time when your family feels good towards each other, get along well. Each minus (-) means a time when they seem to you to feel bad, or angry towards each other, argue and don't get along very well. Which of these circles do you think gives the closest picture to the amount of pluses and minuses in an average day?

(a) (+ + + + + + +)
(b) (+ + + + - - -)
(c) (+ + + - - - - -)
(d) (- - - - - - - - -)
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